Usenet Newsgroup Archive: rec.radio.amateur.policy

2001-01 - 2001-02

These Usenet messages were preserved as a plain-text archive. This PDF was generated by Digital Library of Amateur Radio & Communications from the source text file in 2026.

Date span: 2001-01-13 through 2001-02-28

Source text: rec.radio.amateur.policy.txt

Source item: https://archive.org/details/usenet-rec

Messages included in this PDF: 4,050

Messages are presented chronologically by archived date.

Binary or encoded payloads are not printed as blocks of encoded text; a placeholder appears where such material was detected. The original source text is unchanged.

1. Re: Buy a ham ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-13 06:19:29 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010113011929.10105.00000261@nso-bh.aol.com>
Source record: 251

In article <D2O76.774$e5.1917786@news.ntplx.net>, "Ed Hare, W1RFI"
<w1rfi@arrl.net> writes:

>Len Over 21 <lenover21@aol.com> wrote:
>
>>> But I know of no algorithm to date that can beat the liveware at
>>> decoding very badly sent code.
>
>> ? Does this mean if you don't personally know any such
>> algorithm that it doesn't exist?
>
>I chose my words precisely, Len.

I choose my words to convey meanings, Ed, but your sentence
doesn't answer my question.

>> Or does it mean that the "livewire" at CW is so pumped up they are
>> prescient on guessing the "correct meaning" of garbled characters?
>
>C-N Y__ GU_S_ TH_ ME__NIN_ O_ T__S?

That might be "CCNY GUS THE MINNESOTAN" for all I know.
Could be a student or instructor from the upper midwest? :-)

Ed, as I said before, I broke into long-distance HF communications
with a rather severe requirement to be accurate. If a military radio
circuit was doubtful of some message data, the circuit handlers
would ask for a re-send. With TTY tape, that wasn't difficult at
60 WPM...the original and a re-send could be done faster than
two skilled morse ops doing 20 WPM high on caffeine.

When nuclear warfare is threatening during a Cold War, do you
think that the US military is going to entrust vital communications
to manual morse code?!? Why would anyone bother with
trying to guess message content under such conditions?!?

Ok, so I'm using my early adult experiences. Military
communications isn't amateur radio communications, but is
amateur communications requiring guessing of morse
characters?

Is guessing necessary in all those ham traffic networks
using only morse? Several long-timers have made much
of those nets and their vital information on health and
welfare. Seems to me that message content should have
accuracy in content. Maybe I'm wrong but I thought that
someone's health and welfare depends on accuracy, not

guesses.

>> >Perhaps a few decades from now, the advances in AI will allow a general
>> >system to do as good a job as a human, or even better.
>
>> I think there is too much artificial intelligence around now,
>> especially about the set-in-concrete, armor protected,
>> traditionalist 1930s standards and practices of US amateur
>> radio...but that's only an opinion of mine...and thousands
>> upon thousands of others.
>
>Thousands of thousands? Seems a bit high to me. :-)

There's no polls available to verify all those who've expressed
an interest in amateur radio but were turned away by the
code test requirement. That might explain the quarter million
no-code-test Technicians that joined the US amateur ranks
in the last decade...even though so many long-time amateurs
openly hate and despise Techs.

"Thousands upon thousands" is a carefully chosen term I
wrote, not "thousands of thousands." My careful choice can
be interpreted as either several thousand, a whole million, or
some number in between. Your choice. Can you prove me
wrong on something that hasn't been quantified?

didit

2. Re: Buy a ham ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-13 06:19:30 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010113011930.10105.00000262@nso-bh.aol.com>
Source record: 252

In article <T_N76.773$e5.1917813@news.ntplx.net>, "Ed Hare, W1RFI"
<w1rfi@arrl.net> writes:

>Len Over 21 <lenover21@aol.com> wrote:
>
>> Why should this other Ed "share it with the world?" For
>> laughter and derision from those who "laughed their butts
>> off" such as another in here?
>
>Are you speaking for Ed, or did he tell you that he doesn't want to do so
>because he believes a couple of people miht laugh at him?

I'm speaking for him. Haven't had much contact with him for
about three years other than Christmas cards (he went up
to the Bay area to play in Silicon Gulch).

>> Someone who eight years ago experimented with a project
>> for self-satisfaction has some kind of "need" to "share it
>> with the world?" Someone who has been written up in
>> ACM journals already?
>
>I don't think that most of those who share their experiences with others do
>so out of need, Len.

Of course they do, Ed the First. The "Publish or Perish"
syndrome is as alive and well today as well as a decade
ago.

Do you REALLY think that a full explanation of the program
along with flow charts would be "acceptible" to a member-
ship that prizes manual code skill over nearly anything else
in amateur radio?!? I don't think so based on input from
others concerning their expertise and "necessity" of manual
code skill...'others' include those not in this newsgroup.

>> Of course you did. Uh huh. Guessing at what garbled characters
>> "really meant." Hmmm...that sounds suspiciously like the Carroll
>> Syndrome at work. :-)
>
>It worked for me, Len. If you choose not to believe it, I see no harm.

I choose to not believe it. Of course, my break-in to real-world
communications was rather severe in accuracy on message
content (the USSR had the Bomb and was waving that around).

Fortunately the US military was using teleprinters back then,
not morse operators at each end.

>> Whoa. How did all this "guesstimation" become part of the Lore
>> of CW? [see "Accuracy Transcends Speed" or something like
>> that from another organization]
>
>I don't think the guesstimate is related to CW skills in any way at all,
>Len. Just happens that the thread is about CW copying by software.

Oh? Accuracy isn't required with manual morse code?

Are skilled human operators so good they can "fill in blanks"
due to garble and sloppy sending? I guess so.

>> Maybe I underestimated the Lore of CW. Maybe it is a large
>> detective game, of trying to find clues and other little details to
>> lead to some kind of conclusion? I find it fascinating to watch
>> all the rationalizations being written to shore up leaking ships.
>
>In what way do you think my statement that AI will someday advance to being
>able to perform a skill that right now can only be performed by a human to
>be CW lore or shorign up a ship?

I didn't send my message in private, Ed the First. This is in public
and all those other CW expert superoperators expound on the
Lore of CW, etc.

>> All I did was report on something I saw and heard working some
>> while ago. I make no claims to its efficacy other than it worked
>> at "human rates" and at rates faster than most humans can
>> tolerate. It had its drawbacks and was not perfected. So what?
>
>I think it was neat, Len -- neat enough that I was hoping he would share it
>so we could all learn a bit more about how to solve such problems.

Again I ask why? All those extrasuperior morsemen out there all
say that the only "problem" is practice, practice, practice so that
all newcomers can approach (but never equal) their superior skill.
That makes newcomers "acceptible to the amateur community"
or something like that.

I have no quarrel with you, Ed. I've never had any quarrel with
several other Ed persons I've met...including Ed Dodds, my
boss at Ramo Wooldridge in 1960 (forgot his W6 call). I have
a quarrel (arrows included) with all those old-timers who think
that the epitome of all amateur radio is to emulate the super
morsemen of the 1930s in the year 2001.

>> Yours in science,
>
>Somehow, this doesn't quite feel like the science I remember.

It doesn't feel like science to me either. Scientists tend to be
more flexible on accepting new ideas than long-time radio
amateurs who don't want anything new to disturb their tales
of derring-do and daring, of being able to leap tall pile-ups,

and destroying infidels and heretics with mighty FISTS of CW.

:-)

didit

3. Re: Buy a ham ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-13 06:23:53 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <93os9p$t0i$0@208.207.71.142>
Source record: 253

> Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com> pontificated sanctimoniously:
>
> > FISTS says: ACCURACY TRANSCENDS SPEED, COURTESY AT ALL TIMES
> >
> > You disagree?

Of course I agree.
But as usual, the exception to the rule always seems to show up. This time it's you. It really is too bad that you didn't grow up and mature into a real man before you showed up on RRAP. You might have showed some potential as true
Real Ham ï¿½. Instead, looks like you're determined to spend the rest of your ham radio involvement as a malcontent, protesting your own inadequacies by pointing the finger anywhere else. You said that you might just learn the code once no one was "forcing" you to do it. And now this nonsense. So much for your "plans".

Accuracy is more important than speed most CW operations, it's true. Courtesy at all times is definately the preferred rule, but on rare occasions a belligerant, pugnacions induhvidual will appear and insist on blaming all his personal shortcomings and immaturities on those who he envies, becoming critical and abusive, generating a regretable exception to the most desirable rule.

And in your case, of course you have no idea what a CW test actually amounts to. When you take (took) a test at the FCC office they require you to copy a message to paper, any way you can without aid, and when they required the applicant to send code, they had you send a few words from a printed sheet. If the examiner could copy what you sent you passed.
Your assinine assertion that some vaporous "specification" must be adhered to is one of the most brainless ideas you have had to date, and that includes a considerable number of brainless ideas.

The idea that FCC, while downgrading all code speeds should then invoke some closely toleranced "specification" shows just how far you are from reality.
But that's nothing new for you, is it?

4. Re: Buy a ham ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-13 06:27:07 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <93osfr$t4n$0@208.207.71.142>
Source record: 254

"Ed Hare, W1RFI" wrote:
>
> Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com> wrote:
>
> > Do you intend to engage in poor amateur practice?
>
> I would not do so on purpose, Brian. It might be interesting to see how the
> equipment decodes the J38, and we could even try a bit of banana boat to
> test the limits, but I always try to send the best I can, by hand or with
> the keyer.
>

Ed, do him a favor and clue him in on how ridiculous he really is. He
won't listen to just anyone, he's too busy keeping the chips balanced on
both shoulders.

5. Re: Buy a ham ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-13 07:33:19 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <fs006t83vqdnu8jgk2nl43sh3abh48efjm@4ax.com>
Source record: 255

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
>If you are trolling and trying to pick a fight, you came to the
>wrong person.

You gonna beat me up like you do Steve... :-)

>I gave no "specifications,"

You used the word "simple". *You* said that a "simple decoder" could be done in less than 64MB. I didn't even disagree with you. I just pointed out that a simple decoder could be done in a lot less memory, namely 4KB. Did I damage your pride that much for you to get so nasty and generate another technically impressive 61 lines... 8-0

>I gave no "specifications," ...
>I saw the compiler stats of memory...
>I try for "tight" code using minimum memory....
>I've kept all the development versions...
>I stated some OBJECTIVES of Ed the...
>I'm not saying it cannot be done...
>I'm just giving an off-hand opinion...
>I've seen the source code printouts...
>I've seen two other commercial decoder boxes...
>I've seen and heard the results...
> I'm not interested in such anymore...
>I did was report on something...
>
>If you want an intro to Mitzi at the Comedy Store I
>can't help you there...make your own way in stand-up.

A little comedy? OK. I always got a chuckle out of your we-we jokes about hams always using the word "we". Well I've noticed that your posts seem to have a awful lot of the pronoun "I" in them. You know, I did this and I did that. So anyway, if we hams are we-we's then you Len are an I-dull person. Get it? Idle, I-dull person? Does it fit or does it fit. Aren't you chuckling? Hey don't get mad, you egged me on... :-)

6. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-13 07:33:20 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <pa006tsmtdvit3k48ft6hjggikv5ataugg@4ax.com>
Source record: 256

"W4JLE" <Fred@w4jle.com> wrote:
>Ok, you got me.. I am actually 61 years 9 months and some days.

That explains the age error...

>As to the calls, check my web site at W4JLE.com and you will
>se the progression of calls W4JLE W4JLE/pj V3CB V31GR
>KB4NGB KJ4JE W4JLE (Vanity call original call holder)

That explains the gap in the FCC database...

>As to code speed Let's set a sked and you tell me.

OK, I believe you can do 35wpm...

>> >To all of you I simply say I am proud of my achievement,
>> >I really feel it makes me better than you!
>>
>> Unfortunately I think this statement is accurate. Sad...

However you failed to comment on my last comment (above), any
comments? Any retractions? Or do you really feel that you are superior
to many, perhaps the majority of hams...

7. Re: any ideas on HOw to learn Morse quickly??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-13 11:55:39 UTC
From: Dave@spammenot.com
Message-ID: <3a6041af.3207830@news.accessnv.com>
Source record: 257
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Don't know about fun and fast but one tip I can give you is to learn
to copy by hand writting rather than printing. Before I became a ham
I heard one ham tell another he wished he had learned by using hand
writing as he found printing took too long especially at faster
speeds. I used that tip and never regretted it.

On Sat, 16 Dec 2000 22:33:15 GMT, "@!@" <ezypezy@ureach.com> wrote:

>have a computer handy as all can see.
>
>I have Morse Code made easy by ken Bradford but dont really know how much
>time to spend on it. It gets quite boring after a while.
>
>Maybe theres a way i can make it fun . and learn fast.

8. The Election & the Commission on Civil Rights

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-13 12:31:10 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3A604A8A.CA8EDA1A@sccoast.net>
Source record: 258
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Since we haven't had much discussion about the election recently, I decided it was probably time to revisit the topic. After all, anything has to be better than the endless no-code debate. Besides, this has it all - the election, Katherine Harris, Mary Berry, Nazi Germany, racism, civil rights, Democrats, Republicans, Bush, the new Congress, and so on. I'm sure there is something in here to interest almost anyone.

Anyway, I watched C-SPAN today as Mary Frances Berry, Christopher Edley, and several other members of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, trashed Florida's Secretary of State Katherine Harris during a hearing about "Allegations of Florida Voting Irregularities."

Following almost an hour of often rude questions from the various members, including a request that Ms. Harris read quotes about Nazi Germany from a book, Chairman Berry called Ms. Harris's testimony "laughable."

During Ms. Harris's testimony, Berry seemed particularly bothered whenever Ms. Harris referred questions to Clay Roberts, director of the Secretary of State's elections division, instead of answering the question herself. Ms. Harris repeatedly explained, whenever challenged on this, that it was far better that Mr. Roberts answer the question himself to insure that information given was accurate and complete.

Since Mr. Roberts was sitting right next the Ms. Harris, this logic seemed perfectly reasonable, but that did not satisfy Berry, who made several sarcastic comments, both during and after the testimony, about it.

Following the hearing, Berry said that another hearing will take place soon and that she intends to call Ms. Harris to testify again. Berry also said that she intends to subpoena Governor Jeb Bush once again (he appeared Thursday), concluding that, "I have the power to subpoena anybody and I'm going to use that power."

In spite of several days of testimony, and weeks of gathering information, the commission has yet to find any evidence of illegal activity on the part of Florida voting officials, or a single instance of intentional civil rights violation.

The Commission has been widely criticized in recent years. The appointment of chairman Mary Frances Berry caused a fire storm when it was discovered that she had once claimed that, "civil rights laws were not passed to protect the rights of white men and do not apply to them." [Civil Rights Under Reagan, San Francisco, ICS Press, 1991, p. 141.]

The commission has also been widely criticized for its political makeup. The law says that no more than four members shall be of the

same political party. And, while the commission currently consists of four Democrats, three independents, and one Republican, critics charge that the three independents, which includes Berry, have a long record of supporting Democrat party issues and candidates, and are therefore nothing more than Democrats who call themselves independents.

I certainly hope President Bush, and the new Congress, uses better judgement when selecting members for future commissions. They can start by selecting members who are more racially and politically representative of all Americans, and by avoiding extremists like Mary Frances Berry.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net

9. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-13 12:43:22 UTC
From: Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com>
Message-ID: <3A604D6A.D6BB32BD@dvol.com>
Source record: 259

Len Over 21 wrote:

> >Bingo: Absolutely. Up near the top of my ham want list is a single decent
> >tabletop xcvr which covers 6/2/222/440 all modes, cw, ssb, nbfm, wideband RX,
> >RS-232 interface, etc. Having a 10m capability for satellite ops would really
> >cork it. Try to find anything even CLOSE out there. Yet the market is flooded
> >with corresponding HF xcvrs. Dismal. Never mind radios for the centimeter
> >bands. 222 is definitely a threatened species.
>
> Some items out of the new HRO catalog just received -
>
> Icom IC-706MKIIG, 160m to 6m, 2m, 70cm. all modes.

>
Interesting class of radios to which can be added the new FT-1000 and FT-817 which is a whole new breed of cat. The problem with all of them is that they suffer performance deficiencies because the design intent was to cram as many features as possible into as small a package as possible and compromises had to be made. Not shabby radios at all and they put signals on the air from places where bigger radios are simply impractical. But they just don't cut the mustard for serious vhf/uhf weak signal work.
>

> Kenwood TS-2000, HF, 50, 144, 440, 1200 MHz bands,
> all modes

>
> Kenwood TM-642AD, 144 and 220 MHz dual bander
> Yaesu FT-847 HF, 6m, 2m, 70cm, all modes.

>
They'll all hit various vhf/uhf bands and various modes and the TS-2000 and FT-847 desktoppers probably have some decent vhf/uhf performance capabilities. The problem with those is that a serious vhf/uhf operator has to lay down well over $2k for a duz-all-bands (except 222 . .) radio including 9 HF bands + wideband SWL receive in which he may well have no interest. I can't believe that there isn't a market for a >30Mhz all-mode 100w Tech radio which has the features and performance of the "HF/vhf hybrids" and should cost a lot less money. I already have all the HF gear I need. I'd jump all over a radio like that if it was in the $1k range. Ten-Tec had one in the works but the designer quit so they dropped the project. (?!)
>

> Yes, I agree that the 220 MHz band transceivers are scarce.
> Saw only single-band and dual-band models from four
> manufacturers covering that band.

>
The auction is coming . .
>

> I haven't seen any regulation yet on banning homebrew

>
Nobody has the time to scratch-build and chasing parts is expensive and time consuming, there's just no ROI on the dollars or the hours unless it's for experimentation. Kit building seems to be on the upswing, however.
>
w3rv

10. Re: Buy a ham ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-13 12:43:58 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <93piie$d17$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 260

In article <93osfr$t4n$0@208.207.71.142>,
Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>
>
> "Ed Hare, W1RFI" wrote:
> >
> > Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com> wrote:
> >
> > > Do you intend to engage in poor amateur practice?
> >
> > I would not do so on purpose, Brian. It might be interesting to see
how the
> > equipment decodes the J38, and we could even try a bit of banana
boat to
> > test the limits, but I always try to send the best I can, by hand or
with
> > the keyer.
> >
>
> Ed, do him a favor and clue him in on how ridiculous he really is. He
> won't listen to just anyone, he's too busy keeping the chips balanced
on
> both shoulders.

I certainly won't take any advice from you. You advovate, if not engage
in poor amateur practice. I would have expected better from an old
Extra and VE.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

11. Re: Buy a ham ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-13 12:47:32 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <93pip3$d3e$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 263

In article <93op5f$l7r$0@208.207.71.142>,
Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>
>
> Brian wrote:

> > I understand this:
> >
> > E1A16 @E1A14 (D) [97.211b]
> >
> > When may a station use special codes intended to obscure the meaning
> > of messages?
> >
> > A. Never under any circumstances
> > B. Only when a Special Temporary Authority has been obtained from
the
> > FCC
> > C. Only when a Pre-1999 Extra class operator is controlling the
station
> > D. When sending telecommand messages to a station in space
operation
>
> Typically, you have no idea what you're talking about.

I have an idea what you are talking about, and it sucks.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

12. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-13 12:54:47 UTC
From: Vincent Biancomano <103520.355@CompuServe.COM>
Message-ID: <93pj6n$5k4$1@sshuraac-i-1.production.compuserve.com>
Source record: 261

>If it was legal (and there's no case law to sustain any
>position that it was truly illegal) then the consequences
>you complain about are just whining. The FCC could have
>changed the tests every day if they wanted.

Your troll will do you little good, Bill, so stop praying for that break that is never coming to you. You asked the questions, I answered them in full. Very explicitly. So shifting the focal point back on Bash as a person, versus what the overall effects were, is a bit amateurish. If the powers that be want to change the face of the exam structure, they will. Over an 18-year period, I've told them, and you, just how to do it. If they haven't got the stomach for it, it's ham radio's, and ARRL's, funeral. It's that simple. If they want to restore integrity, they will.

Regards,
Vince, WB2EZG

13. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-13 12:56:07 UTC
From: Vincent Biancomano <103520.355@CompuServe.COM>
Message-ID: <93pj97$5k4$2@sshuraac-i-1.production.compuserve.com>
Source record: 262

>Just how many different ways can the questions be
>configured before the test preparers begin to recycle
>previously used questions?

The ways are virtually infinite.

Regards,
Vince, WB2EZG

14. Re: Buy a ham ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-13 12:56:30 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <93pj9u$df7$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 268

In article <93opn2mrn0@208.207.71.142>,
Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>
>
> Brian Burke (N0MiND) wrote:
>
> > You cannot stop a madman.
>
> If nothing more you surely have proved that. Anyone who
> self-flaggelates as you have over the past 15 years in a vain attempt
to
> conform the rest of the world to your own personal specifications by
> denyingyourself as you have is either an isolated monk on a remote
> mountaintop or a total nut. We all know the correct answer to that
> question with no aid whatever from the Question Pool's exact answers.

Dick, you'll always find opposition from me when you advocate poor
amateur practice. All you have to do is reverse yourself.

I don't know what it is about these OF's that think just because they
have more time in the chow hall, they own the ARS. It doesn't work that
way. When you're wrong, you're wrong.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

15. Re: 10 bucks buys a ham license.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-13 12:58:46 UTC
From: "D. S. Platt" <jeepp@erols.com>
Message-ID: <3A605106.59349F9@erols.com>
Source record: 265
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

jamesrhampton@my-deja.com wrote:

> Neat. Someone actually thought of not charging. Of course, my first
> licenses cost nothing - it was just the 60 mile (one way) drive to
> Buffalo that cost a bit of time and money (gas, thruway tolls, parking,
> etc.). The cost is actually minimal anywhere. I think I paid $5.90
> when I decided to get back into amateur radio and tested out in 1993
> (after letting my tickets expire over 10 years earlier). Whats the
> cost today?
>
> 73 from Rochester, NY
> Jim (AA2QA)
>
> In article <93airr$1js$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
> BamBam <kl0an@my-deja.com> wrote:
> > Now why would I go and PAY for a license when I got my license, AND
> > upgrades for free.. Oh, sorry, I did have to earn them with a little
> > studying and such.. My club offers testing free.. No money exchanges
> > hands.. And I can now talk world-wide on the Extra bands..
> >
> > Just quit tryin to cheat the system, sit down with the manuals and get
> > studying.. And if you want to take a test for free.. First Saturday of
> > the month, Geo-Physics Institute, UAF, Fairbanks, Alaska.
> >
> > 73
> > Paul Jordan
> > kl0an
> >
> > In article <no.skill@arrl.crappy.org>,
> > Buyone@arrl.crap (peddler) wrote:
> > > Thanks to the organization called the ARRL, you don't have to earn a
> > license
> > > anymore. You can go to your local VE group and buy one for $10.
> > > Get one today and join in the Fun!
> > >
> > > AOHF ~ assholes on H.F.
> > >
> > >
> >
> > --
> > Don't Sweat the Petty Things.
> > Don't Pet the Sweaty Things.
> >

> > Sent via Deja.com
> > http://www.deja.com/
> >
>
> Sent via Deja.com
> http://www.deja.com/

The Laurel (MD) VEC (MD) has had a fee!

16. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-13 13:00:41 UTC
From: Vincent Biancomano <103520.355@CompuServe.COM>
Message-ID: <93pjhp$5k4$3@sshuraac-i-1.production.compuserve.com>
Source record: 264

>That's a mouth full of unspecified jargon. You offer
>not one practical example of what/how you'd accomplish
>your goal...and you again avoid answering the
>fundamental question:

That's because you took a knee jerk approach to reading and didn't read on. I've also outlined the details for 18 years, in published form. ARRL has some of those papers. By the way, when I'm assigned national overseer of the exam process by ARRL, and am given a lawyer who knows his/her way around the courtroom, I'll show you how it's done.

Regards,
Vince, WB2EZG

17. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-13 13:04:53 UTC
From: Vincent Biancomano <103520.355@CompuServe.COM>
Message-ID: <93pjpl$5k4$4@sshuraac-i-1.production.compuserve.com>
Source record: 266

>Just how many ways can you ask what the unit
>of electrical resistance is?

First, that's not a technical question, which is the
subject under discussion. It's asking for a definition.
Second, I'd wager you never actually saw that question
asked on any actual exam you ever took. I never saw that
question on even my Novice exam. If it's being asked now,
it's time for hams taking those exams to start complaining
about dumbing down.

Regards,
Vince, WB2EZG

18. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-13 13:10:20 UTC
From: Vincent Biancomano <103520.355@CompuServe.COM>
Message-ID: <93pk3s$5k4$5@sshuraac-i-1.production.compuserve.com>
Source record: 267

>We are dealing with amateur licenses...NOT the testing
>for satisfactory completeion of a three credit college
>course.

You're not reading Bill. I'm talking about an example
for college test guides.

You're also not reading ahead before responding. So you're
responding in knee jerk fashion. I end up by saying that
license manuals for Amateurs, _at a lower level_, should
achieve the same goal as a college test guide.

Regards,
Vince, WB2EZG

19. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-13 13:15:43 UTC
From: Vincent Biancomano <103520.355@CompuServe.COM>
Message-ID: <93pkdv$5k4$6@sshuraac-i-1.production.compuserve.com>
Source record: 269

>Your level of technical proficiency to answer those type
>questions goes well beyond that of any entry level amateur
>exam...including General. You want a graduation certificate,
>not a license exam.

Given what I've said about college exam guides, and Amateur
guides _at a lower level_, you're incorrect. Go back as far as
you wish in Dejanews for what I've said, which is learn the
BASICS before trying to master DSP, etc.

Regards,
Vince, WB2EZG

20. Re: any ideas on HOw to learn Morse quickly??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-13 13:33:17 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010113083317.05639.00000132@ng-cd1.aol.com>
Source record: 270

>From: Dave@spammenot.com (Dave)

>Before I became a ham I heard one ham tell another he wished he
>had learned by using hand writing as he found printing took too long
>especially at faster speeds. I used that tip and never regretted it

Might explain why I keep losing code-copying contests. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

21. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-13 13:37:28 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010113083728.05639.00000133@ng-cd1.aol.com>
Source record: 271

>From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

>Ed, you've convinced me! You and your lab crew get to keep your
>jobs!

Thanks, Larry; I will let Mark Wilson know that you have changed your mind.
The paperwork wasn't turned in until I had one last chance to save our hides.
:-)

>I guess the DXCC Desk will have to be given over to an
>all-volunteer staff!

With the DXCC fees, DXCC is at least partially self funded. I don't know how
close it is. A number of hams are members of the ARRL JUST for DXCC.

However, if you feel that the money spent on DXCC is better spent and that the
loss of members would be offset by the savings, that sounds like good
information for you to discuss with your ARRL Division Director. He may also
be able to answer any questions about the funding and other financial issues.
The Board meeting is coming up, so now is an ideal time to send him an email or
pick up the telephone.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

22. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-13 13:48:03 UTC
From: Vincent Biancomano <103520.355@CompuServe.COM>
Message-ID: <93pmajqrf1@sshuraaa-i-1.production.compuserve.com>
Source record: 272

>The FCC could have changed the tests every day if
>they wanted.

The FCC hasn't wanted any part of ham radio since at least the early 80s, remember? Remember when Vic Clark's statement was brought in re: the issue has to do with code AND theory, not Morse per se? Remember when you said "that's all bull"? FCC's recent R&O made it quite clear Clark's statement was right on target. We now have no justification for our frequencies as a technical hobby. And that's just the way the "powers that be" want it.

Regards,
Vince, WB2EZG

23. Re: Buy a ham ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-13 13:53:43 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010113085343.05639.00000136@ng-cd1.aol.com>
Source record: 273

>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)

>>> ? Does this mean if you don't personally know any such
>>> algorithm that it doesn't exist?

> choose my words to convey meanings, Ed, but your sentence
>doesn't answer my question.

You are right, Len; I had misread your question. I believe that things exist that I don't know about. This could be one of them. I didn't realize that you thought that some people were unaware that things could exist without their knowledge. While I would agree that some people might think that, but I believe it is a very small percentage.

What is your estimate of the percentage of population that believes that things they don't know about cannot exist? Did you ask the question because you feel that I am in that percentage?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

24. Re: Buy a ham ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-13 14:00:12 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010113090012.05639.00000137@ng-cd1.aol.com>
Source record: 274

>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)

>When nuclear warfare is threatening during a Cold War, do you
>think that the US military is going to entrust vital communications
>to manual morse code?!?

I certainly hope not.

>Why would anyone bother with
>trying to guess message content under such conditions?!?

Do you believe a QSO on the bottom end of 40 meters is of the same scope as nuclear war threatening? Under the QSO conditions, I "guessed" because I didn't know what the other guy's problem was and didn't want to get into a discussion about why his sending is so bad. I never imagined that the QSO would be related to nuclear war on a newsgroup. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

25. Re: Buy a ham ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-13 14:06:32 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010113090632.05639.00000139@ng-cd1.aol.com>
Source record: 275

>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)

>Is guessing necessary in all those ham traffic networks
>using only morse?

I would say, Len, that few of the QSOs I have require guessing. Certainly the percentage due to faulty encoding is very small.

>Several long-timers have made much
>of those nets and their vital information on health and
>welfare. Seems to me that message content should have
>accuracy in content. Maybe I'm wrong but I thought that
>someone's health and welfare depends on accuracy, not
>guesses.

You are correct; in any formal traffic handling, accuracy is part of the system specification. Guessing is not allowed. Casual QSOs? Probably the same rule as vocal conversations. If you miss a word that you don't believe to be critical to the flow of thoughts and believe you know what it is from context, do you always ask for a reiepeat? How about at the party where the noise is loud? If the guy who is slurring his words comes up to you and you can't understand part of what he is saying, do you ask for a lot of repeats or nod a lot? :-)

I can assure you, Len, if I am ever handling military traffic because of a nuclear war, I will ask for fills if I miss a word.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
>
>>> >Perhaps a few decades from now, the advances in AI will allow a general
>>> >system to do as good a job as a human, or even better.
>>
>>> I think there is too much artificial intelligence around now,
>>> especially about the set-in-concrete, armor protected,
>>> traditionalist 1930s standards and practices of US amateur
>>> radio...but that's only an opinion of mine...and thousands
>>> upon thousands of others.
>>
>>Thousands of thousands? Seems a bit high to me. :-)
>
>There's no polls available to verify all those who've expressed
>an interest in amateur radio but were turned away by the
>code test requirement. That might explain the quarter million
>no-code-test Technicians that joined the US amateur ranks

>in the last decade...even though so many long-time amateurs
>openly hate and despise Techs.
>
>"Thousands upon thousands" is a carefully chosen term I
>wrote, not "thousands of thousands." My careful choice can
>be interpreted as either several thousand, a whole million, or
>some number in between. Your choice. Can you prove me
>wrong on something that hasn't been quantified?
>
>didit
>
>
>
>
>

26. Home-Plug HF device interference concerns

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-13 14:11:19 UTC
From: billsohl@mindspring.com
Message-ID: <3a60609b.1091289@news.mindspring.com>
Source record: 276

>In article <20010109075537.29930.00000754@ng-cb1.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com
>(W1RFI) writes:
>>... last month I met with representatives from HomePlug, an industry
>>consortium that is developing the spec for home-networking devices that will
>>put HF signals onto residential electrical wiring. ARRL has helped persuade
>>them that their spec needs to include notches in the HF bands and they
>>brought some test equipment that let us test the levels they are notching
>>to at W1INF, W1AW and KB1BE.
>>The results were mixed, and this month, I will be doing some
>>additional testing using a noise generator/amplifier I built in the Lab. The
>>results will be used by the manufacturers to set the standard at a level
>>expected not to cause widespread interference to ham radio.

Ed,

You said: "The results will be used by the manufacturers to set the
standard at a level expected not to cause widespread interference to
ham radio."

Does that imply that they aren't concerned about seletive
or locally limited interference to ham radio?

Just what does
"widespread" mean in their efforts to limit interference to
my operations and those of other hams?

What about local interference by one of these devices to
my operation if a neighbor installs one?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

27. Re: Buy a ham ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-13 14:13:15 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <3A60627B.4A5B5E86@arrl.org>
Source record: 277

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> Do you REALLY think that a full explanation of the program
> along with flow charts would be "acceptible" to a member-
> ship that prizes manual code skill over nearly anything else
> in amateur radio?!?

You're referring to FISTS?

> I don't think so based on input from
> others concerning their expertise and "necessity" of manual
> code skill...'others' include those not in this newsgroup.

ARRL members liked:
A PIC16F84-Based CW Decoder, Morgantini, Francesco, IK3OIL, QST, Aug
1999, pp 37-40.

Maybe you need a new set of "others" from which to solicit input. The
one you've got now seems to be misleading you.

Jon

28. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-13 14:15:41 UTC
From: billsohl@mindspring.com
Message-ID: <3a606235.1500804@news.mindspring.com>
Source record: 278

On 13 Jan 2001 12:56:07 GMT, Vincent Biancomano
<103520.355@CompuServe.COM> wrote:

>>Just how many different ways can the questions be
>>configured before the test preparers begin to recycle
>>previously used questions?
>
>The ways are virtually infinite.

While that may be a very specific mathematical answer, the
reality is that there is a practical point at which questions, while
technically different are still essentially the same.

I can ask:

What is the unit of electrical resistance?
or I can ask?
The unit of electrical resistance is?

Different questions but would anyone argue they
are essentially identical as to the memorization of
unit of resistance = ohm

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

29. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-13 14:21:16 UTC
From: billsohl@mindspring.com
Message-ID: <3a606342.1770364@news.mindspring.com>
Source record: 279

On 13 Jan 2001 13:00:41 GMT, Vincent Biancomano
<103520.355@CompuServe.COM> wrote:

>>That's a mouth full of unspecified jargon. You offer
>>not one practical example of what/how you'd accomplish
>>your goal...and you again avoid answering the
>>fundamental question:
>
>That's because you took a knee jerk approach to reading
>and didn't read on. I've also outlined the details for
>18 years, in published form. ARRL has some of those
>papers.

So you say. If it isn't something that has been published
by the ARRL or posted here, just how does anyone have
a clue as to what your "details" really are?

>By the way, when I'm assigned national overseer
>of the exam process by ARRL, and am given a lawyer who
>knows his/her way around the courtroom, I'll show you how
>it's done.

Are you now saying that the ARRL has some legal hold
over study guides? Here again, you make this
non-specific statement to having an ARRL attorney work
with you as if that would create some special/new legal
aspects to testing that aren't now there. Without the
details your statement is meaningless as to the liklihood
of accomplishing your goal.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

30. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-13 14:24:51 UTC
From: billsohl@mindspring.com
Message-ID: <3a6064b1.2137748@news.mindspring.com>
Source record: 280

On 13 Jan 2001 13:15:43 GMT, Vincent Biancomano
<103520.355@CompuServe.COM> wrote:

>>Your level of technical proficiency to answer those type
>>questions goes well beyond that of any entry level amateur
>>exam...including General. You want a graduation certificate,
>>not a license exam.
>
>Given what I've said about college exam guides, and Amateur
>guides _at a lower level_, you're incorrect. Go back as far as
>you wish in Dejanews for what I've said, which is learn the
>BASICS before trying to master DSP, etc.

Actually, I'd go so far to say that one actually
doesn't need to understand ohm's law at all to
master DSP. Thousands of people do systems engineering
work without ever getting into the BASICs you talk
about.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

31. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-13 14:27:51 UTC
From: billsohl@mindspring.com
Message-ID: <3a60654f.2295133@news.mindspring.com>
Source record: 281

On 13 Jan 2001 13:48:03 GMT, Vincent Biancomano
<103520.355@CompuServe.COM> wrote:

>>The FCC could have changed the tests every day if
>>they wanted.
>
>The FCC hasn't wanted any part of ham radio since at
>least the early 80s, remember?

The point was made in reference to when the FCC was
still giving tests and the FCC (as well as some hams)
were upset because Bash was publishing the questions
from PAST exams.

>Remember when
>Vic Clark's statement was brought in re: the issue has
>to do with code AND theory, not Morse per se?
>Remember when you said "that's all bull"? FCC's
>recent R&O made it quite clear Clark's statement was
>right on target. We now have no justification for our
>frequencies as a technical hobby. And that's just the
>way the "powers that be" want it.

That's a conclusion on your opinion only.
You are entitled to that opinion, as I am mine which
is to disagree with it.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

32. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-13 14:30:02 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <93pop7gvq1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 283

In article <pa006tsmtdvit3k48ft6hjggikv5ataugg@4ax.com>,
Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com> wrote:
> "W4JLE" <Fred@w4jle.com> wrote:
> >> >To all of you I simply say I am proud of my achievement,
> >> >I really feel it makes me better than you!
> >>
> >> Unfortunately I think this statement is accurate. Sad...
>
> However you failed to comment on my last comment (above), any
> comments? Any retractions? Or do you really feel that you are superior
> to many, perhaps the majority of hams...

Perhaps so much so that he thinks it is perfectly OK to disregard good
amateur practice. We'll let him address that.

It's the same kind of attitude that Dick and others of his kind appear
to have when they advocate some imaginary rights in amateur radio that
the FCC doesn't grant. I used to let it go by, but no longer.

Even Riley has commented that the worst offenders often hold advanced
licenses and are long time hams. If only the Catholic Church hadn't
taught me to read, I too, could ignore Part 97.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

33. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-13 14:32:56 UTC
From: Vincent Biancomano <103520.355@CompuServe.COM>
Message-ID: <93pouo$i51$1@sshuraab-i-1.production.compuserve.com>
Source record: 282

>While that may be a very specific mathematical answer, the
>reality is that there is a practical point at which questions,
>while technically different are still essentially the same.

Referring to your question about "resistance" specifically, the reality is (1) asking about the unit of resistance is not a technical question, just a definition and (2) a bona fide technical exam won't be asking such a rudimentary question, even at Novice level, on what the unit of resistance is.

And on a general level for actual technical questions, the practical number of ways a question can be asked, a very high number, will far outstrip the person's ability to "look it up."

Regards,
Vince, WB2EZG

34. Re: The Election & the Commission on Civil Rights

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-13 14:38:04 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A60684C.5022F5BE@IEEE.org>
Source record: 287
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Dwight Stewart wrote:
> In spite of several days of testimony, and weeks of gathering
> information, the commission has yet to find any evidence of illegal
> activity on the part of Florida voting officials, or a single instance
> of intentional civil rights violation.

I thought it interesting that they didn't produce a single witness
who was denied his/her right to vote. All the witnesses voted! The
worst complaint was that there was a delay or something made someone
nervous. Jesse Jackson was conspicuous by his absence.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

35. Re: The Election & the Commission on Civil Rights

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-13 14:39:10 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A60688E.F89B8B80@IEEE.org>
Source record: 288
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

helmsman wrote:
> Gore lost fair and square and the Democratic party is a bunch of
> loosers.

Make that sore losers looking for revenge.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

36. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-13 14:40:09 UTC
From: Vincent Biancomano <103520.355@CompuServe.COM>
Message-ID: <93ppc9$i51$2@sshuraab-i-1.production.compuserve.com>
Source record: 284

>So you say. If it isn't something that has been published
>by the ARRL or posted here, just how does anyone have
>a clue as to what your "details" really are?

Keep praying for that break, Bill. The details have been put forth many times over 18 years, a sampling of which I just repeated to you yesterday/today.

VB>By the way, when I'm assigned national overseer
VB>of the exam process by ARRL, and am given a lawyer who
VB>knows his/her way around the courtroom, I'll show you how
VB>it's done.

>Are you now saying that the ARRL has some legal hold
>over study guides? Here again, you make this
>non-specific statement to having an ARRL attorney work
>with you as if that would create some special/new legal
>aspects to testing that aren't now there. Without the
>details your statement is meaningless as to the liklihood
>of accomplishing your goal.

Keep praying for that break, Bill.

Regards,
Vince WB2EZG

37. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-13 14:40:54 UTC
From: billsohl@mindspring.com
Message-ID: <3a6065fc.2468215@news.mindspring.com>
Source record: 285

On 13 Jan 2001 05:05:17 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

>Bill Sohl wrote:
>>
>> On Thu, 11 Jan 2001 04:05:00 GMT, Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
>> wrote:
>>
>> >billsohl@mindspring.com (Bill Sohl) wrote:
>> >> Dick Bash just pissed off the feds and
>> >>others because no one thought to do what he did before.
>> >>The feds were pissed because their "storehouse"
>> >>of tests had to be constantly changed to counter
>> >>Bash's efforts and the non-feds were just pissed
>> >>because they hadn't done it first.
>> >
>> >A little rewrite of history? I remember all the gripes. Most thought
>> >it was cheating which it was. Try that scheme at any university and
>> >you would be kicked out quick...
>>
>> Pick-up many college study guides and you'll often find
>> copies of past tests.

> You really are a case study Willie. You can't discern the difference
>between "past tests" and those currently in use? No wonder you're so far
>out in left field

Bash ONLY published test questions from PAST tests.
If the FCC did NOT change the tests then whose fault is that?
If a college class uses the same test questions year
after year, is that the fault of the study guide publisher?
In another post, Vince claims there's an infinite variety
for test questions. Assuming that is soo, then the FCC
could have given differnet tests every time rather than
repeating them as they apparently were doing.

> It makes NO difference if you or
>> anyone else thought it was cheating, the bottom line
>> would still be was it legal?
>
> And it was NOT legal.

It has NEVER ben tested in a court. The fact that a law may
have existed which appeared to make something illegal does
not offer the opportunity to state catagorically that the
illegal act would have been validated as illegal if a court
case was brought. Many laws get tossed by courts when

someone is finally prosecuted for the first time under the law
in question. No such case ever was brought by the FCC
against Bash or anyone else...therefore, no absolute conclusion
can be made as to the true legality/illegality of what Bash
did. We have and will only have opinions of what might have been.

>The fact that FCC wound up not prosecuting him
>for his violations in no way indicate that his actions which were very
>much in violation of law were legal.

Again, your opinion ONLY. The question is? Would the FCC
have prevailed in a case against Bash? That we will never
know the answer to.

> It is revealing that you would suggest otherwise.

It is interesting that you buy in so willingly to every
government law just because it has been passed or
promulgated by an administrative agency. Here in NJ
a few years back the state dept of Health passed
a regulation forbidding restaurants to serve eggs
over easy. The public and the restaurantors
told the dept of health exactly what they could
do with that law by totally ignoring it. Likewise,
the entire driving public routinely ignored the national
55 limit wor over a decade.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

38. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-13 14:46:59 UTC
From: Vincent Biancomano <103520.355@CompuServe.COM>
Message-ID: <93ppp3$i51$3@sshuraab-i-1.production.compuserve.com>
Source record: 286

>Actually, I'd go so far to say that one actually
>doesn't need to understand ohm's law at all to
>master DSP. Thousands of people do systems engineering
>work without ever getting into the BASICs you talk
>about.

You're shifting focal points again. Ham radio is still defined as
a "fundamentally technical" hobby. And the most rudimentary
part of that is knowing basic electronics. In one form or
another, you're always railing against learning the basics.
That's why I say you're basically a no-theory advocate.
That part of your postings _always_ comes thru loud and clear.

Regards,
Vince, WB2EZG

39. Re: Buy a ham ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-13 14:50:03 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <93ppurhqq1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 291

In article <aTN76.772$e5.1916897@news.ntplx.net>,
"Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net> wrote:

> Yes, you will probably be on the air pretty quickly with that set up.
Is
> your QTH far enough from a major city that you will survive the
initial
> blast that generates the EMP?
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

Ed, I went to see where his QTH was in relation to 1st strike targets.
Go follow the link from his personal data on QRZ.com. Whatever his
capability after a nuclear exchange will be wasted on 3950. I should
have caught on sooner. Sorry.

73, Brian

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

40. Re: The Election & the Commission on Civil Rights

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-13 14:51:26 UTC
From: n4jzh@knology.net
Message-ID: <3a606b12.635707@news.knology.net>
Source record: 290
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

On Sat, 13 Jan 2001 08:38:04 -0600, Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
wrote:

>Dwight Stewart wrote:
>> In spite of several days of testimony, and weeks of gathering
>> information, the commission has yet to find any evidence of illegal
>> activity on the part of Florida voting officials, or a single instance
>> of intentional civil rights violation.
>
>I thought it interesting that they didn't produce a single witness
>who was denied his/her right to vote. All the witnesses voted! The
>worst complaint was that there was a delay or something made someone
>nervous. Jesse Jackson was conspicuous by his absence.
>--
>http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

C the reason Jesse Jackson wasn't there is because folks sent him
some money for his cause, now that he has some spending money
he will be quite for a while, last seen at a KFC near you.

41. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-13 14:51:49 UTC
From: Vincent Biancomano <103520.355@CompuServe.COM>
Message-ID: <93pq25$i51$4@sshuraab-i-1.production.compuserve.com>
Source record: 289

VB>Remember when
VB>Vic Clark's statement was brought in re: the issue has
VB>to do with code AND theory, not Morse per se?
VB>Remember when you said "that's all bull"? FCC's
VB>recent R&O made it quite clear Clark's statement was
VB>right on target. We now have no justification for our
VB>frequencies as a technical hobby. And that's just the
VB>way the "powers that be" want it.

>That's a conclusion on your opinion only.
>You are entitled to that opinion, as I am mine which
>is to disagree with it.

Bill, with respect to your "that's all bull" remark, you couldn't
be more solidly nailed to the wall.

Regards,
Vince, WB2EZG

42. Re: The Election & the Commission on Civil Rights

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-13 14:52:29 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A606BAD.77C74E59@IEEE.org>
Source record: 292
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Donnie wrote:
> ... last seen at a KFC near you.

Hey, what's wrong with a KFC? Wish there was one in my
home town.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

43. Re: The Election & the Commission on Civil Rights

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-13 15:20:25 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3A607231.3DB1E99D@sccoast.net>
Source record: 293
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Cecil wrote:
>
> Dwight Stewart wrote:
> > In spite of several days of testimony,
> > and weeks of gathering information, the
> > commission has yet to find any evidence
> > of illegal activity on the part of Florida
> > voting officials, or a single instance
> > of intentional civil rights violation.
>
> I thought it interesting that they didn't
> produce a single witness who was denied
> his/her right to vote. All the witnesses
> voted!

They keep talking about witnesses and evidence, and everyone keep asking for witnesses and evidence. But, so far, I have not seen a thing other than talk.

> The worst complaint was that there was a
> delay or something made someone nervous.

Good point. Shortly after the election, there were complaints about police at some of the voting booths (it made some minority voters nervious). Of course, in some of the voting districts in the Miami area, I would nervious if there were not any police around. However, I don't hear much about that complaint anymore. Perhaps someone else pointed out what I just said, or I simply missed it. Did you hear it during the commission's hearing?

> Jesse Jackson was conspicuous by his absence.

Ah, Jesse. He does seem to be keeping a lower profile lately (perhaps the Republican demonstrators in Florida were more effective than they thought).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net

44. Re: Proof of License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-13 16:18:56 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010113111856.02315.00001726@nso-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 294

In article <sRM76.182$_B2.69443@typhoon.kc.rr.com>, wd9get@amsat.org (Keith E. Brandt, M.D.) writes:

>My XYL received her technician license back in the good-old-days of the 5 WPM
>
>code test and the General written. We've been searching, but so far have not
>been able to find her old license to show the VEC so she can upgrade to
>General under the new system. I have heard that there is a webpage either at
>the FCC or ARRL that you can get proof of licensure prior to the cutoff date.
>
>
>Anyone know where I can find this?
>
>Tnx & 73,
>Keith

Keith:

Wouldn't it be easier for her to simply re-take the 5 WPM code test? If not, why not?

73 de Larry, K3LT

45. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-13 16:18:57 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010113111857.02315.00001728@nso-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 295

In article <3A5DE319.CD86ADAB@toast.net>, John O'Flaherty <oflahert@toast.net>
writes:

>> I just went from a 9-year old Ford Taurus with a 6-cylinder engine
>> and an automatic transmission to a new Toyota Corolla with a
>> 4-cylinder transmission and a stick shift. I now believe I have a
>> better car than I had before. How's that for my idea of a
>> "progressive attitude?"
>
>What kind of mileage do you get out of that 4-cylinder transmission? :-)
>
>john

John:

As you were. I *obviously* meant "four-cylinder engine and a
stick shift. Answer: 27-32 MPG City, 41-44 MPG highway. Thanks
for asking!

73 de Larry, K3LT

46. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-13 16:18:57 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010113111857.02315.00001727@nso-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 297

In article <20010111070021.03672.00001152@ng-fc1.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>
>>>> A 5 WPM maximum code test is no code test at all, and there is
>>>> no point in keeping it if it will never be increased, which it never
>will.
>
>>>Translation: If I can't have it my way, I don't want it at all. :-)
>
>>Your translator isn't working very well.
>
>Then are you saying that if you can't have it your way, you still want to see
>Morse code testing continue in its present form?
>
>73,
>Ed Hare, W1RFI

Ed:

I'd have to admit that a 5 WPM code test is better than none at all, but considering that this low maximum level doesn't do much to support continued advancement in this practical communications skill, and isn't likely to do so, I have to be realistic and admit that there is little point in keeping this requirement. For all practical purposes, 5 WPM is, in fact, "no-code" ham radio -- for that's what it gives us as an end result. The former, 3-tiered 5, 13, and 20 WPM code testing regime produced the kind of learning challenge which actually brought new CW operators on-the-air, using the Morse/CW mode. All 5 WPM will do in the future is put an HF microphone into someone's hand or on their desk -- and force us CW operators to hand over large chunks of spectrum presently used by that mode to support growth in the usage of HF phone. Having it "my way" is irrelevant. Human nature being what it is, most people will take the path of least resistance in order to achieve the greatest amount of instant gratification.

73 de Larry, K3LT

47. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-13 16:18:58 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010113111858.02315.00001729@nso-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 298

In article <3A5E03D9.ECCF32DF@uci.edu>, Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> writes:

>> Jim:
>
>> So do I; but few (if any!) of those QSO's were held at a speed as low
>> as 5 WPM! How many people these days who have taken only the
>> 5 WPM code test actually get on the air with CW and achieve
>> proficiency at 20 WPM or higher? Personally, I don't know a single
>> one, although I'm sure one will occasionally surface.
>
>Well now you do. Didn't you pass a 5 WPM test before you worked all
>those stations? I think it shows that it's the operator who determines
>what will happen after he passes the test - not the test itself.
>Learning the code is all that's required in order to get on the air and
>get up to speed. Elements 1B and 1C didn't make me become more
>proficient at code. Operating did. Element 1A made me learn the code.
>Operating gave me the proficiency to pass the others. I didn't need
>those tests in order to become a CW operator. I had already become one
>(after a fashion) by the time I took them. I'm just lucky, I guess,
>that I didn't run into guys like you on the air while I was learning.
>
>>> I think you understate the utility of the mode, Larry.
>
>> Hah! That'll be the day!
>
>But that's what you're doing by making your claim about the 5 WPM test.
>You might consider tempering your comments about it.
>
>73, Jim AC6XG

Jim:

I learned Morse code at speeds greater than 5 WPM because
it was the current requirement to obtain an Extra-class license!
If the requirement hadn't existed, neither would my achievement --
and I would not have benefited from the enjoyment of reasonable
proficiency in this practical communications skill. It's as simple
as that.

73 de Larry, K3LT

48. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-13 16:18:59 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010113111859.02315.00001730@nso-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 296

In article <O9n66.630$e5.1544641@news.ntplx.net>, "Ed Hare, W1RFI"
<w1rfi@arrl.net> writes:

>> I dunno, but that's the mantra used by the ARRL and the ham radio
>> equipment manufacturers and publishers for years -- as a justification
>> for dumbing-down licensing requirements.
>
>Do you believe that if Amateur Radio were "smartened up" to the point where
>one could study a 16-page study guide to get a General, that ARRL would stop
>saying that it is important that hams understand modern radio technology?
>
>73,
>Ed Hare, W1RFI

Ed:

I don't know. I can't personally relate to reading a 16-page study
manual to get a General, or any other, amateur license. I became
a ham after years as an electronics hobbyist, and passed my
written tests largely on the basis of knowledge I had acquired over
that time -- through self-study from a variety of sources, and
hands-on experience in project building. I didn't get my ham
ticket for the singular purpose of being able to empower myself
by projecting my voice over long distances at the press of a
button. Moreover, having had that capability for my entire
career ham career, I've always sought, and utilized, more
challenging modes. From a technical standpoint, I don't even
approach the knowledge and experience that professionals
such as yourself possess; but as an AMATEUR radio operator;
I consider myself to be well-qualified to hold the highest, most
distinctive class of license. I've had nothing handed over to
me on a silver platter; in fact, I've had to get over years of
whining for just that to happen before I realized that becoming
a ham meant enough to me to learn the practical communications
skill which is Morse/CW.

73 de Larry, K3LT

49. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-13 16:18:59 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010113111859.02315.00001731@nso-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 299

In article <3A59DEDD.EC79A07E@IEEE.org>, Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>> Is it possible for a woman to rape a man or a boy? If so, how could
>> pre-registering the penis of the victim prevent the crime?
>
>Is she using a penis in the commission of a crime?

Cecil:

Re-read the question, and try again.

73 de Larry, K3LT

50. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-13 16:19:00 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010113111900.02315.00001732@nso-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 300

In article <sIM66.653$e5.1665591@news.ntplx.net>, "Ed Hare, W1RFI"
<w1rfi@arrl.net> writes:

>
>I think, however, that for the most part, those who want to be hams are
>hams. In the mid 60s, I think there were just over 100,000 hams. Today,
>there are over 6 times that number. I agree that growth is not one of our
>major problems.
>
>73,
>Ed Hare, W1RFI

Ed:

If growth isn't one of "our major problems," what do you think they
are? And how will a zero-WPM, one-class license fix them?

73 de Larry, K3LT

51. Re: The Election & the Commission on Civil Rights

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-13 16:30:42 UTC
From: n4jzh@knology.net
Message-ID: <3a6080ad.6167085@news.knology.net>
Source record: 301
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

On Sat, 13 Jan 2001 08:38:04 -0600, Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
wrote:

>Dwight Stewart wrote:
>> In spite of several days of testimony, and weeks of gathering
>> information, the commission has yet to find any evidence of illegal
>> activity on the part of Florida voting officials, or a single instance
>> of intentional civil rights violation.
>
>I thought it interesting that they didn't produce a single witness
>who was denied his/her right to vote. All the witnesses voted! The
>worst complaint was that there was a delay or something made someone
>nervous. Jesse Jackson was conspicuous by his absence.
>--
>http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

Cecil,
Do you think the N.A.A.C.P. Should Boycott KFC?
they are really raising hell here in S.C. about the flag issue.
they even went after a Columbia,S.C. business man because he flies
the confedrate flag at his restaurants.
Anyway next time you look at a KFC commercial look very closely and
think! I remember KFC commercials with the colonel standing with a
family having a picnic behind him talking about good food and family
tradition, today you see a commercial with the colonel ''Moon
Walking'', High Fiving, Shucking and Jiving and Rapping.
Wheres Jesse and the N.A.A.C.P. on this slap in the face?
just a thought.
Donnie

52. Re: any ideas on HOw to learn Morse quickly??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-13 17:24:41 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <lm316tk5o2i7k6p1ml8kjoosqqhcja20pt@4ax.com>
Source record: 305
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Dave@spammenot.com (Dave) wrote:
>Don't know about fun and fast but one tip I can give you is to learn
>to copy by hand writting rather than printing.

Another point is to write (or print) small. It takes less time to
write small letters and by writing 2 lines in the paper space allotted
for one line, I've found that I can increase my hand copy speed
substantially...

53. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-13 17:24:42 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <od316tgnetnbhg83msq4bgrkq29ot3tavg@4ax.com>
Source record: 302

Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com> wrote:
>Nobody has the time to scratch-build and chasing parts
>is expensive and time consuming,

Translation:
Hams can't really homebrew state of the art gear anymore...

54. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-13 17:24:43 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <h7316tcuqnklfilutpfjg998vmc324ek7u@4ax.com>
Source record: 303

billsohl@mindspring.com (Bill Sohl) wrote:
>If a college class uses the same test questions year
>after year, is that the fault of the study guide publisher?

If a college (or the Bash era FCC) does not combat cheating by changing the tests frequently, does that make the person who uses the illicit material any less of a moral cheater?? Is it OK to steal physical property just because someone is careless with it?

>It has NEVER ben tested in a court.

How about in the court of morality?? Did you use those fraternity cheat cheats to get through college, even though there might be no *legal* law broken??

>It is interesting that you [Vince] buy in so willingly to every
>government law just because it has been passed

If (for arguments sake) there wasn't a law (during the Bash era) forbidding the publishing of confidential federal test material, then don't you think that to have one would have been reasonable? The reason being to protect the sanctity of the testing process from both the commercial cheaters and from the buying (soon to be ham) cheaters??

55. Re: any ideas on HOw to learn Morse quickly??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-13 17:30:37 UTC
From: Cap'n Crunch <kcfamily@tir.com>
Message-ID: <H8086.280$V6.175928@nntp1.onemain.com>
Source record: 304
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Dave" <Dave@spammenot.com> wrote in message
news:3a6041af.3207830@news.accessnv.com...
> Don't know about fun and fast but one tip I can give you is to learn
> to copy by hand writting rather than printing. Before I became a ham
> I heard one ham tell another he wished he had learned by using hand
> writing as he found printing took too long especially at faster
> speeds

The first message is good advice for those just starting to learn morse...
if you can learn it AND do all your copy by writing in script V.S. printing,
you'll find that copy at higher speeds (as you reach those speeds) will be
easier.

> On Sat, 16 Dec 2000 22:33:15 GMT, "@!@" <ezypezy@ureach.com> wrote:
> >have a computer handy as all can see.
> >I have Morse Code made easy by ken Bradford but dont really know how much
> >time to spend on it. It gets quite boring after a while.
> >Maybe theres a way i can make it fun . and learn fast.

In answer to the second message....
Time-wise, if you spend 20 minutes, 2 - 3 times daily, EVERYDAY (note the
emphasis!) you should be able to pass a 5wpm code exam in a lil' over 2
weeks, maybe 3. (Seems to be about the norm for what I've seen as a VE).
I've heard the excuses before about 'not having the time'... but I doubt
there's many folks who can't find 20 minutes, twice a day, to devote to code
for a few weeks (breaks @ work, get to work a few minutes early, park, and
practice in the car, get up a lil' earlier & practice before leaving for
work/school, skip a TV program, etc, etc....) If you WANT HF privileges,
you'll FIND the time, if not, you won't.

As for "fun".... I and many others I've helped reach 5wpm have all used the
Gordon West 5wpm learning tapes. He's kinda' corny on the tapes, but some
of the corny jokes and puns help the lessons stick in your head longer.
--
__/__ __ /__
__ /__ __/__
_____/_____/___ /~
\ Cap'n Crunch /
~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~
~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~

56. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-13 17:48:14 UTC
From: pschleck@novia.net
Message-ID: <3a609384$0$82370$45beb828@newscene.com>
Source record: 306

In <93pjhp$5k4$3@sshuraac-i-1.production.compuserve.com> Vincent Biancomano
<103520.355@CompuServe.COM> writes:

>>That's a mouth full of unspecified jargon. You offer
>>not one practical example of what/how you'd accomplish
>>your goal...and you again avoid answering the
>>fundamental question:

>That's because you took a knee jerk approach to reading
>and didn't read on. I've also outlined the details for
>18 years, in published form. ARRL has some of those
>papers. By the way, when I'm assigned national overseer
>of the exam process by ARRL, and am given a lawyer who
>knows his/her way around the courtroom, I'll show you how
>it's done.

>Regards,
>Vince, WB2EZG

Wow, now that's dictatorial solipsism of the first rank. Certainly as
good as the most rabid caller into any right-wing talk radio program.
In other words, when Vince is appointed dictator, THEN things will be
run right. Sorry, didn't work for Genghis Kahn, didn't work for
Mussolini, won't work for Vince.

I get the impression, from the personality he has displayed on this
newsgroup, that Vince would quickly tire of any collaborative effort.
Especially one where compromise, and tailoring to a realistic world with
realistic constraints, are involved. The ARRL members in the Hudson
Division probably suspected this when they voted against him (by a 2/3
or greater margin) for their Director four times in a row. This may
also be why we will never see Vince sitting on the NCVEC board.

Vince might benefit from that old Dale Carnegie book, "How to Win
Friends and Influence People."

--
Paul W. Schleck, K3FU
pschleck@novia.net
http://www.novia.net/~pschleck/ ICQ# 44218003
Finger pschleck@novia.net for PGP Public Key

57. Re: any ideas on HOw to learn Morse quickly??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-13 17:55:35 UTC
From: Glenn <glenn.hansen@usa.net>
Message-ID: <rE086.260540$U46.8293907@news1.sttls1.wa.home.com>
Source record: 307
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

And everyplace you go spell what you see in Morse code. Really.

Glenn de KB7PKC

"Cap'n Crunch" <kcfamily@tir.com> wrote in message
news:H8086.280$V6.175928@nntp1.onemain.com...
> "Dave" <Dave@spammenot.com> wrote in message
> news:3a6041af.3207830@news.accessnv.com...
> > Don't know about fun and fast but one tip I can give you is to learn
> > to copy by hand writting rather than printing. Before I became a ham
> > I heard one ham tell another he wished he had learned by using hand
> > writing as he found printing took too long especially at faster
> > speeds
>
> The first message is good advice for those just starting to learn morse...
> if you can learn it AND do all your copy by writing in script V.S.
printing,
> you'll find that copy at higher speeds (as you reach those speeds) will be
> easier.
>
> > On Sat, 16 Dec 2000 22:33:15 GMT, "@!@" <ezypezy@ureach.com> wrote:
> > >have a computer handy as all can see.
> > >I have Morse Code made easy by ken Bradford but dont really know how
much
> > >time to spend on it. It gets quite boring after a while.
> > >Maybe theres a way i can make it fun . and learn fast.
>
> In answer to the second message....
> Time-wise, if you spend 20 minutes, 2 - 3 times daily, EVERYDAY (note the
> emphasis!) you should be able to pass a 5wpm code exam in a lil' over 2
> weeks, maybe 3. (Seems to be about the norm for what I've seen as a VE).
> I've heard the excuses before about 'not having the time'... but I doubt
> there's many folks who can't find 20 minutes, twice a day, to devote to
code
> for a few weeks (breaks @ work, get to work a few minutes early, park, and
> practice in the car, get up a lil' earlier & practice before leaving for
> work/school, skip a TV program, etc, etc....) If you WANT HF privileges,
> you'll FIND the time, if not, you won't.
>
> As for "fun".... I and many others I've helped reach 5wpm have all used
the
> Gordon West 5wpm learning tapes. He's kinda' corny on the tapes, but some
> of the corny jokes and puns help the lessons stick in your head longer.
> --

```
> __/__ __ /__
> __ /__ __/__
> _____/_____/___ /~
> \ Cap'n Crunch /
> ~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~
>
>
```

58. Re: any ideas on HOw to learn Morse quickly??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-13 18:08:09 UTC
From: n4jzh@knology.net
Message-ID: <3a60990c.12407104@news.knology.net>
Source record: 308
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Sat, 13 Jan 2001 17:24:41 GMT, Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
wrote:

>Dave@spammenot.com (Dave) wrote:
>>Don't know about fun and fast but one tip I can give you is to learn
>>to copy by hand writting rather than printing.
>
>Another point is to write (or print) small. It takes less time to
>write small letters and by writing 2 lines in the paper space allotted
>for one line, I've found that I can increase my hand copy speed
>substantially...
Code Quick is by far the best I've seen to learn the code
and it will keep your attention span, gordon west is equal to a
bottle of sleeping pills. GUD LUCK! ...-.-

59. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-13 18:18:57 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A609C11.399D1FC9@IEEE.org>
Source record: 311

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> Human nature being what it is, most
> people will take the path of least resistance in order to achieve
> the greatest amount of instant gratification.

Are you implying that CW is not gratifying?
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

60. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-13 18:21:06 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A609C92.532E75C8@IEEE.org>
Source record: 312

```
Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>
> >Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> >> Is it possible for a woman to rape a man or a boy? If so, how could
> >> pre-registering the penis of the victim prevent the crime?
> > >
> > >Is she using a penis in the commission of a crime?
> >
> Re-read the question, and try again.

I'm trying to ascertain the depth of the crime.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca
```

61. Re: 10 bucks buys a ham license.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-13 18:21:07 UTC
From: TheRock <therock@nospam.irc-chat.net>
Message-ID: <o0186.22$5a6.24426@news.pacbell.net>
Source record: 309
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"D. S. Platt" <jeepp@erols.com> wrote in message
news:3A605106.59349F9@erols.com...
> jamesrhampton@my-deja.com wrote:
>
> > Neat. Someone actually thought of not charging. Of course, my first
> > licenses cost nothing - it was just the 60 mile (one way) drive to
> > Buffalo that cost a bit of time and money (gas, thruway tolls, parking,
> > etc.). The cost is actually minimal anywhere. I think I paid $5.90
> > when I decided to get back into amateur radio and tested out in 1993
> > (after letting my tickets expire over 10 years earlier). Whats the
> > cost today?
> >
> > 73 from Rochester, NY
> > Jim (AA2QA)
> >
> > In article <93airr$1js$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
> > BamBam <kl0an@my-deja.com> wrote:
> > > Now why would I go and PAY for a license when I got my license, AND
> > > upgrades for free.. Oh, sorry, I did have to earn them with a little
> > > studying and such.. My club offers testing free.. No money exchanges
> > > hands.. And I can now talk world-wide on the Extra bands..
> > >
> > > Just quit tryin to cheat the system, sit down with the manuals and get
> > > studying.. And if you want to take a test for free.. First Saturday of
> > > the month, Geo-Physics Institute, UAF, Fairbanks, Alaska.
> > >
> > > 73
> > > Paul Jordan
> > > kl0an
> > >
> > > In article <no.skill@arrl.crappy.org>,
> > > Buyone@arrl.crap (peddler) wrote:
> > > > Thanks to the organization called the ARRL, you don't have to earn a
> > > license
> > > > anymore. You can go to your local VE group and buy one for $10.
> > > > Get one today and join in the Fun!
> > > >
> > > > AOHF ~ assholes on H.F.
> > > >
> > > >
> > >
> > > --
> > > Don't Sweat the Petty Things.

> > > Don't Pet the Sweaty Things.
> > >
> > > Sent via Deja.com
> > > http://www.deja.com/
> > >
> >
> > Sent via Deja.com
> > http://www.deja.com/
>
> The Laurel (MD) VEC (MD) has had a fee!
>
>
>

The charge today can be up to $10 per fcc regulations.
The limit is $10 though. It was $6 when I got mine 7 years ago roughly,
course that VEC didn't charge the full rate, I think the max they could
charge was $7 or something.

TheRock
KD6NIG
irc.acestar.org

62. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-13 18:24:39 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A609D67.79EBE3C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 314

Aaron Jones wrote:
> If a college (or the Bash era FCC) does not combat cheating by
> changing the tests frequently, does that make the person who uses the
> illicit material any less of a moral cheater?? Is it OK to steal
> physical property just because someone is careless with it?

It is OK to do what an ordinary prudent man would do.

> How about in the court of morality?? Did you use those fraternity
> cheat cheats to get through college, even though there might be no
> *legal* law broken??

It is OK to do what an ordinary prudent man would do.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

63. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-13 18:24:58 UTC
From: Vincent Biancomano <103520.355@CompuServe.COM>
Message-ID: <93q6hqjgq1@sshuraac-i-1.production.compuserve.com>
Source record: 310

>I get the impression, from the personality he has displayed on
>this newsgroup, that Vince would quickly tire of any
>collaborative effort. Especially one where compromise, and
>tailoring to a realistic world with realistic constraints, are
>involved. The ARRL members in the Hudson Division probably
>suspected this when they voted against him (by a 2/3 or greater
>margin) for their Director four times in a row. This may
>also be why we will never see Vince sitting on the NCVEC board.

>Vince might benefit from that old Dale Carnegie book, "How to
>Win Friends and Influence People."

Glad to see I woke you up finally, Paul. But you neglected to
mention the fact that the fellow who won ran along a no-theory
approach as well, which is one of the reasons we are where we
are. To paraphrase him "you know, there's no reason for Amateur
Radio to be a technical hobby today, simply because there's no
jobs for engineers. You know, my father was a plumber, and
advised me to do the same. Looking back on it, you know, he was
right." Go ask him, he's one guy who is still alive.

Winning friends and influencing people isn't my bag, Paul. The
goal is trying to save the Service, not deep-six it.

Regards, Vince WB2EZG

64. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-13 18:29:23 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A609E83.893BFFF@IEEE.org>
Source record: 315

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> I learned Morse code at speeds greater than 5 WPM because
> it was the current requirement to obtain an Extra-class license!
> If the requirement hadn't existed, neither would my achievement --
> and I would not have benefited from the enjoyment of reasonable
> proficiency in this practical communications skill. It's as simple
> as that.

Are you implying that you must be forced to do something before
you get anything done? That sounds like sheer laziness to me.
I learned Morse code before I ever heard of amateur radio simply
because it was fun.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

65. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-13 18:33:54 UTC
From: Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com>
Message-ID: <3A609F92.AC8894ED@dvol.com>
Source record: 313

Aaron Jones wrote:

> Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com> wrote:
> >Nobody has the time to scratch-build and chasing parts
> >is expensive and time consuming,
>
> Translation:
> Hams can't really homebrew state of the art gear anymore.

>
I don't think that's 100% true, but close. The state of the art today is set by far-end professionals in the biz who have access to pricey CAE software, custom chips, board fab facilities, deep pockets, long list of assets which even most technically astute hams don't have today let alone the rest of us who homebrewed back when. It's just evolutionary reality which started in spark days when somebody decided to make radio parts for money and sell 'em to hams, 1910 or so.
>
For my own part I hombrew all my antennas including beams and I'm mulling building a single 3-500Z amp. Not much else left worth hombrewing.
>
w3rv

66. Re: Proof of License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-13 18:34:34 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A609FBA.5F4C5A05@IEEE.org>
Source record: 316

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> Wouldn't it be easier for her to simply re-take the 5 WPM code
> test? If not, why not?

Different strokes for different folks, Larry. After Tiny Tim tried making a baby, he said he hoped he wouldn't ever have to go through that again. :-) Some people feel that way about Morse code.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

67. Re: The Election & the Commission on Civil Rights

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-13 18:37:23 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A60A063.DBA5F4D0@IEEE.org>
Source record: 317
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Dwight Stewart wrote:
> Did you hear it during the commission's hearing?

Actually, I was on the road at the time and heard it second-hand
from either Rush Linbaugh or Neal Boortz, I can't remember which.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

68. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-13 18:45:24 UTC
From: W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com>
Message-ID: <93q7q7$a7q$1@iac5.navix.net>
Source record: 318

You would loose that bet as well Cecil, I still am better than you because I do CW and you need to admit that you are incapable of learning a simplistic digital transmission scheme. What did you do 50 years BDSP (before DSP).

A man needs to know his limitations, and the sooner all the CW challenged people admit it the better.

"Cecil" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:3A5F72FA.5356A96@IEEE.org...
> W4JLE wrote:
> > As a ham for almost 45 years, and 62 years on the planet ...
> > I really feel it (CW) makes me better than you!
>
> Tough Titty, Fred. I'm the same age as you, have been a ham five years
> longer than you, and I say you are not a better ham than I am simply
> because you can copy CW faster than I can. I'll bet I can run circles
> around you in the programming of DSP systems and/or designing digital
> logic systems. That obviously makes me better than you. (How do you like
> your very own words thrown back at you?)
>
> Each of us has something to contribute to this great hobby. Feeling
> superior because you can do fast code is a ridiculous way to live your
> life, IMHO, because as CW becomes more obsolete, you lose your self-
> proclaimed superiority. In my mouth with no hands, I can tie a cherry
> stem in a knot while copying PACTOR II. Can you do that? If not, you
> are certainly an extremely inferior ham.
> --
> http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

69. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-13 18:47:57 UTC
From: W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com>
Message-ID: <93q7v3abv1@iac5.navix.net>
Source record: 319

Nice post Len, misguided as it may be. I did enjoy your views.

73 Fred W4JLE

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20010112174503.14777.00000438@nso-bd.aol.com...
> In article <93nntl$4ee$1@iac5.navix.net>, "W4JLE" <Fred@w4jle.com> writes:
>
> >What in the world is wrong with people today? Has the left in there
efforts
> >to make everyone feel equal demonized achievement?
>
> Oh, my, a general purpose Troll posting involving Patriotism and
> the American Way of Life for white Protestants.
>
> >As a ham for almost 45 years, and 62 years on the planet I have seen
changes
> >occur not only on the ham bands but in life as well.
>
> No Kidding?!? I have seen six more years than you have...
> but not spent dreaming in front of ham radios.
>
> >As a young lad I
> >remember the Joy of the end of WW2 and the pride of America in it's
> >industrial might.
>
> Yes, so did I, but I was a bit older than 7 years in 1945.
>
> >I watched as the flower children of the sixties took drugs
> >as their religion and promiscuity as their values.
>
> ...and?
>
> >I watched as the roll of
> >motherhood was relegated to a shameful position as any real woman would
be a
> >corporate mogul.
>
> Sounds like they should be "barefoot and in the kitchen?!?"
>
> >I watched as religion was removed from schools and those
> >that believed in it's tenets were made the butt of humor.
>
> Gosh, a new observance we don't share. As a Lutheran in
> a Lutheran-ethnic public school system I never saw any

> protestantism rampant (or even flourishing) in my northern
> Illinois school system. Of course I was 7 years older so it
> must have been later when religion was installed and then
> removed, yes?
>
> >I watched as life
> >became meaningless if it inconvenienced the new hedonistic society.
>
> Fred, would you believe I actually went to dances as a young
> man, even went to a motion picture show?!?
>
> >And once
> >again I watch as a these same people attack the Morse mode of
communication.
> >Why should I be surprised?
>
> Oh, wow, a Morseodist True Believer!
>
> Fred, while you were 14 and probably being properly instructed
> on God's Chosen Path of Righteousness, I was operating and
> maintaining trans-Pacific HF communications as a member of
> the US Army. Not a single one of those radio circuits used
> OOK CW. That was 48 years ago, Fred.
>
> Are you saying that the US Army is/was "godless" because
> they didn't use morse in trans-Pacific HF radio? We had
> chaplains on duty but I can't remember anyone going for
> religious counsel on radio matters.
>
> >"How dare some of you hams have an ability I don't have and make it a
> >requirement for what I want NOW!"
>
> How "dare" we?!? :-)
>
> How dare you maintain that a hobby activity requiring federal
> regulation be forever cast in concrete and protected by ultra-
> traditionalist, quasi-religious traditions of the 1930s?!?
>
> >The same demonizing is in progress, we
> >have heard the terms "hazing ritual", "elitists old farts" and other such
> >endearing terms hurled from the "it's my right" crowd.
>
> Ah, another of the CW Power religious fanatics who would
> toss out the First Amendment to all who did not want to
> acquire CW skills!
>
> Fred, the regulating agency for US amateur radio has said,
> in 1990 and 1999, that a morse code test does not meet
> their requirements for amateur radio licensing. Are you
> saying that the FCC is a bunch of godless heathen who do

> not Believe In The One True Way?!?
>
> Fred, you come across as the ideal "old fart" in attitude.
> I can recognize old farts, being their chronological
> contemporary. :-)
>
> >To all of you I
> >simply say I am proud of my achievement, I really feel it makes me better
> >than you!
>
> Yes, Your Grace. Shall we kiss your ring now? Will you wave
> to the masses from the balcony?
>
> >As politically incorrect as that is, tough noogies, work me on 75
> >at 35 WPM and then argue against CW.
>
> ...and that "really shows up" those arguing against CW TESTING,
> doesn't it? Wow...you gonna "beat up" somebody with your
> CW? :-)
>
> >At least I will respect your opinion even if different than mine.
>
> Of course you will, your posting was evidence of your "respect."
>
> >Those that can't meet the above, quit your crying!
>
> Fred, as a citizen and a veteran and a husband and a retired
> engineer with a near-lifelong career in radio and electronics,
> I am hard-pressed not to cuss you out...I'm chuckling too
> much... :-)
>
> >You are no position to be running your mouths about Morse
> >communications.
>
> Way wrongo, Lone Stranger. YOU are in NO position nor
> have you any authoritiy (mortal or divine) to dictate one damn
> thing one way or another about what others can say about
> morse communications.
>
> didit
>

70. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-13 18:50:10 UTC
From: W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com>
Message-ID: <93q835ago1@iac5.navix.net>
Source record: 321

Absolutely I am superior to any ham that cannot send/receive a piece of
traffic in Morse, and thank you for asking.

73 Fred W4JLE

"Aaron Jones" <nomail@nomail.com> wrote in message
news:pa006tsmtdvit3k48ft6hjggikv5ataugg@4ax.com...
> "W4JLE" <Fred@w4jle.com> wrote:
> >Ok, you got me.. I am actually 61 years 9 months and some days.
>
> That explains the age error...
>
> >As to the calls, check my web site at W4JLE.com and you will
> >se the progression of calls W4JLE W4JLE/pj V3CB V31GR
> >KB4NGB KJ4JE W4JLE (Vanity call original call holder)
>
> That explains the gap in the FCC database...
>
> >As to code speed Let's set a sked and you tell me.
>
> OK, I believe you can do 35wpm...
>
> >> >To all of you I simply say I am proud of my achievement,
> >> >I really feel it makes me better than you!
> >>
> >> Unfortunately I think this statement is accurate. Sad...
>
> However you failed to comment on my last comment (above), any
> comments? Any retractions? Or do you really feel that you are superior
> to many, perhaps the majority of hams...

71. Re: The Election & the Commission on Civil Rights

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-13 18:50:15 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A60A367.C0BB01A1@IEEE.org>
Source record: 323
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Donnie wrote:
> Do you think the N.A.A.C.P. Should Boycott KFC?
> they are really raising hell here in S.C. about the flag issue.

Texas is way out on the fringes of the Old South and I see black
guys on Harleys wearing Confederate battle flags on their heads
and jackets. In Texas, the Confederate battle flag is not a symbol
of slavery but is instead a symbol of rebellion, akin to the
"Don't Tread On Me" flag of yesteryear. Here in Texas, it says,
"I'm still a rebel".

> Anyway next time you look at a KFC commercial look very closely and
> think! I remember KFC commercials with the colonel standing with a
> family having a picnic behind him talking about good food and family
> tradition, today you see a commercial with the colonel ''Moon
> Walking'', High Fiving, Shucking and Jiving and Rapping.
> Wheres Jesse and the N.A.A.C.P. on this slap in the face?
> just a thought.

It's not much different from a Dr. Pepper or Coke commercial.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

72. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-13 18:52:11 UTC
From: W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com>
Message-ID: <93q86vaid1@iac5.navix.net>
Source record: 320

Brian, I will answer your post later. I am in the process of practicing how to send poorly formed characters to screw over the inferior technicians that have to use computers to copy code.

73 Fred W4JLE

"Brian" <brianburke@my-deja.com> wrote in message news:93pop7gvq1@nnrp1.deja.com...
> In article <pa006tsmtdvit3k48ft6hjggikv5ataugg@4ax.com>,
> Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com> wrote:
> > "W4JLE" <Fred@w4jle.com> wrote:
> > >> >To all of you I simply say I am proud of my achievement,
> > >> >I really feel it makes me better than you!
> > >>
> > >> Unfortunately I think this statement is accurate. Sad...
> >
> > However you failed to comment on my last comment (above), any
> > comments? Any retractions? Or do you really feel that you are superior
> > to many, perhaps the majority of hams...
>
> Perhaps so much so that he thinks it is perfectly OK to disregard good
> amateur practice. We'll let him address that.
>
> It's the same kind of attitude that Dick and others of his kind appear
> to have when they advocate some imaginary rights in amateur radio that
> the FCC doesn't grant. I used to let it go by, but no longer.
>
> Even Riley has commented that the worst offenders often hold advanced
> licenses and are long time hams. If only the Catholic Church hadn't
> taught me to read, I too, could ignore Part 97.
>
>
> Sent via Deja.com
> http://www.deja.com/

73. Re: Buy a ham ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-13 18:54:56 UTC
From: W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com>
Message-ID: <93q8c4ala1@iac5.navix.net>
Source record: 322

I suspect that Ed is the one that sends the nightly W1AW code practice, and he uses a handkey.

"Cecil" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:3A5F6FCD.991091C4@IEEE.org...
> W4JLE wrote:
> > Only a non cw operator would believe this type on nonsense Ed.
>
> But Ed is a CW operator extraordinaire. I observed his expertise
> at the Ft. Tuthill hamfest.
> --
> http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

74. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-13 19:00:01 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A60A5B1.4871F3E9@IEEE.org>
Source record: 325

W4JLE wrote:
> You would loose that bet as well Cecil, I still am better than you because I
> do CW ...

No offense, Fred, but if you are not joking, you need some
professional help.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

75. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-13 19:09:35 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A60A7EF.58BEB324@IEEE.org>
Source record: 326

W4JLE wrote:
> Absolutely I am superior to any ham that cannot send/receive a piece of
> traffic in Morse, and thank you for asking.

Your superiority and a buck fifty will get you a cup of coffee.
Are you so bad at everything else in life that you must rely on
Morse code trafficking ability for your pseudo self esteem?
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

76. Re: The Election & the Commission on Civil Rights

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-13 19:11:08 UTC
From: 'Doc <w5lz@oio.net>
Message-ID: <3A60A84C.2AF19CE3@oio.net>
Source record: 324
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Donnie,
Please excuse Jesse. He has been staying in OKC
lately, courtesy of OKC-PD.
'Doc

77. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-13 21:12:06 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010113161206.22631.00000502@nso-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 331

In article <3A604D6A.D6BB32BD@dvol.com>, Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com> writes:

>> Icom IC-706MKIIG, 160m to 6m, 2m, 70cm. all modes.
>
>Interesting class of radios to which can be added the new FT-1000 and FT-817
>which
>is a whole new breed of cat. The problem with all of them is that they suffer
>performance deficiencies because the design intent was to cram as many
>features as
>possible into as small a package as possible and compromises had to be made.
>Not
>shabby radios at all and they put signals on the air from places where bigger
>radios are simply impractical. But they just don't cut the mustard for
>serious vhf/uhf weak signal work.

"Mustard" needs some definition. :-)

According to the www.icomamerica.com specs, the receiver
sensitivity is down there near internal noise limit.

>> Kenwood TS-2000, HF, 50, 144, 440, 1200 MHz bands,
>> all modes
>
>> Kenwood TM-642AD, 144 and 220 MHz dual bander
>> Yaesu FT-847 HF, 6m, 2m, 70cm, all modes.
>
>They'll all hit various vhf/uhf bands and various modes and the TS-2000 and
>FT-847
>desktoppers probably have some decent vhf/uhf performance capabilities. The
>problem with those is that a serious vhf/uhf operator has to lay down well
>over $2k for a duz-all-bands (except 222 . .) radio including 9 HF bands +
>wideband
>SWL receive in which he may well have no interest. I can't believe that there
>isn't a market for a >30Mhz all-mode 100w Tech radio which has the features
>and performance of the "HF/vhf hybrids" and should cost a lot less money. I
>already have all the HF gear I need. I'd jump all over a radio like that if it
was in
>the $1k range. Ten-Tec had one in the works but the designer quit so they
dropped
>the project. (?!)

Prices keep going up on everything. More features, greater band
capability equates to more money. If you think that is bad, look
at the ones which have an integral spectrum analyzer for
receiving... :-)

>> Yes, I agree that the 220 MHz band transceivers are scarce.
>> Saw only single-band and dual-band models from four
>> manufacturers covering that band.
>
>The auction is coming . .

Off-hand, based on FCC notices and the general electronics
trades' info, the more important bands for commercial
applications have moved up beyond 900 MHz. The drivers
for moving well up into the microwave region are various
wireless applications and the ability of semiconductors to
work well into tens of GHz. I'd say the 220 band spectrum
is going to stay as it is for a while.

>> I haven't seen any regulation yet on banning homebrew
>
>Nobody has the time to scratch-build and chasing parts is expensive and time
>consuming, there's just no ROI on the dollars or the hours unless it's for
>experimentation. Kit building seems to be on the upswing, however.

The "ROI" thing is individual and subjective. The technology is
known, but the sources of information on it are scattered.

Two examples are the Stoner-Goral-Company's SGC-200 and
Elecraft K2 transceivers. Full circuit details/schematics are
available over the Internet. One can find nearly all of those
circuits' design info in ARRL publications, even the crystal
filters which are hard-wired in from supplied individual crystals.
Microprocessor "control glue" programming is NOT available,
though, and both depend largely on those micros for functional
control and display.

In the world above 30 MHz, the design details are truly
scattered over a number of texts and Application Notes from
a number of manufacturers (Motorola, ADI, National has most
Appnotes on-line at their websites). Test equipment for the
VHF and above range is very expensive, even if bought from
third-hand dealers (presuming those dealers check
calibration). One can't make a SOTA radio project without
calibrated test equipment...probably why so many project
article authors are working as pros in electronics companies
where they can accurately measure radio performance.

didit

PS: Keep a 3/8" open-end, closed-end wrench handy. It is
just right for SMA connectors common at commercial VHF
and higher RF stuff. I think it replaced the pocket protector
as an RF-nerd sign back in the mid- to late-70s. :-)

78. Re: Buy a ham ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-13 21:12:07 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010113161207.22631.00000503@nso-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 328

In article <fs006t83vqdnu8jgk2nl43sh3abh48efjm@4ax.com>, Aaron Jones
<nomail@nomail.com> writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
>>If you are trolling and trying to pick a fight, you came to the
>>wrong person.
>
>You gonna beat me up like you do Steve... :-)

Steve who? :-)

>>I gave no "specifications,"
>
>*You* used the word "simple". *You* said that a "simple decoder" could
>be done in less than 64MB. I didn't even disagree with you. I just
>pointed out that a simple decoder could be done in a lot less memory,
>namely 4KB. Did I damage your pride that much for you to get so nasty
>and generate another technically impressive 61 lines... 8-0

I gave no "specifications," just generalities of a project personally
witnessed...followed by some offhand guesses of a similar project.

If you've ever done any real programming, you know that few of
them are "simple." I do not count programming exercises such
as those displaying "hello world" on the screen as real programs.
You made some claims without mentioning any personal
experience in programming or which publications had listed
goals of morse decoding other than some vague generalities
that "early magazines used to print [source] code." Oh, wow,
and you criticize others about "specifications?"

Let's talk about "specifications." Let's assume an ad from
the mythical Kilowatter Antenna Company. Which of the
two phrases below would you say are specifications?

Forward gain is 12 dbi min., F:B ratio is 16 db minimum.

"The Kilowatter Swatter-20 gave me DXCC in a month."
[testimonial of Floyd Sphergometer, W2##]

The phrase at the top is the obvious specification. The one
at the bottom is just a claim...something that could be
done with an ordinary piece of wire when ionospheric
conditions are just right. Forward gain of the "Swatter-20"
will hold regardless of the ionosphere and remains constant.
The bottom phrase is emotional loading to convince the
reader they should buy Kilowatter's Swatter-20 but doesn't

say anything specific about performance.

Given the price of Kilowatter's Swatter-20 at $895.95
(list, shipping extra) would you consider buying it solely
on the claim of being able to DXCC in a month? Or would
you compare its specifications and price to other
antennas first?

When you mentioned a morse decoder using an 8080
CPU with 16K of memory you didn't really say anything
about its performance. You really only said one existed
based on remembering one seen as an article in a
magazine. My personal observation of a single decoder
project stated more conditions along with the Goals of
the project: Rate adaptation, timing adaptation to a
certain tolerance for dot/dash/spacing, achieving the
lowest possible signal-to-noise ratio. I had only touched
on "specifications" remembering that the lowest rate was
about 3 WPM morse equivalent and a tested maximum
of 90 WPM morse equivalent. Who said more about a
thing? Me who stated some numbers based on
performance of a working program or you who mentioned
seeing some magazine article?

>A little comedy? OK. I always got a chuckle out of your we-we jokes
>about hams always using the word "we".

I don't say that about "all" amateurs. I only say that about those
who presume to represent all US radio amateurs as having the
same goals-likes-dislikes-fetishes as they.

That is extended to include certain anonymous posters who have
never given their license call.

didit

79. Re: Buy a ham ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-13 21:12:08 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010113161208.22631.00000504@nso-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 330

In article <3A60627B.4A5B5E86@arrl.org>, Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org> writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> Do you REALLY think that a full explanation of the program
>> along with flow charts would be "acceptible" to a member-
>> ship that prizes manual code skill over nearly anything else
>> in amateur radio?!?
>
>You're referring to FISTS?

Hello Jon, welcome back? :-)

I used the word 'membership' in my sentence. I have no doubt
that FISTS members are also members of the ARRL. However,
I was not referring to just FISTS members but rather the general
ARRL membership...and the general editorial policies of QST in
regard to selection of material to publish.

>> I don't think so based on input from
>> others concerning their expertise and "necessity" of manual
>> code skill...'others' include those not in this newsgroup.
>
>ARRL members liked:
>A PIC16F84-Based CW Decoder, Morgantini, Francesco, IK3OIL, QST, Aug
>1999, pp 37-40.

All the members liked that? Some members liked that? A few
members liked that? With 170 thousand or so members in the
ARRL, was there also a Poll done to ascertain who liked what?
How does the ARRL decide on what is liked or disliked?

I'm sure Morgantini's article has some merit, is interesting, well-
motivated, and was certainly based on a lot of thought and work
on development of the PIC coding. All such programs and
innovations represent a lot of personal effort.

>Maybe you need a new set of "others" from which to solicit input. The
>one you've got now seems to be misleading you.

Jon, from what you've written, I daresy you are rather
uncomfortable with my opinion. :-)

As a non-subscriber to QST, I cannot hope to compete with an
ARRL staffer who has ready access to the full line of ARRL
publications. I am not critiquing individual QST articles but
rather expressing an opinion on the attitude in general of the

ARRL relative to morse code...over the last few decades...and the attitude of the general membership of the ARRL relative to morse code proficiency being the paramount achievement in US amateur radio.

I readily admit to not knowing the entire scope of amateur radio activity as practiced by over a half million licensed US radio amateurs. To be fair, you should admit the very same thing. Being an ARRL staff member does not give you some magic powers to know the entire scope of amateur radio activity...or radio activity that is possibly related to amateur activity.

didit

80. Re: Buy a ham ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-13 21:12:09 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010113161209.22631.00000505@nso-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 327

In article <20010113090632.05639.00000139@ng-cd1.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>
>>Is guessing necessary in all those ham traffic networks
>>using only morse?
>
>I would say, Len, that few of the QSOs I have require guessing. Certainly
>the percentage due to faulty encoding is very small.

That's a good thing.

>as vocal conversations. If you miss a word that you don't believe to be
>critical to the flow of thoughts and believe you know what it is from
>context,
>do you always ask for a reiepeat? How about at the party where the noise is
>loud? If the guy who is slurring his words comes up to you and you can't
>understand part of what he is saying, do you ask for a lot of repeats or nod
>a lot? :-)

At parties, those who slur words have been into the sauce just a
tad too much. I back off to avoid breathing in the fumes.

Besides, the fumes tend to shrivel canapes...

>I can assure you, Len, if I am ever handling military traffic because of a
>nuclear war, I will ask for fills if I miss a word.

It's good to know the world is safe for democracy, Ed, three
cheers for your spirit! :-)

didit

81. Re: Buy a ham ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-13 21:12:10 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010113161210.22631.00000506@nso-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 329

In article <20010113085343.05639.00000136@ng-cd1.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>
>>>> ? Does this mean if you don't personally know any such
>>>> algorithm that it doesn't exist?
>
>> choose my words to convey meanings, Ed, but your sentence
>>doesn't answer my question.
>
>You are right, Len; I had misread your question. I believe that things exist
>that I don't know about. This could be one of them. I didn't realize that
>you
>thought that some people were unaware that things could exist without their
>knowledge. While I would agree that some people might think that, but I
>believe it is a very small percentage.

Now, now, you are getting a tad testy there, Ed.

There's a common expression in American English, "I've never heard of such a thing!" It is usually spoken with some accusation and punctuated with a verbal exclamation point. Very common expression, not limited to one geographic region.

Do I know the entire scope of activity in radio? No.
Do you know the entire scope of activity in amateur radio? No.

Nobody can know everything happening everywhere.

QST and QEX combined cannot print everything that is done in US amateur radio. The entire published works of the ARRL cannot print everything done by everyone in US amateur radio, let alone done by all hobbyists in radio and electronics.

I described, in general terms, a programming experiment that was done by a non-amateur person with a slight assist from me, another non-amateur person for the purposes of trying to make an adaptive morse code reader. That was not for any sort of purposeful use in amateur radio activity but rather as an intellectual exercise. Intellectual since morse code is not symmetric as are other codings used in electronic communications. After over a century of existance, morse code is fairly stable in structure and any variations are due to human operators both in rate and dot-dash timing relation.
To anyone involved in any sort of communications by

electronics, morse codings are unique. Morse codings are also involved with over a century of mystique and claims which generally have the human operator triumphing over mere "machinery" and claiming superiority. On that basis the exercise-experiment set out to prove that a computer could emulate an experienced morse operator over a wide range of signal environments.

The exercise-experiment was witnessed by two experienced morse operators, one that I saw personally, one that I did not see. A simulation of 90 WPM equivalent morse rate was done where the computer program was able to decode clearly and accurately but neither experienced operator could "read" at that rate except in a few bursts.

As far as I know, none of the participants or their friends and families have ever communicated this experiment in public. Does this mean that the experiment did not exist? No. All that means is that this particular project was never publicized. There is no more "philosophy" discourse on that than for any other project or experiment still being worked on but not yet published. There is no more "philosophy" or existentialism on its "existance" just because so few knew of it. Granted, there have been similar projects undertaken, including one attempt to real-time decode morse on a programmable pocket calculator. Do I know of all of them? No. Do you know all of them? Probably not.

>What is your estimate of the percentage of population that believes that
>things they don't know about cannot exist?

I haven't the foggiest idea. All I can point to is a very common American expression which started out this reply.

>Did you ask the question because you feel
>that I am in that percentage?

No. My public message postings are assumed to be read or skimmed by all who have access. My remarks are to them as well as individuals. In general I've found that strict traditionalists in US amateur radio believe that everything done in US amateur radio is all contained in the publications of the ARRL...but that is my personal observation.

didit

82. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-13 21:49:53 UTC
From: W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com>
Message-ID: <93qik6ldi1@iac5.navix.net>
Source record: 332

Pseudo? You may consider it pseudo, but if you can't utilize Morse for sending/receiving traffic your opinion doesn't count...

Real hams send dit's and dah's, the rest try to find something else to establish their pseudo self esteem.

"Cecil" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:3A60A7EF.58BEB324@IEEE.org...
> W4JLE wrote:
> > Absolutely I am superior to any ham that cannot send/receive a piece of
> > traffic in Morse, and thank you for asking.
>
> Your superiority and a buck fifty will get you a cup of coffee.
> Are you so bad at everything else in life that you must rely on
> Morse code trafficking ability for your pseudo self esteem?
> --
> http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

83. Re: Proof of License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-13 21:56:21 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nospam.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.g746ws1.pminews@ca.news.verio.net>
Source record: 334

On Sat, 13 Jan 2001 01:31:42 GMT, Brian wrote:

>I would write to Pennsylvania Avenue
>for a confirmation letter that she is coded.

What is on "Pennsylvania Avenue"? Certainly not the FCC.

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

84. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-13 21:56:37 UTC
From: billsohl@mindspring.com
Message-ID: <3a60ce05.4605168@news.mindspring.com>
Source record: 335

On 13 Jan 2001 12:54:47 GMT, Vincent Biancomano
<103520.355@CompuServe.COM> wrote:

>>If it was legal (and there's no case law to sustain any
>>position that it was truly illegal) then the consequences
>>you complain about are just whining. The FCC could have
>>changed the tests every day if they wanted.
>
>Your troll will do you little good, Bill, so stop praying
>for that break that is never coming to you.

Vince,
I need no break at all. Why the devil would I need a
break anyway?

>You asked the
>questions, I answered them in full. Very explicitly.

If anyone out there thinks Vince answered ANY question
in full I'd like to hear from you.

>So
>shifting the focal point back on Bash as a person, versus
>what the overall effects were, is a bit amateurish.

Always the class act Vince.

>If
>the powers that be want to change the face of the exam
>structure, they will. Over an 18-year period, I've told
>them, and you, just how to do it.

Gee Vince, thankfully I haven't had the knowledge of your
existence for probably half that time, so you've told me
your line for far less than 18 years.

> If they haven't got
>the stomach for it,

I haven't a clue what you think I might not have
the stomach for.

>it's ham radio's, and ARRL's, funeral.
>It's that simple. If they want to restore integrity, they
>will.

Oh doom and gloom, oh doom and gloom.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

85. Re: any ideas on HOw to learn Morse quickly??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-13 21:58:37 UTC
From: Cap'n Crunch <kcfamily@tir.com>
Message-ID: <W3486.315$H3.802414@nntp2.onemain.com>
Source record: 333
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Glenn" <glenn.hansen@usa.net> wrote in message.....
> And everyplace you go spell what you see in Morse code. Really.

Good idea..... used to do that with every sign I'd see, license plates, and
even sometimes with the newspaper... any practice is good practice.
--
__/__ __ /__
__ /__ __/__
_____/_____/___ /~
\ Cap'n Crunch /
~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~
~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~

86. Re: any ideas on HOw to learn Morse quickly??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-13 22:02:28 UTC
From: "David Michael Kelly"
Message-ID: <7mj16tsh7l151jpsrk7b077k13vap3h8ke@4ax.com>
Source record: 336
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Wed, 20 Dec 2000 19:06:05 -0000, darryl_NOSPAM@shecora.com (Darryl Wagoner - WA1GON) wrote:

>
>http://www.vmeng.com/minow/MorsePractice/MorsePractice.html
>

This web page with the same applet works better on my machine.

http://homepage.mac.com/k6mam/MorsePractice/MorsePractice.html

Better yet follow the directions and download the .jar file to your machine and pick up a copy of the SUN java runtime environment and use it locally. It allows you to save your place and not have to highlight all the characters every time you start. Using this applet I was able to pass my element 1 after two weeks. This is a very fine tool and has everything you need including instructions on the Koch method. The price is right as well! Thanks to Martin Minow for the development.

--
david
avid@nospam@home.com <---remove nospam before emailing.

87. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-13 22:02:28 UTC
From: billsohl@mindspring.com
Message-ID: <3a60cf86.4990830@news.mindspring.com>
Source record: 337

On 13 Jan 2001 14:46:59 GMT, Vincent Biancomano
<103520.355@CompuServe.COM> wrote:

>>Actually, I'd go so far to say that one actually
>>doesn't need to understand ohm's law at all to
>>master DSP. Thousands of people do systems engineering
>>work without ever getting into the BASICs you talk
>>about.
>
>You're shifting focal points again. Ham radio is still defined as
>a "fundamentally technical" hobby. And the most rudimentary
>part of that is knowing basic electronics. In one form or
>another, you're always railing against learning the basics.
>That's why I say you're basically a no-theory advocate.
>That part of your postings _always_ comes thru loud and clear.

Bull! I have never advocated no theory and my
record is clear on that. Your personal opinion of individual
comments is exactly that...nothing but your
personal opinion. My comment on DSP was simply
stating the fact that there's no need to know Ohm's
law to understand DSP...you translate that to state
that indicates I don't support basic knowledge is pure
bunk.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

88. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-13 22:06:23 UTC
From: billsohl@mindspring.com
Message-ID: <3a60d097.5263493@news.mindspring.com>
Source record: 338

On Sat, 13 Jan 2001 17:24:43 GMT, Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
wrote:

>billsohl@mindspring.com (Bill Sohl) wrote:
>>If a college class uses the same test questions year
>>after year, is that the fault of the study guide publisher?
>
>If a college (or the Bash era FCC) does not combat cheating by
>changing the tests frequently, does that make the person who uses the
>illicit material any less of a moral cheater?? Is it OK to steal
>physical property just because someone is careless with it?

Please elaborate on what theft has occured?

>>It has NEVER ben tested in a court.
>
>How about in the court of morality?? Did you use those fraternity
>cheat cheats to get through college, even though there might be no
>*legal* law broken??

I wasn't in any fraternity.

>>It is interesting that you [Vince] buy in so willingly to every
>>government law just because it has been passed
>
>If (for arguments sake) there wasn't a law (during the Bash era)
>forbidding the publishing of confidential federal test material, then
>don't you think that to have one would have been reasonable?

The question is WHY is the material confidential?
Clearly the congress thinks there's no reason to have
confidentiality of such material...and I agree.

>The
>reason being to protect the sanctity of the testing process from both
>the commercial cheaters and from the buying (soon to be ham)
>cheaters??

So how come colleges seem to do just fine without such
laws? If colleges get by OK, then the Feds don't
deserve any special protection by laws.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

89. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-13 22:07:28 UTC
From: billsohl@mindspring.com
Message-ID: <3a60d179.5489999@news.mindspring.com>
Source record: 339

On Sat, 13 Jan 2001 17:24:42 GMT, Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
wrote:

>Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com> wrote:
>>Nobody has the time to scratch-build and chasing parts
>>is expensive and time consuming,
>
>Translation:
>Hams can't really homebrew state of the art gear anymore...

Actually, that's pretty much a true statement.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

90. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-13 22:10:15 UTC
From: billsohl@mindspring.com
Message-ID: <3a60d1d4.5580338@news.mindspring.com>
Source record: 340

On 13 Jan 2001 16:19:00 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>In article <sIM66.653$e5.1665591@news.ntplx.net>, "Ed Hare, W1RFI"
><w1rfi@arrl.net> writes:
>
>>I think, however, that for the most part, those who want to be hams are
>>hams. In the mid 60s, I think there were just over 100,000 hams. Today,
>>there are over 6 times that number. I agree that growth is not one of our
>>major problems.
>>Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
>Ed:
>If growth isn't one of "our major problems," what do you think they
>are? And how will a zero-WPM, one-class license fix them?

Who is advocating a ONE license "fix?"

As to the zero-WPM...that has nothing to do with
fixing any problem other than the recognition of the
fact that there is no longer any valid reason to
test for code knowledge. It's that simple.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

91. Re: Proof of License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-13 22:49:30 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <93qm1o$77o$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 341

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.g746ws1.pminews@ca.news.verio.net>,
"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nospam.spam> wrote:
> On Sat, 13 Jan 2001 01:31:42 GMT, Brian wrote:
>
> >I would write to Pennsylvania Avenue
> >for a confirmation letter that she is coded.
>
> What is on "Pennsylvania Avenue"? Certainly not the FCC.

Legacy building time is running short. Better hurry.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

92. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-13 22:58:17 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <93qmi7$7kb$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 342

In article <3A60A5B1.4871F3E9@IEEE.org>,
Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> W4JLE wrote:
> > You would loose that bet as well Cecil, I still am better than you
because I
> > do CW ...
>
> No offense, Fred, but if you are not joking, you need some
> professional help.

Cecil, hint, hint. This guy is from 3950. Go to QRZ and follow his
link.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

93. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-13 23:06:40 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <93qn1t$7r2$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 343

In article <93q86vaid1@iac5.navix.net>,
"W4JLE" <Fred@w4jle.com> wrote:
> Brian, I will answer your post later. I am in the process of
practicing how
> to send poorly formed characters to screw over the inferior
technicians that
> have to use computers to copy code.
>
> 73 Fred W4JLE

Hey, slick, do you send 35wpm on 3950? Rhetorical question. Don't answer. Go back to 75M fone. Riley will cite you sooner or later.

Sayonara baby.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

94. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-13 23:11:30 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <93qnau$85m$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 344

In article <93qik6ldi1@iac5.navix.net>,
"W4JLE" <Fred@w4jle.com> wrote:
> Pseudo? You may consider it pseudo, but if you can't utilize Morse for
> sending/receiving traffic your opinion doesn't count...
>
> Real hams send dit's and dah's, the rest try to find something else to
> establish their pseudo self esteem.

Hey slick, I'll listen for your dits and dahs on 3950.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

95. Re: Buy a ham ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-13 23:16:29 UTC
From: "Steven J Robeson", K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <93qnk9$892$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 345

In article <20010113161208.22631.00000504@nso-fz.aol.com>,
lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:

> All the members liked that? Some members liked that? A few
> members liked that? With 170 thousand or so members in the
> ARRL, was there also a Poll done to ascertain who liked what?
> How does the ARRL decide on what is liked or disliked?

Perhaps a "Letter to the Editor"...??? Gallup and other polls
manage to determine to within a certain percentage what others are
thinking by sampling only a meager number.

> Jon, from what you've written, I daresy you are rather
> uncomfortable with my opinion.

Nothing in Jon's letter revealed any "discomfort"...Disdain,
perhaps...but NOT discomfort.

> As a non-subscriber to QST, I cannot hope to compete with an
> ARRL staffer who has ready access to the full line of ARRL
> publications. I am not critiquing individual QST articles but
> rather expressing an opinion on the attitude in general of the
> ARRL relative to morse code...over the last few decades...and
> the attitude of the general membership of the ARRL relative to
> morse code proficiency being the paramount achievement in
> US amateur radio.

You admittedly don't subscribe. Unless you are using this as a
smoke screen for reading other's copies (mooching) or paying full price
at the stand, HOW can you even BEGIN to form an INFORMED opinion on
what ARRL members think when you don't have the journal in front of you?

Is this the type of investigative research that ENGINEERS are
known for, Len?

> I readily admit to not knowing the entire scope of amateur
> radio activity as practiced by over a half million licensed US
> radio amateurs.

Then the MAJORITY of your posts and rants in this NG are,
esentially, baseless. Without the scientific employment of true
polling techniques, your "opinions" are at best, nothing but emotional
sludge. A hatred built upon your perceptions against Amateurs based
upon your military and dubious professional experiences, but in no way
based upon any practical experience as a Ham.

> To be fair, you should admit the very same
> thing. Being an ARRL staff member does not give you some
> magic powers to know the entire scope of amateur radio
> activity...or radio activity that is possibly related to amateur
> activity.

No magic powers, to be sure, but he, UNLIKE YOU, is involved in
the day-to-day activities of Amatuer Radio. I would take any one
sentence of Jon's assertions over any 10 pages of quotes with footnotes
from you simply because I know he's knee deep in Amatuer Radio.

He knows. You don't.

Perhap if YOU were, your posts might start to reflect some
reality. But I doubt it.

Steve

--
"If you're not living life on the edge, you're taking up too much
space..."

http://hometown.aol.com/k4yz/myhomepage/index.html
http://www.qrz.com/k4yz/

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

96. Re: Buy a ham ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-13 23:31:56 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <93qohc$92a$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 347

In article <93os9p$t0i$0@208.207.71.142>,
Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>
>
> > Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com> pontificated sanctimoniously:
> >
> > > > FISTS says: ACCURACY TRANSCENDS SPEED, COURTESY AT ALL TIMES
> > >
> > > You disagree?
>
> Of course I agree.
> But as usual, the exception to the rule always seems to show up. This
> time it's you. It really is too bad that you didn't grow up and mature
> into a real man before you showed up on RRAP. You might have showed
> some potential as true
> Real Ham . Instead, looks like you're determined to spend the rest of
> your ham radio involvement as a malcontent, protesting your own
> inadequacies by pointing the finger anywhere else. You said that you
> might just learn the code once no one was "forcing" you to do it. And
> now this nonsense. So much for your "plans".
>
> Accuracy is more important than speed most CW operations, it's true.

How dare you agree with me. Take it back. Take it back!

> Courtesy at all times is definately the preferred rule, but on rare
> occasions a belligerant, pugnacions induhvidual will appear and insist
> on blaming all his personal shortcomings and immaturities on those
who
> he envies, becoming critical and abusive, generating a regretable
> exception to the most desirable rule.

I expect that you've run into may people like yourself. Birds of a
feather...

> And in your case, of course you have no idea what a CW test actually
> amounts to. When you take (took) a test at the FCC office they require
> you to copy a message to paper, any way you can without aid, and when
> they required the applicant to send code, they had you send a few
words
> from a printed sheet. If the examiner could copy what you sent you
> passed.

Unfortuantely I passed via the 100% copy route.

> Your assinine assertion that some vaporous "specification" must be
> adhered to is one of the most brainless ideas you have had to date,

Vaporous? Morse Code is vaporous? OK, but do you mind if I quote you?

> and that includes a considerable number of brainless ideas.

So you really don't KNOW CODE?

> The idea that FCC, while downgrading all code speeds should then
invoke
> some closely toleranced "specification" shows just how far you are
from
> reality.

Wake up Rip Van Winkle. The specification of Morse Code hasn't changed much since 1834. You've had 166 years to get it right.

> But that's nothing new for you, is it?

Dick, go join your bud, JLE (Jelly) on 3950 and show us the man you've become. Oh yeh, be sure to use code and send accurately, unless you're the drunk one who utters the vulgarities.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

97. Re: Buy a ham ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-13 23:32:29 UTC
From: "Steven J Robeson", K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <93qoid$92g$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 348

In article <20010113011929.10105.00000261@nso-bh.aol.com>,
lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:

> I choose my words to convey meanings, Ed, but your sentence
> doesn't answer my question.

How could you tell, Len? You still can't answer direct questions
put to you with unambivilent parameters.

> Ok, so I'm using my early adult experiences. Military
> communications isn't amateur radio communications, but is
> amateur communications requiring guessing of morse
> characters?

Perhaps if you were ACTIVE on Amateur Radio traffic nets you'd
KNOW that "by guess and by golly" are NOT standards for "word counts"
or missed words. REGARDLESS of the mode.

> Is guessing necessary in all those ham traffic networks
> using only morse? Several long-timers have made much
> of those nets and their vital information on health and
> welfare. Seems to me that message content should have
> accuracy in content. Maybe I'm wrong but I thought that
> someone's health and welfare depends on accuracy, not
> guesses.

I have missed far fewer "charachters" on Morse nets. You don't
have accents, speech imediments or other anomolies of the human factor.

You can equally discount those anomolies in digital traffic, but
not everyone carries a laptop and TNC with them. Simplicity.

> There's no polls available to verify all those who've expressed
> an interest in amateur radio but were turned away by the
> code test requirement. That might explain the quarter million
> no-code-test Technicians that joined the US amateur ranks
> in the last decade...even though so many long-time amateurs
> openly hate and despise Techs.

The quarter million NCT's to whom you refer have not stopped at
NCT, either, Len. Some have, but most have at least taken the 5wpm to
be a "Tech Plus", if not General.

The license demographics are fluid and dynamic. Nailing them down
in ANY kind of a poll would require a very wide spectrum polling.

> "Thousands upon thousands" is a carefully chosen term I
> wrote, not "thousands of thousands." My careful choice can

> be interpreted as either several thousand, a whole million, or
> some number in between. Your choice. Can you prove me
> wrong on something that hasn't been quantified?

And proof that YOUR forte is wordsmithing, NOT Amateur Radio.

73

Steve

--
"If you're not living life on the edge, you're taking up too much
space..."

http://hometown.aol.com/k4yz/myhomepage/index.html
http://www.qrz.com/k4yz/

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

98. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-13 23:36:23 UTC
From: W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com>
Message-ID: <93qort$qr5$1@iac5.navix.net>
Source record: 346

Not much CW on 3950 Brian. I guess if the local newspaper reports a killing, you assume they are murderers?

While I may or may not support any activity on any freq, the fact I have a link to a site does not imply, nor should you infer my personal position on that link.

The only other person who tried to make these type of connections lives in Mass and is a certifiable nut case, should I infer that you are as well?

I am sorry that your little butt is chapped because you don't know, nor can you learn CW, but that's the way life goes!

"Brian" <brianburke@my-deja.com> wrote in message news:93qmi7$7kb$1@nnrp1.deja.com...
> In article <3A60A5B1.4871F3E9@IEEE.org>,
> Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> > W4JLE wrote:
> > > You would loose that bet as well Cecil, I still am better than you
> because I
> > > do CW ...
> >
> > No offense, Fred, but if you are not joking, you need some
> > professional help.
>
> Cecil, hint, hint. This guy is from 3950. Go to QRZ and follow his
> link.
>
>
> Sent via Deja.com
> http://www.deja.com/

99. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-13 23:38:06 UTC
From: "Steven J Robeson", K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <93qost$9dr$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 350

In article <20010112174503.14777.00000438@nso-bd.aol.com>,
lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:

> Oh, my, a general purpose Troll posting involving Patriotism and
> the American Way of Life for white Protestants.

Oh my, general purpose creep who disdains anything Patriotic
or "The American Way of Life", and continuing to make irrelevant and
racist commnets where none was offered.

Andersonian to the hilt.
--
"If you're not living life on the edge, you're taking up too much
space..."

http://hometown.aol.com/k4yz/myhomepage/index.html
http://www.qrz.com/k4yz/

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

100. Re: Buy a ham ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-13 23:46:39 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <93qpd0$38v$0@208.207.71.147>
Source record: 349

```
Brian wrote:
>
> In article <93osfr$t4n$0@208.207.71.142>,
> Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
> >
> >
> > "Ed Hare, W1RFI" wrote:
> > >
> > > Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com> wrote:
> > >
> > > > Do you intend to engage in poor amateur practice?
> > >
> > > I would not do so on purpose, Brian. It might be interesting to see
> how the
> > > equipment decodes the J38, and we could even try a bit of banana
> boat to
> > > test the limits, but I always try to send the best I can, by hand or
> with
> > > the keyer.
> > >
> >
> > Ed, do him a favor and clue him in on how ridiculous he really is. He
> > won't listen to just anyone, he's too busy keeping the chips balanced
> on
> > both shoulders.
>
> I certainly won't take any advice from you. You advovate, if not engage
> in poor amateur practice. I would have expected better from an old
> Extra and VE.
>

You sometimes seem to have a wild imagination, but all to frequently
you prove yourself to be simply delusional instead.
```

101. Re: Buy a ham ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-13 23:47:44 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <93qpf0$38v$1@208.207.71.147>
Source record: 351

```
Brian wrote:
>
> In article <93op5f$l7r$0@208.207.71.142>,
> Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
> >
> >
> > Brian wrote:
>
> > > I understand this:
> > >
> > > E1A16 @E1A14 (D) [97.211b]
> > >
> > > When may a station use special codes intended to obscure the meaning
> > > of messages?
> > >
> > > A. Never under any circumstances
> > > B. Only when a Special Temporary Authority has been obtained from
> the
> > > FCC
> > > C. Only when a Pre-1999 Extra class operator is controlling the
> station
> > > D. When sending telecommand messages to a station in space
> operation
> >
> > Typically, you have no idea what you're talking about.
>
> I have an idea what you are talking about, and it sucks.

With all the personal experience you have you'd know about "sucks".
```

102. Re: Buy a ham ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-13 23:50:05 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <93qpjd$38v$2@208.207.71.147>
Source record: 352

Cecil wrote:
>
> "Ed Hare, W1RFI" wrote:
> >
> > Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> >
> > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > > Never in all my years on the air have I heard - .-. ..- - ....
> > > > Never shall I.
> >
> > > So you don't believe in truth. Why am I not surprised?
> >
> > Do you really think that Dick meant that, or are you just "debating?"
>
> I'm just treating Dick exactly the way he treats me. He interprets
> my postings in the worst possible light. I thought it was funny that
> he said: "Never in all my years on the air have I heard 'truth'". :-)
> If CW operators never send - .-. ..- - .... then they obviously
> are not interested in 'truth'. Get it? :-)
>
> > I think he meant he has never heard visual dots and dashes. I think that he
> > would agree that he has heard
> > dah--di-dah-dit--di-di-dah--dah--di-di-di-dit where "dit" and "dah" are
> > generally taken by hams to be the sounds of the tones and spacing of Morse
> > code.
>
> I inferred it to mean that he had never heard the English word 'truth'
> sent using CW on the air. It never occurred to me that he might be
> talking about visual dots and dashes.

That a real problem with you, you're separated from reality far too
much.

103. Re: The Election & the Commission on Civil Rights

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-13 23:52:24 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <93qpnn$9um$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 353
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

In article <3A60688E.F89B8B80@IEEE.org>,
Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> helmsman wrote:
> > Gore lost fair and square and the Democratic party is a bunch of
> > loosers.
>
> Make that sore losers looking for revenge.

Haven't they hurt enough people already? They've made generations of Americans dependant upon them, they wave the racism flag while making every American declare their color on government forms, they embrace socialism and want to abandon the greatest form of government that has ever graced the earth.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

104. Re: Buy a ham ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-13 23:59:01 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <93qq45$38v$3@208.207.71.147>
Source record: 354

SHHHHHH! Fred, Brian is too immature and unlearned to know the
difference. Makes his goat real easy to lead around by the nose.

W4JLE wrote:
>
> Maybe I couldn't tell him about the Birthday party, but I bet I can exchange
> a signal report and get a QSL card. Try that on phone if neither of you
> truly does not understand a single word of the others language.
>
> "Cecil" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> news:3A5F0C76.2AB24EA8@IEEE.org...
> > W1RFI wrote:
> > > I think of the word "the" when I hear the French word "le."
> >
> > But that wasn't the question. The question was: What do you think of when
> > you hear - .-. ..- - .... I chose that particular word for a
> > particular reason.
> >
> > > This may set Dick off againk, but although Morse code is an encoding
> method, it
> > > can be language like in a number of ways.
> >
> > How would you use Morse code to tell a Japanese ham, who knows Morse code
> > but doesn't speak any English, how much fun you had at your birthday
> party?
> > --
> > http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

105. Re: The Election & the Commission on Civil Rights

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-13 23:59:26 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <93qq4saae1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 359
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

In article <3A60684C.5022F5BE@IEEE.org>,
Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> Dwight Stewart wrote:
> > In spite of several days of testimony, and weeks of gathering
> > information, the commission has yet to find any evidence of illegal
> > activity on the part of Florida voting officials, or a single
instance
> > of intentional civil rights violation.
>
> I thought it interesting that they didn't produce a single witness
> who was denied his/her right to vote. All the witnesses voted! The
> worst complaint was that there was a delay or something made someone
> nervous. Jesse Jackson was conspicuous by his absence.

I "heard" from a bed-wetting liberal that police "roadblocks" (probably traffic control near the polling locations) were scaring away minority voters. No reason to be scared unless they didn't have a green card or had a warrant out for them.

Besides, most cops I see are minorities. I just don't get it.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

106. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-13 23:59:47 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <93qq5j$38v$4@208.207.71.147>
Source record: 355

```
Cecil wrote:
>
> Jim Kelley wrote:
> >
> > Cecil wrote:
> >
> > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > > I'll be patient with you, Cecil. Morse code is a language only to
> > > > operators who learn and practice it to fluency, and to no others. THEY
> > > > must translate it.
> >
> > > Dick, so far you have refused to swear on a Bible that you don't translate
> > > - .-. ..- - .... into English.
> >
> > Translate? You mean like translating from another language into
> > English? :-)
>
> Ok, used the wrong word. Should have said "decode" instead of "translate".

And Cecil says his slips are never Fruedian.
```

107. Re: Buy a ham ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-14 00:01:18 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <93qq8e$38v$5@208.207.71.147>
Source record: 356

```
Cecil wrote:
>
> W4JLE wrote:
> > Maybe I couldn't tell him about the Birthday party, but I bet I can exchange
> > a signal report and get a QSL card. Try that on phone if neither of you
> > truly does not understand a single word of the others language.
>
> Works just fine on PACTOR with no hint of Morse code. So you must
> believe that PACTOR is a language?

Can you do that on PACTOR with a single active device?
```

108. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-14 00:08:06 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <93qql7$7mk$0@208.207.71.147>
Source record: 358

Cecil wrote:
>
> W4JLE wrote:
> > As a ham for almost 45 years, and 62 years on the planet ...
> > I really feel it (CW) makes me better than you!
>
> Tough Titty, Fred. I'm the same age as you, have been a ham five years
> longer than you, and I say you are not a better ham than I am simply
> because you can copy CW faster than I can. I'll bet I can run circles
> around you in the programming of DSP systems and/or designing digital
> logic systems. That obviously makes me better than you. (How do you like
> your very own words thrown back at you?)
>
> Each of us has something to contribute to this great hobby. Feeling
> superior because you can do fast code is a ridiculous way to live your
> life, IMHO, because as CW becomes more obsolete, you lose your self-
> proclaimed superiority. In my mouth with no hands, I can tie a cherry
> stem in a knot while copying PACTOR II. Can you do that? If not, you
> are certainly an extremely inferior ham.

It requires one active debvice to tie the knot and then how many tens
of thousands or millions to do the PACRTOR? Meanwhile with a handful of
active devices Fred works the world on CW, using his personally learned
and developed skill. All the programming you can do is for naught
without the complicated hardware to implement it, assuming the software
doesn't lock up the machinery instead of working as intended-far too
often the case.

You'll never win this argument. There is no mode that can favorably
compare with CW on its own turf. The only way you can kill it is to do
your best to downplay its advantages so that newcomers won't want to
learn it.

109. Lets Sing For President Un-Elected Bush!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-14 00:09:13 UTC
From: mailfrmpa@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010113190913.15644.00001463@ng-df1.aol.com>
Source record: 357

> > The Kennebunkport Hillbilly
>
> > > > (sung to the tune of The Beverly Hillbillies Theme Song)
>
> > > >
>
> > > > Come and listen to my story 'bout a boy name Bush.
>
> > > > His IQ was zero and his head was up his tush.
>
> > > > He drank like a fish while he drove all about.
>
> > > > But that didn't matter 'cuz his daddy bailed him out.
>
> > > > DUI, that is. Criminal record. Cover-up.
>
> > > >
>
> > > > Well, the first thing you know little Georgie goes to Yale.
>
> > > > He can't spell his name but they never let him fail.
>
> > > > He spends all his time hangin' out with student folk.
>
> > > > And that's when he learns how to snort a line of coke.
>
> > > > Blow, that is. White gold. Nose candy.
>
> > > >
>
> > > > The next thing you know there's a war in Vietnam.
>
> > > > Kin folks say, "George, stay at home with Mom."
>
> > > > Let the common people get maimed and scarred.
>
> > > > We'll buy you a spot in the Texas Air Guard.
>
> > > > Cushy, that is. Country clubs. Nose candy.
>
> > > >
>
> > > > Twenty years later George gets a little bored.
>

> > > > He trades in the booze, says that Jesus is his Lord.
>
> > > > He said, "Now the White House is the place I wanna be."
>
> > > > So he called his daddy's friends and they called the GOP.
>
> > > > Gun owners, that is. Falwell. Jesse Helms.
>
> > > >
>
> > > > Come November 7, the election ran late.
>
> > > > Kin folks said "Jeb, give the boy your state!"
>
> > > > "Don't let those colored folks get into the polls."
>
> > > > So they put up barricades so they couldn't punch their holes.
>
> > > > Chads, that is. Duval County. Miami-Dade.
>
> > > >
>
> > > > Before the votes were counted five Supremes stepped in.
>
> > > > Told all the voters "Hey, we want George to win."
>
> > > > "Stop counting votes!" was their solemn invocation.
>
> > > > And that's how George finally got his coronation.
>
> > > > Rigged, that is. Illegitimate. No moral authority.
>
> > > >
>
> > > > Y'all come vote now. Ya hear?
>
>

110. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-14 00:11:17 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <93qqr6$86d$0@208.207.71.147>
Source record: 360

Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> Len Way Over 21 wrote:
> > It would seem the anti-SS proponents fear the unfamiliar
> > and the non-traditional...probably because most aren't sure what
> > Spread-Spectrum is about, how it works, and so forth.
>
> Sure does seem like a lot of fun, though. 8-|
>
> > I don't understand this demonstrated-implicit fear.
>
> Could be fear of all the fun we've been missing out on. 8-|
>
> Think of all the people we could be talking to that we
> can't talk to now! 8-|
>
> Sorry, Len. You do make good points about SS. If only it
> weren't so darn eye-glazingly boring. For amateur radio
> at present, it's a solution to a non-existant problem.
> That may change, however.

Can't you just imagine? Instead of tuning the band for the 'weak ones'
we can tune among the spreading sequences to see who's on the air today.
Whoopie!

111. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-14 00:15:33 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A60EFA5.39B745E7@IEEE.org>
Source record: 362

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Can't you just imagine? Instead of tuning the band for the 'weak ones'
> we can tune among the spreading sequences to see who's on the air today.
> Whoopie!

Exactly what is the conceptual difference between looking at a
digital frequency meter and looking at a digital spreading sequence
meter? Is 12345 a frequency or a spreading sequence?
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

112. Re: Buy a ham ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-14 00:16:13 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <93qr49$av4$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 364

In article <93qoid$92g$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
Steven J Robeson, K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com> wrote:

> I have missed far fewer characters on Morse nets. You don't
> have accents, speech imediments or other anomolies of the human
factor.

What? No added swing? No Banana Boat Swing? No Lake Erie Swing?
No Eastern Superior Swing? No extra dits at 65wpm?

Just sterile W1AW-like code?

I'm suprised you didn't miss a few karakters from sheer boredom.

You guys butter your bread on both sides, don't you? Not a consistent
one in the whole lot.

Go swing by 3950 and give your good buddies a hi-5.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

113. Re: any ideas on HOw to learn Morse quickly??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-14 00:16:45 UTC
From: Glenn <glenn.hansen@usa.net>
Message-ID: <Nd686.260945$U46.8354995@news1.sttls1.wa.home.com>
Source record: 361
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Cap'n Crunch" <kcfamily@tir.com> wrote in message
news:W3486.315$H3.802414@nntp2.onemain.com...
>
>
>
> "Glenn" <glenn.hansen@usa.net> wrote in message.....
> > And everyplace you go spell what you see in Morse code. Really.
>
> Good idea..... used to do that with every sign I'd see, license plates,
and
> even sometimes with the newspaper... any practice is good practice.

Not as boring and you find you are spending a whole lot of time practicing
without really trying.

Just don't pay attention to that dit dah crap if its still around. Such
nonsense. They sound the same ones just longer than the other.

114. Re: Buy a ham ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-14 00:21:01 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <93qrd8$b9o$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 363

In article <93opeq$l7r$1@208.207.71.142>,
Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

> Yet certain ARRL officials advocate that anyone who wants should be
> free to attempt to operate CW anytime and anywhere on the bands they
> wish. So can we then presume that ARRL advocates ignoring certain
rules
> that advance a PC agenda WRT Morse code?

Hey, they couldn't do any worse than you. Swing by 3950 and give your
buds a hi-5 at 65wpm.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

115. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-14 00:23:02 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <93qrh7$9n1$0@208.207.71.147>
Source record: 365

Brian wrote:
>
don't for one second think you can convince me to accept poor
> amateur practice. Isn't going to happen. My mind is made up.

Yep. Your mind was made up the day you tried to operate the Novice band and no one answered your CQ. That was the end of the beginning for you, and you moaned and whined nonstop, to he exclusion of all other constructive activity, for the next dozen years, until Uncle Sam finally decided that your poor pitiful plight needed relief, in the face of the facts.
So now you claim some sort of expertise on 'poor amateur practice'. Of course you can't recognize it when you see it, since you see it in the mirror each and every morning and haven't yet recognized it for what it is.

116. Re: Buy a ham ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-14 00:24:03 UTC
From: K0HB <k0hb@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <93qriu$bb6$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 366

In article <93o7uu$e14$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com> wrote:

> Hans, just in case you've forgotten, each dit is one element, each dah
> is three elements, intra-character spacing is one element, inter-
> character spacing is three elements and inter-word spacing is seven
> elements.

I've heard there are a few unimaginative sheep who blindly adhere to
that protocol. Most good CW ops prefer to add some personalization,
however. Come back and play when you'd like to be a real CW operator,
as opposed to an automaton.

Good luck on this one now!

73, de Hans, K0HB
--
"1943 Poster Child for The National Precocious Little Bastard Campaign"

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

117. Re: Buy a ham ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-14 00:28:29 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A60F2AD.92954C83@IEEE.org>
Source record: 367

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> Cecil wrote:
> > Works just fine on PACTOR with no hint of Morse code. So you must
> > believe that PACTOR is a language?
>
> Can you do that on PACTOR with a single active device?

OK Mr. Genius, please tell us about your one transistor CW transceiver.
Must be nice not to have to have a store bought transceiver.

The point is: If I can use all the Morse short forms in PACTOR, then
if Morse is a language, PACTOR is also a language. Do you really
think PACTOR is a language?
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

118. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-14 00:34:39 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A60F41F.5FDC356E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 368

Dick Carroll wrote:
> It requires one active debvice to tie the knot ...

A transistor can tie a knot in a cherry stem?????

> You'll never win this argument.

I've already won the argument, Dick. I can communicate just as well with
a non-English speaking ham using PACTOR as with Morse code. I can do
it without any Morse code whatsoever. So are you going to tell me that
PACTOR is a language?
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

119. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-14 00:41:02 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <93qsiu$c98$0@208.207.71.147>
Source record: 369

Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> On 12 Jan 2001 12:40:47 GMT, Vincent Biancomano
> <103520.355@CompuServe.COM> wrote:
>
> >>Pick-up many college study guides and you'll often find
> >>copies of past tests.
> > >
> > >Past tests. Not future ones.
> > >Vince, WB2EZG
> >
> > Glad you made that statement Vince. The ONLY
> > thing Bash did was publish test questions from PAST
> > tests. If that is so then why all the concern?

That wasn't even a credible try at obfuscation. Bash was publishing the questions and answers to **CURRENT** FCC exams. Who would have wanted them if not?

You sure are some logician, Slick.

120. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-14 00:49:03 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <93qt1v$c98$1@208.207.71.147>
Source record: 370

Aaron Jones wrote:
>
> >> >To all of you I simply say I am proud of my achievement,
> >> >I really feel it makes me better than you!
> >>
> >> Unfortunately I think this statement is accurate. Sad...
>
> However you failed to comment on my last comment (above), any
> comments? Any retractions? Or do you really feel that you are superior
> to many, perhaps the majority of hams...

When it comes time to do CW, and nothing else, what are you? Inferior
to someone who was too lazy to learn it? Equal? PC?

121. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-14 00:53:42 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A60F896.B3DBDB41@IEEE.org>
Source record: 374

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Bash was publishing
> the questions and answers to **CURRENT** FCC exams.

Maybe so, maybe not. It would depend on how often the FCC changed
the exams and/or how many different exams they had, wouldn't it?
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

122. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-14 00:54:19 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <93qtbr$e3e$0@208.207.71.147>
Source record: 371

Cecil wrote:
>
> W4JLE wrote:
> > Absolutely I am superior to any ham that cannot send/receive a piece of
> > traffic in Morse, and thank you for asking.
>
> Your superiority and a buck fifty will get you a cup of coffee.

His superiority will get traffic passed on radiotelegraphy. You know
it. Brainless Burke knows it. NCI in its entirety knows it. ARRL knows
it. FCC knows it, and even acknowledged it- "We believe that knowedge
and skill in Morse code ....etc."
So go right and deny it till you're too stiff to work the keyboard, it
changes nothing whatever of the facts.

123. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-14 00:58:43 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A60F9C3.3138B29C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 376

```
Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> Cecil wrote:
> > Your superiority and a buck fifty will get you a cup of coffee.
>
> His superiority will get traffic passed on radiotelegraphy.

Whoopdeedoo Dick, I'll bet the Internet is shaking in its boots.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca
```

124. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-14 01:00:27 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <93qtnb$f9m$0@208.207.71.147>
Source record: 372

You seem to be saying that no individual college exam is that important
in itself, but the entire course, as evidenced by the degree, is.

Doesn't compute.

Either a test is valid and shows to some degree of confidence that the
examinee has absorbed a minimum level of information, else he doesn't
pass the test. Any test that doesn't..... well, fails the test.

Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> > Carl, you are obviously involved in education (from your email
> > address). So tell us: Is a test valid in a setting where no mandatory
> > study or other training is required when all the possible *exact* test
> > questions along with all their exact answers are given in advance? When
> > the examinee is given all the time he wants to work with them any way he
> > pleases?
>
> I think you've put your finger on one of the biggest differences between
> a FCC license and a college diploma.
>
> > I'd like to hear from a educational professional on this subject. I
> > completed almost all of a degree in secondary ed. (I wasn't able to take
> > three months off work to do student teaching and didn't need the degree
> > then in my job so put it on hold and then worked on to retirement
> > without finishing it). So I have had some study, now a little old, in
> > the subject. I can't recall ever even hearing of such a scheme being
> > described as credible. I know that no school I ever attended would have
> > considered it to be valid.
>
> I think you'd agree that getting the college degree is considerably more
> difficult than getting a ham radio license. I'd estimate that studying
> for an Extra class license would be comparable to 4 or 5 upper division
> units at a university - with considerably less writing. The college
> degree demonstrates the completion of a broad course of study. An FCC
> license allows someone to operate a two-way radio station - which in the
> grander scheme of things, is generally not a very demanding kind of
> activity. The Extra class license is almost comparable to the
> commercial radio license, and the responsibilities less demanding than
> those in commercial broadcast. Things seem scaled pretty well to me,
> Dick.
>
> 73, Jim AC6XG

125. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-14 01:00:52 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A60FA44.3EB5BFD2@IEEE.org>
Source record: 377

Dick Carroll wrote:
> When it comes time to do CW, and nothing else, what are you?

Mostly bored. Exactly how many RSTs do I need to be satisfied?
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

126. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-14 01:02:05 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <93qtqd$f9m$1@208.207.71.147>
Source record: 373

Brian wrote:
>
> In article <3A5F4A89.D603EB4A@IEEE.org>,
> Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> > W1RFI wrote:
> > > My life expectancy is about 30 years. How about we give it at least
> that long
> > > before we pronounce the mode dead. I will do my part. :-)
> >
> > If CW will give me 30 more years, I'll be glad to talk to you. :-)
>
> Deal. Lets set up a sked in 2030.

No use. You'll still be bitching and complaining that someone wants you
to either learn the code or shut up abojut it.

127. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-14 01:07:02 UTC
From: W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com>
Message-ID: <93qu5tvp1@iac5.navix.net>
Source record: 375

Isn't it amazing how the politically correct view pride in anything as "sick".

If they can not achieve, the rest of society must dumb down so they won't feel inferior.

And woe be it unto the person who dares to excel at anything, they have to be racists living in the past. I had to work racist in there somewhere, they always do.

Poor Aaron, can't copy CW and he needs to have someone tell him it is because he is a better person than those prideful old hams that can.

Aaron meet Brian, you can commiserate with each other, only on phone of course!

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:93qt1v$c98$1@208.207.71.147...
>
>
> Aaron Jones wrote:
> >
> > >> >To all of you I simply say I am proud of my achievement,
> > >> >I really feel it makes me better than you!
> > >>
> > >> Unfortunately I think this statement is accurate. Sad...
> >
> > However you failed to comment on my last comment (above), any
> > comments? Any retractions? Or do you really feel that you are superior
> > to many, perhaps the majority of hams...
>
> When it comes time to do CW, and nothing else, what are you? Inferior
> to someone who was too lazy to learn it? Equal? PC?

128. Re: Buy a ham ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-14 01:12:33 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <s3v16tspubvemm3psms8bb3t9tm1hfm2si@4ax.com>
Source record: 381

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
>When you mentioned a morse decoder using an 8080
>CPU with 16K of memory

Wrong Len.
That was *4KB* of memory, not 16KB..

>you didn't really say anything about its performance.

Wrong again Len.
I said it did a "great job"...

>You really only said one existed based on remembering
>one seen as an article in a magazine.

Wrong again Len.
I said my old computer had used such a program.

Here is my original quote:
"...My old Interact computer using an 8080 at 1 MHz
with only *4KB* of memory did a great job of Morse and
RTTY decoding..."

Your memory seems somewhat faulty Len,
maybe you need to upgrade... :-)

129. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-14 01:12:34 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <a3v16tooqliuu4i3uujf38f2o03k9kopl3@4ax.com>
Source record: 379

"Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net> wrote:
>how many hams feel they have as much time
>available as they did 10 or 20 years ago?

That's because there was no rrap 20 years ago... :-)

130. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-14 01:12:34 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <c8t16tk9rd0j831ld8ceanaqcgcqip2s5m@4ax.com>
Source record: 380

Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com> wrote:

>>Aaron Jones wrote:
>> Hams can't really homebrew state of the art gear anymore.

>I don't think that's 100% true, but close. The state of the art today is
>set by far-end professionals in the biz...

Agreed. I have never thought that it was the *amateurs* fault. The
same thing has happened in other hobbies. Cars and computers are two
examples that come to mind...

131. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-14 01:12:36 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <j0v16tgfh2uuot0h75d8t2ep164768t5rs@4ax.com>
Source record: 378

billsohl@mindspring.com (Bill Sohl) wrote:
>Please elaborate on what theft has occured?

You seemed to be blaming the FCC for being careless about not changing the tests to thwart Bash. My analogy was that it is like blaming the theft victim for being careless with her property, or blaming the professor who is not careful with his tests...

>I wasn't in any fraternity.

Nice sidestepping. Was dance your major? :-)

>The question is WHY is the material confidential?
>Clearly the congress thinks there's no reason to have
>confidentiality of such material...and I agree.

More sidestepping. The question was the morality of the Bash situation. Try not to give in so much to the politician in you... :-)

>So how come colleges seem to do just fine
> without such laws?

They have rules. Do you really think trying Bash's technique at a college would fly?? You would be out on your *** quick...

132. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-14 01:27:17 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <93qv9lkdr0@208.207.71.147>
Source record: 382

Brian wrote:

> Leland, I have a suspicion that Fred learned code in the military

Typically you construct your entire body of "evidence" around a
personal suspicion. You will NEVER learn, and not just the code.

133. Re: Buy a ham ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-14 01:33:59 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <93qvm7llk0@208.207.71.147>
Source record: 383

"Ed Hare, W1RFI" wrote:
>
> Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com> wrote:
>
> > Ed, I know that you know what I thought you said, but I don't know that
> > you know what I understood.
>
> Whew! I don't think I will ever follow that one. Let me just answer your
> question.
>
> > Are you saying that sending which was so bad as to constitute "poor
> > amateur practice" ocurred outside the Novice subbands?
>
> Yes, indeed. The ones that stick in my mind were, I believe, on 40 CW. I
> don't know whether they were in the General or Extra sub-bands (nor do I
> think it really matters). Nor do I really hold any ill will against the
> sender; that code could have been poorly sent for any of a number of
> reasons.

It happens. Some are the victim of strokes, and may have no facility
of speech remaining. A coiuple years ago I heard a very hesitant
extremely poorly sent CQ and answered it. The copy was horrendous,
barely possible at all. The station was an Extra class, had a very old
callsign, over 30 years old, and was not a vanity callsign. We completed
the contact with difficulty. I'd wager that fellow had some sort of
extreme physical impairment. That may well have been the *only* means he
had of communicating at all. It happens. I've read of quadruplegics who
use a "puffer" switch to key their rigs by blowing air through a straw.
But BrianBurkeTurkey would have Riley cite those guys for "poor amateur
practice". Shows where he's coming from. As far as I'm cncerned he can
go back.

134. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-14 01:56:48 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <93r10u$f93$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 384

In article <93qort$qr5$1@iac5.navix.net>,
"W4JLE" <Fred@w4jle.com> wrote:
> Not much CW on 3950 Brian. I guess if the local newspaper reports a killing,
> you assume they are murderers?
>
> While I may or may not support any activity on any freq, the fact I have a
> link to a site does not imply, nor should you infer my personal position on
> that link.

Oh, innocent bystander? Rogue OO?

> The only other person who tried to make these type of connections lives in
> Mass and is a certifiable nut case, should I infer that you are as well?

Infer what you like.

> I am sorry that your little butt is chapped because you don't know, nor can
> you learn CW, but that's the way life goes!

Fred, real hams don't have little butts. You otta know that by now.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

135. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-14 02:02:32 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <93r1bmfkb1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 386

In article <93qrh7$9n1$0@208.207.71.147>,
Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>
>
> Brian wrote:
> >
> don't for one second think you can convince me to accept poor
> > amateur practice. Isn't going to happen. My mind is made up.
>
> Yep. Your mind was made up the day you tried to operate the Novice
band
> and no one answered your CQ. That was the end of the beginning for
you,
> and you moaned and whined nonstop, to he exclusion of all other
> constructive activity, for the next dozen years, until Uncle Sam
finally
> decided that your poor pitiful plight needed relief, in the face of
the
> facts.
> So now you claim some sort of expertise on 'poor amateur practice'.
Of
> course you can't recognize it when you see it, since you see it in the
> mirror each and every morning and haven't yet recognized it for what
it
> is.

Dick, your powers of reverse psychology are underwhelming. Now that
Kennard has resigned, who are you going to blame for demeaning your
station in life?

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

136. Re: Buy a ham ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-14 02:08:24 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <93r1mo$r3q$0@208.207.71.147>
Source record: 385

Your problem, in part, is one of perception, and it shows evidence of
being a problem of lifelong standing. At this late juncture it seems
unlikely to be cured in time to do you much good. Sad.

Brian wrote:
>
> In article <93opn2mrn0@208.207.71.142>,
> Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
> >
> >
> > Brian Burke (N0MiND) wrote:
> >
> > > You cannot stop a madman.
> >
> > If nothing more you surely have proved that. Anyone who
> > self-flaggelates as you have over the past 15 years in a vain attempt
> to
> > conform the rest of the world to your own personal specifications by
> > denyingyourself as you have is either an isolated monk on a remote
> > mountaintop or a total nut. We all know the correct answer to that
> > question with no aid whatever from the Question Pool's exact answers.
>
> Dick, you'll always find opposition from me when you advocate poor
> amateur practice. All you have to do is reverse yourself.
>
> I don't know what it is about these OF's that think just because they
> have more time in the chow hall, they own the ARS. It doesn't work that
> way. When you're wrong, you're wrong.
>
> Sent via Deja.com
> http://www.deja.com/

137. Re: Buy a ham ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-14 02:11:26 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <93r1sb$g1t$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 388

In article <93qq45$38v$3@208.207.71.147>,
Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
> SHHHHHH! Fred, Brian is too immature and unlearned to know the
> difference. Makes his goat real easy to lead around by the nose.

It's not my birthday and leave my goat alone. You make her nervous.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

138. Re: Proof of License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-14 02:14:26 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.10.10101140214280.20021-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 387

On Fri, 12 Jan 2001, Keith E. Brandt, M.D. wrote:
> My XYL received her technician license back in the good-old-days of the 5 WPM
> code test and the General written. We've been searching, but so far have not
> been able to find her old license to show the VEC so she can upgrade to
> General under the new system. I have heard that there is a webpage either at
> the FCC or ARRL that you can get proof of licensure prior to the cutoff date.

Try QRZ.com's 1993 callbook page. Otherwise, write the FCC to get the letter
that confirms issuance before the magic 1987 date.

139. Re: The Election & the Commission on Civil Rights

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-14 02:19:33 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <93r2blqj0@208.207.71.147>
Source record: 389
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Donnie wrote:
>
> Wheres Jesse and the N.A.A.C.P. on this slap in the face?
> just a thought.

I was talking yesterday to a fella who has spent some time in Africa, and he was telling me about conditions there. He said "If I was a black person I'd thank my lucky stars that my ancestors were slow enough to get caught and sent over here". Instead they got Big Jesse and his stuff.

140. Re: Buy a ham ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-14 02:22:14 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <93r2gigfh1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 392

In article <93qriu$bb6$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
K0HB <k0hb@my-deja.com> wrote:
> In article <93o7uu$e14$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
> Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com> wrote:
>
> > Hans, just in case you've forgotten, each dit is one element, each
dah
> > is three elements, intra-character spacing is one element, inter-
> > character spacing is three elements and inter-word spacing is seven
> > elements.
>
> I've heard there are a few unimaginative sheep who blindly adhere to
> that protocol. Most good CW ops prefer to add some personalization,
> however. Come back and play when you'd like to be a real CW operator,
> as opposed to an automaton.

You and dick have a fascination with sheep and goats. Been hanging on
3950 a little too long?

"That" protocol? Is there another?

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

141. Re: 10 bucks buys a ham license.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-14 02:22:52 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.10.10101140218450.20021-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 390
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Sat, 13 Jan 2001, TheRock wrote:
> The charge today can be up to $10 per fcc regulations.
> The limit is $10 though. It was $6 when I got mine 7 years ago roughly,
> course that VEC didn't charge the full rate, I think the max they could
> charge was $7 or something.

Wrong. Although the ARRL and other VEC's may charge $10, there is NO REGULATORY LIMIT, having been removed by a 1996 law change that was previously overlooked.

There is still a general requirement that organizations not PROFIT from amateur radio operations, so any fee charged must be relatively close to or equal cost. The ARRL computed this as $10 to cover its costs, which includes $4 that the VE team may retain for their share of the expenses. The part where fees may be charged for testing costs (or code practice) are still in the regulations.

142. Re: Proof of License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-14 02:25:27 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.10.10101140224200.20021-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 391

On Sat, 13 Jan 2001, Phil Kane wrote:
> On Sat, 13 Jan 2001 01:31:42 GMT, Brian wrote:
> >I would write to Pennsylvania Avenue
> >for a confirmation letter that she is coded.
>
> What is on "Pennsylvania Avenue"? Certainly not the FCC.

The alternative way of getting a license, similar to the "Betty Ford" rule for CB, but no marriage or continued commitment required. Better hurry - only 6 days left for "special handling."

However, what's interesting is that neither Paula Jones or Monica Lewinsky have become licensed (to my knowledge) in the amateur radio service.

143. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-14 02:35:25 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <93r39dqm0@208.207.71.147>
Source record: 393

Cecil wrote:
>
> Aaron Jones wrote:
> > If a college (or the Bash era FCC) does not combat cheating by
> > changing the tests frequently, does that make the person who uses the
> > illicit material any less of a moral cheater?? Is it OK to steal
> > physical property just because someone is careless with it?
>
> It is OK to do what an ordinary prudent man would do.
>
> > How about in the court of morality?? Did you use those fraternity
> > cheat cheats to get through college, even though there might be no
> > *legal* law broken??
>
> It is OK to do what an ordinary prudent man would do.

Talk about subjective. Who says who is ordinary and prudent? Only in
court.

144. Re: Proof of License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-14 02:44:04 UTC
From: W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com>
Message-ID: <93r3rs$5bt$1@iac5.navix.net>
Source record: 395

But they both became Cbers which in this case stands for Clinton Blowers.

>"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> >wrote in message > However, what's interesting is that neither Paula Jones or Monica Lewinsky have
> become licensed (to my knowledge) in the amateur radio service.
>

145. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-14 02:44:15 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <ct326tk8ufmk2co82127m4b2g0tk8mu00v@4ax.com>
Source record: 394

Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
> When it comes time to do CW, and nothing else, what are you?

I'm a CW ragchewer. My average QSO lasts for about 30 minutes to an hour. These days I generally do 1 to 2 QSOs a day. I don't work DX. I hate contests because they ruin my ragchewing :-). My top head copy speed is around 40wpm, however most of my QSO's are in the 25wpm range. I use a keyer with standard weighting. I don't own a straight key or a bug. I enjoy CW mobile. I keep a CW homebrew computer log. It's over 3000 QSOs now. I dabble in CW computer programming. I don't belong to any CW clubs. I have a number of regular CW friends, some of who are way over the 150 QSO mark in the log, but I keep no skeds, handle no traffic, and visit no nets. I simply enjoy using the mode...

>Inferior to someone who was too lazy to learn it [code]?

You're talking about me. If it wasn't required for my General, I certainly would never have learned the code. And even after getting my General, I didn't start regularly using CW for another 30 years. Yes Dick, I used a mike almost exclusively for 30 years. I'm that guy with the mike in his face that's been described here so often. If there had been no code requirement in 1957 (my Novice) or 1959 (my General) I can safely say I would have never learned the code. I was (am still) too lazy...

On reflection though, I think I must apologize to W4JLE. My attack on him was somewhat sanctimonious. While I strongly disagree that one ham is "better" than another ham simply because of his CW ability, I could have better worded my thoughts...

146. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-14 02:51:55 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <93r48b$6o8$0@208.207.71.147>
Source record: 396

Cecil wrote:
>
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > I learned Morse code at speeds greater than 5 WPM because
> > it was the current requirement to obtain an Extra-class license!
> > If the requirement hadn't existed, neither would my achievement --
> > and I would not have benefited from the enjoyment of reasonable
> > proficiency in this practical communications skill. It's as simple
> > as that.
>
> Are you implying that you must be forced to do something before
> you get anything done? That sounds like sheer laziness to me.
> I learned Morse code before I ever heard of amateur radio simply
> because it was fun.

BS. You learned the letters, you never have learned it to fluency.
Hence your 5wpm Extra.
Excepting the segment of hams who learned CW in the military, then
later became hams (many did it in the reverse mode, went into service as
hams then became military CW ops), almost ALL hams who learned CW to
proficiency at 13 o 20wpm did it not because they found it attractive,
actually the reverse was most always true. They tolerated that
unpleasant task solely because they wanted the HF ham license.In the
process of learning a high percentage found what Morse code
communications really is about, and went on to like the mode and become
effective trained operators.

The exceptions are the few dingalings like Burke who just sulled up and
stonewalled themselves, preferring to resist by forfeiting a HF license
in favor of "I want". Self-flaggelation at its finest. Of course there
were few of them.

The Proof? Easy. The resounding "wet noodle" flop that has been
Restructuring.

147. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-14 03:03:39 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <93r4ub$6o8$1@208.207.71.147>
Source record: 397

W4JLE wrote:
>
> Not much CW on 3950 Brian.
> I am sorry that your little butt is chapped because you don't know, nor can
> you learn CW, but that's the way life goes!

His butt is far worse than just chapped, its's totally hide-less. He's
been this way so long he knows no other way to act, and is showing that
he has no aptitude to learn. I see no hope for him.

148. Re: Buy a ham ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-14 03:07:47 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <93r563$9ql$0@208.207.71.147>
Source record: 398

Brian wrote:
> go join your bud, JLE (Jelly) on 3950 and show us the man you've
> become. Oh yeh, be sure to use code and send accurately, unless you're
> the drunk one who utters the vulgarities.
>

So what's on 3950??? and WHY do you know so much about it???

149. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-14 03:12:35 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <93r5f3$9ql$1@208.207.71.147>
Source record: 400

```
Cecil wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Can't you just imagine? Instead of tuning the band for the 'weak ones'
> > we can tune among the spreading sequences to see who's on the air today.
> > Whoopie!
>
> Exactly what is the conceptual difference between looking at a
> digital frequency meter and looking at a digital spreading sequence
> meter? Is 12345 a frequency or a spreading sequence?
>

Your use of the word "conceptual" is revealing of your plans to screw
the ARS with that nonsense. 'nother Freudian job...
```

150. Re: Buy a ham ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-14 03:14:22 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <93r5ie$9ql$2@208.207.71.147>
Source record: 399

Brian wrote:
>
> In article <93opeq$l7r$1@208.207.71.142>,
> Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>
> > Yet certain ARRL officials advocate that anyone who wants should be
> > free to attempt to operate CW anytime and anywhere on the bands they
> > wish. So can we then presume that ARRL advocates ignoring certain
> rules
> > that advance a PC agenda WRT Morse code?
>
> Hey, they couldn't do any worse than you. Swing by 3950 and give your
> buds a hi-5 at 65wpm.

Why are you so reluctant to tell us what is on 3950? You're the only
one here that seems to know.

151. Re: Buy a ham ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-14 03:15:38 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <93r5kq$9ql$3@208.207.71.147>
Source record: 401

Brian wrote:
>
> Go swing by 3950 and give your good buddies a hi-5.

Why are you so reluctant to tell us what is on 3950? You seem to be the
only one here that knows.

152. Re: Buy a ham ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-14 03:19:32 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <93r5s5bqk0@208.207.71.174>
Source record: 402

Cecil wrote:

> If I can use all the Morse short forms in PACTOR, then
> if Morse is a language, PACTOR is also a language. Do you really
> think PACTOR is a language?

PACTOR has nothing whatever to do with Morse that is practdiced at the
level of fluency.

153. Re: Buy a ham ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-14 03:34:13 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <93r6nlbqk1@208.207.71.174>
Source record: 403

Brian wrote:
>
>
> "That" protocol? Is there another?

Why are you so reluctant to tell us what is on 3950? You're the only
one here who seems to know anything about it.

154. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-14 04:00:40 UTC
From: billsohl@mindspring.com
Message-ID: <3a6123d8.2252073@news.mindspring.com>
Source record: 404

On 14 Jan 2001 00:41:02 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

>Bill Sohl wrote:
>>
>> On 12 Jan 2001 12:40:47 GMT, Vincent Biancomano
>> <103520.355@CompuServe.COM> wrote:
>>
>> >>Pick-up many college study guides and you'll often find
>> >>copies of past tests.
>> >
>> >Past tests. Not future ones.
>> >Vince, WB2EZG
>>
>> Glad you made that statement Vince. The ONLY
>> thing Bash did was publish test questions from PAST
>> tests. If that is so then why all the concern?
>
> That wasn't even a credible try at obfuscation. Bash was publishing
>the questions and answers to **CURRENT** FCC exams. Who would have
>wanted them if not?
>
> You sure are some logician, Slick.

Why shouln't the FCC have made up new tests to avoid
the "problem" of people making past questions known?
Vince said there's an infinite variety of questions.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

155. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-14 04:05:19 UTC
From: billsohl@mindspring.com
Message-ID: <3a612487.2426713@news.mindspring.com>
Source record: 405

On Sun, 14 Jan 2001 01:12:36 GMT, Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
wrote:

>billsohl@mindspring.com (Bill Sohl) wrote:
>>Please elaborate on what theft has occured?
>
>You seemed to be blaming the FCC for being careless about not changing
>the tests to thwart Bash.

I'm not blaming anyone for anything. IF the issue
is the constant re-use of the same tests, then that
is the FCC's problem...NOT Bash's.

>My analogy was that it is like blaming the
>theft victim for being careless with her property, or blaming the
>professor who is not careful with his tests...

Removal of phisical property by theft is NOT
a good anaology. On the other hand, the
college professor that reuses last years tests
has no one but himself to blame if students have
copies or share the questions from prior tests.

>>I wasn't in any fraternity.
>
>Nice sidestepping. Was dance your major? :-)

>>The question is WHY is the material confidential?
>>Clearly the congress thinks there's no reason to have
>>confidentiality of such material...and I agree.
>
>More sidestepping. The question was the morality of the Bash
>situation. Try not to give in so much to the politician in you... :-)

Try to realize that you don't get to legislate morality.

>>So how come colleges seem to do just fine
>> without such laws?
>
>They have rules. Do you really think trying Bash's technique at a
>college would fly?? You would be out on your *** quick...

It goes on all the time at colleges.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

156. Re: The Election & the Commission on Civil Rights

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-14 04:30:26 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3A612B3C.16571943@sccoast.net>
Source record: 406
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Donnie wrote:
>
> [snip] They are really raising hell here in S.C.
> about the flag issue. They even went after a
> Columbia, S.C. business man because he flies the
> confedrate flag at his restaurants. [snip]

Lets report the facts fully and accurately. The complaint against this restaurant owner was not just that he flew a confedrate flag in front of his restaurants, but also that he also used displays of the civil war as part of the restaurant's decor (this is SC that we're talking about). Furthermore, the NAACP complained that his bookstore (a rack of books in one corner of the restaurant) contained "racist" books that glorified the civil war and slavery.

Less troubling then the boycott of the restaurants, was the boycott by local grocery stores of the popular barbeque sauce produced by the owner of the restaurants. Winn-Dixie, Krogers, Piggly Wiggly, Harris-Teeter, Bi-Lo, and Food Lion, all joined in the boycott by dropping the barbeque sauce. No local grocery store joined in the boycott, and two of the six stores above have restocked the barbeque sauce following complaints by customers.

Now, whatever your feelings are about the civil war, slavery, or the confedrate flag, it is clear that this boycott by the NAACP is nothing more than an attempt to censor the views of this businessman. And censorship, no matter who is doing it, is not that this country is supposed to be about.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net

157. Re: The Election & the Commission on Civil Rights

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-14 04:39:38 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3A612D61.EB02F426@sccoast.net>
Source record: 407
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Cecil wrote:
>
> [snip] In Texas, the Confederate battle flag is
> not a symbol of slavery but is instead a symbol
> of rebellion, akin to the "Don't Tread On Me"
> flag of yesteryear. [snip]

The confederate battle flag is not a "symbol of slavery" to anyone displaying that flag. I have not heard a single person, who displays the flag, advocating a return to slavery. Instead, the battle flag is a symbol of State's rights to most southerners (resistance to big government), and a flip of the middle finger at those who criticize the confederate states (especially those who insist the civil war was about slavery).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net

158. Re: The Election & the Commission on Civil Rights

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-14 04:46:23 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3A612EF5.BD54BEB1@sccoast.net>
Source record: 408
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> I was talking yesterday to a fella who has
> spent some time in Africa, and he was telling
> me about conditions there. He said "If I was
> a black person I'd thank my lucky stars that
> my ancestors were slow enough to get caught
> and sent over here". Instead they got Big
> Jesse and his stuff.

I saw an article, with similar sentiments, a couple of years ago, written by the black editor of the military's Stars & Stripes newspaper following his return from an extended tour in Africa. In the article, he said that his trip to Africa changed his entire views about race relations in the United States (he then went on to criticize those blacks in American who fail to appreciate the opportunities they have).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net

159. Re: any ideas on HOw to learn Morse quickly??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-14 05:16:47 UTC
From: BD <bodu@pobox.com>
Message-ID: <ADa86.383$s11.191548@nnrp3.sbc.net>
Source record: 409
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Another is short-hand.. ;)
I learned "note-hand" (an abbreviated version taught for easier note-taking in class) which makes it much easier to keep up. I admit I still have a hard time deciphering what it was that I wrote down, but.. getting it wrote down's easier.. ;)

"Aaron Jones" <nomail@nomail.com> wrote in message
>
> Another point is to write (or print) small. It takes less time to
> write small letters and by writing 2 lines in the paper space allotted
> for one line, I've found that I can increase my hand copy speed
> substantially...
>

160. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-14 05:21:37 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <krd26tk4js8roap0o5944tgfa4c1m2518f@4ax.com>
Source record: 410

billsohl@mindspring.com (Bill Sohl) wrote:
>IF the issue is the constant re-use of the same tests,
>then that is the FCC's problem...NOT Bash's.

Whatever facilitates cheating on ham tests is the hobby's problem...

> On the other hand, the
>college professor that reuses last years tests
>has no one but himself to blame if students have
>copies or share the questions from prior tests.

Yep. Whatever happened to individual honesty and honor? If a student
is cheating his way through college it's the professors fault...

>It [cheating] goes on all the time at colleges.

And that makes it right??

161. Re: Old Calls

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-14 05:52:05 UTC
From: melachri@voicenet.com
Message-ID: <3a613976.3848468@netnews.voicenet.com>
Source record: 411

Phil -

Thanks for the detailed listing. This is precisely the program I was referring to, but I was off by 6 months. (I thought it started in Jan 77.) I've added some comments to explain the dates.

On Thu, 11 Jan 2001 19:14:34 GMT, "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nospam.spam> wrote:

>On 11 Jan 2001 06:25:23 GMT, Qrm2000 wrote:
>
>>If any of the FCC guys are reading this, perhaps they can check with some
>>Department old timers or Commission history books and give us the exact
>>sequence. (J. at Columbia--can you help?)
>
> There are no more "old timers" (of my vintage, at least) left,
> nor are there any history books other than a file of Commission
> orders maintained by a third-party legal publisher (Pike and
> Fischer).
>
> With that said, I researched the case against Richard Zeigler,
> the seller-of-call-signs, and came up with this time line:
>
> 1. Effective in 1968 with "incentive licensing", any Extra
> class licensee who had been a licensed Amateur for 25 years or
> more could apply for a non-specific ("sequential") "1x2" call
> sign.
>
> 2. Effective July 1, 1976, any Extra class licensee who had
> been a licensed Amateur for 25 years or more could select one
> specific "1x2" call sign.

This added the ability to pick a specific call, but did not change eligibility.

> 3. Effective October 1, 1976, anyone who had held an Amateur
> Extra class license since prior to November 22, 1967, could
> select one specific "1x2" call sign.

This date (Nov 67) was to preference hams who held the Extra prior to incentive licensing.

> 4. Effective January 1, 1977, anyone who had held an Amateur
> Extra class license since prior to July 2, 1974, could select
> one specific "1x2" call sign.

This was the original date of the NPRM that created this process.

> 5. Effective April 1, 1977, anyone who held an Amateur Extra
> class license since prior to July 1, 1976, could select one
> specific "1x2" call sign.

This was the effective date of the R&O for this program.

> 6. Effective July 1, 1977, any Amateur Extra class licensee
> could select one specific "1x2" call sign.
>
> 7. Effective March 30, 1978 this was all replaced by the
> strict "sequential" system until the advent of "vanity" call
> sign selection in June 1997.
>
> This, I hope, settles the question.
>
>--
> 73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP
> FCC SF District Director (retired)
>

One minor correction of what I think is a typo, though, Phil. The present vanity call sign system started earlier than June 1997. For example, check W3OR. He was granted a HV (vanity) license on 4 June 96. The FCC Report and Order was adopted on Dec 23, 1994 and released on Feb 2, 1995. You can find the complete text at:

www.fcc.gov/Bureaus/Wireless/Orders/1994/fcc94343.txt

Steve
W3HF

162. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-14 05:52:39 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010114005239.03673.00000673@nso-ck.aol.com>
Source record: 414

In article <93q7v3abv1@iac5.navix.net>, "W4JLE" <Fred@w4jle.com> writes:

>Nice post Len, misguided as it may be. I did enjoy your views.

I doubt that sincerity based on the expressions of outright
sanctimonious self-righteousness presented before the
as-an-expert-CWer-you-are-superior-to-all nonsense.

If you Really believe in what you say then you should
petition to FCC to change US amateur radio to only one
mode: OOK CW. Make every amateur license state
"Amateur Radiotelegraph Operator" and be done with it.
Allow NO freedom. One mode, one service, one Reich...

Fred, you are living in the past and with such a strict
code of morality that it's a wonder you survived this
long with Godless Sinners all around you. [I'm not
talking about CW, just the intolerant bigotted red-
neckism that ran rampant throughout your epistle]

Now cross your legs...we have only one nail left.

didit

163. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-14 05:52:40 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010114005240.03673.00000674@nso-ck.aol.com>
Source record: 413

In article <a3v16tooqliuu4i3uujf38f2o03k9kopl3@4ax.com>, Aaron Jones
<nomail@nomail.com> writes:

>"Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net> wrote:
>>how many hams feel they have as much time
>>available as they did 10 or 20 years ago?
>
>That's because there was no rrap 20 years ago... :-)

The Internet celebrated its 10th Anniversary a few
weeks ago. That news was in some of the larger
newspapers.

didit

164. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-14 05:52:43 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010114005243.03673.00000675@nso-ck.aol.com>
Source record: 415

In article <93qqr6$86d$0@208.207.71.147>, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
writes:

>Jim Kelley wrote:
>>
>> Len Way Over 21 wrote:
>> > It would seem the anti-SS proponents fear the unfamiliar
>> > and the non-traditional...probably because most aren't sure what
>> > Spread-Spectrum is about, how it works, and so forth.
>>
>> Sure does seem like a lot of fun, though. 8-|
>>
>> > I don't understand this demonstrated-implicit fear.
>>
>> Could be fear of all the fun we've been missing out on. 8-|
>>
>> Think of all the people we could be talking to that we
>> can't talk to now! 8-|
>>
>> Sorry, Len. You do make good points about SS. If only it
>> weren't so darn eye-glazingly boring. For amateur radio
>> at present, it's a solution to a non-existant problem.
>> That may change, however.

Jim: The "boring" part is due to spread-spectrum not being
intuitive...and few have explained either direct-sequence or
frequency-hopping in simpler terms or in terms that long-
timers can accept. Long-timers referring to being used to
conventional narrowband frequency tuning as practiced in
amateur radio today.

One amateur band somewhere in the spectrum would be
ideal for DSSS or FHSS trials. I would think it woud be
preferrable in an urban area having many potential users,
such as VHF or UHF with a repeater. There is one
problem at present, a very big one, and that is
standardization of the SS characteristics. At present
the characteristics are individual to a manufacturer and
hardly any are alike enough to be interoperable. In order
to use it for a trial, every participant MUST be using the
SAME characteristic.

Spread-spectrum in either of the two main modes is not
that new to the radio industry. The standard small-unit
ground-air-vehicle manpack size radio for the US

military is now entering its 14th year of operational use.
SINCGARs family is FHSS, primarily for extreme
difficulty of unfriendlies getting a sufficient "fix" on the
signal (hops at 10 mS rates, very hard for an intercept).
DSSS is now installed in numbers of hundreds of
thousands, primarily in WLANs and CDMA cell phones.
DSSS with WLANs is so locally secure and free from
interference that it operates just like hard-wired
connections.

> Can't you just imagine? Instead of tuning the band for the 'weak ones'
>we can tune among the spreading sequences to see who's on the air today.
>Whoopie!

Dick: I'm glad you exhibit some joy at new things. For
a while most readers thought you wanted to fix US amateur
radio in the armor-plate-protected, concrete-block
traditionalism of the Olde Days, never ever to change (as
long as you were alive).

didit

165. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-14 05:52:48 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010114005248.03673.00000676@nso-ck.aol.com>
Source record: 412

In article <3A609F92.AC8894ED@dvol.com>, Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com> writes:

>Aaron Jones wrote:
>
>> Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com> wrote:
>> >Nobody has the time to scratch-build and chasing parts
>> >is expensive and time consuming,
>>
>> Translation:
>> Hams can't really homebrew state of the art gear anymore.
>
>I don't think that's 100% true, but close. The state of the art today is
>set by far-end professionals in the biz who have access to pricey CAE
>software, custom chips, board fab facilities, deep pockets, long list of
>assets which even most technically astute hams don't have today let
>alone the rest of us who homebrewed back when.

Some comments which might aid homebrewers -

Pricey CAE (Computer-Aided Engineering): The ARRL Radio
Designer program set is, what, $150? Allows a circuit
breadboard analysis without buying any parts. Anyone can
download Demo versions from at least three different
software houses who build on the free SPICE program core.
Circuit analysis using the computer as a breadboard is much
faster than building it from real parts, no one gets solder burns,
don't have to buy the components first. Modeled correctly, a
SPICE analysis will work identical to the real thing.

The same for PCB layout programs, at least two Demo
versions having limited size and number of components.
Lacking that, a pad of vellum paper and some colored
pencils work out very nicely...but does take a lot longer
to lay out PCB traces manually.

Custom chips: Not needed for nearly all amateur
applications.

Board fab facilities: For one-of-a-kind boards, one can
get various kits for making PCBs in most electronic
stores. You can choose from room-light exposure to
sunlight exposure from 1:1 scale layouts. Etch them over
the bathroom sink. Clean the foil before and after etching
with ordinary kitchen cleanser. For small jobs I do 1:1
layouts, drill the PCB first, use the drill holes as a guide
to paint on resist made from thinned-out lacquer, then

etch with ferric chloride. No problem but it won't make
0.025" spacing lands and trace spacing, though..

Deep pockets: That's up to the individual on how much
they want to spend. There are pro PCB houses who will
do one-of-a-kind prototype boards, even do layouts first,
but at a price. A few will also do assembly using
controlled-heat ovens, you supply the parts. Ads in
the electronic trades.

SMT: While not stated, this is a big problem for folks who
can't see fine detail or who don't have steady hands. I
would suggest scrounging around for discarded consumer
electronic boards to practice unsoldering and soldering
with suggested soldering tools. Craft stores sell nice,
inexpensive headband magnifiers for looking real close
(cross-stitchers like that type). If the circuit allows
component value measurement, measure before and
after to see if too much heat was applied for too long.

>It's just evolutionary
>reality which started in spark days when somebody decided to make radio
>parts for money and sell 'em to hams, 1910 or so.

There are many places that will sell small quantities of electronic
parts to anyone. Several hams have lists/links to such places.
Allied Electronics has their entire current catalog on their
website. Almost the same for Digi-Key. All Electronics, two
stores in L.A., have a lot of manufacturer's surplus of many
kinds. Fair Radio Sales is still in business and advertising on
the web, still carrying military surplus (but of limited types).

Things that won't be found or are very scarce: Variable caps
other than trimmers or AM/FM radio two-gangers. Tube
sockets and shields (lots of locations carrying replacement
tubes of many kinds). Some ICs that were once common
20 years ago.

A treasure for those working in RF from mid-HF on into the
microwave region: Mini-Circuits passive and active
components. Anyone serious about VHF+ homebrew ought
to have their catalog (order it via website)...contains good
info on component specs, how measured, etc. Harvey
Kaylie's company sells onsies to thousand-plus lots, no
problem. Good rep. in the industry on quality.

>For my own part I hombrew all my antennas including beams and I'm
>mulling building a single 3-500Z amp. Not much else left worth
>hombrewing.

Anyone wanting to homebrew solid-state PAs can contact at
least one website that sells parts or kits of parts for Helge
Granberg's series of Motorola Application Notes (their PDFs

have much larger file sizes and poorer repro than Motorola's website, go direct to Motorola for the AppNotes). The ARRL TIS has at least one article repro on PAs based on the Granberg AppNotes.

Some of the older-package DIP ICs are still available, such as a Motorola phase-locked loop IC with everything available on-chip in stock at JDR Microdevices. There's also some prescaler ICs in DIPs that will work to 1.2 GHz for counting down to a PLL input. VCOs (Voltage Controlled Oscillators) in DIP or discrete thin-film are now the general choice for variable frequency control...the old variable-capacitor tuning method has gone by the wayside.

Rolling-your-own from scratch takes patience, research, study, and a scientific calculator to crunch the numbers. Design data/formulas are all available...but it isn't all available at a single place. Once done, though, one can truly brag about it without exaggeration...it is a unique thing that no one else has done!

Building one's own from a construction article is an exercise in faith. :-) Faith that the author was correct, faith that the publication didn't make a typo somewhere. While typos are generally caught by someone, these "short circuit" corrections seldom appear sooner than three months after an article went to press.

didit

166. Re: Buy a ham ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-14 05:52:48 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010114005248.03673.00000677@nso-ck.aol.com>
Source record: 416

In article <s3v16tspubvemm3psms8bb3t9tm1hfm2si@4ax.com>, Aaron Jones
<nomail@nomail.com> writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
>>When you mentioned a morse decoder using an 8080
>>CPU with 16K of memory
>
>Wrong Len.
>That was *4KB* of memory, not 16KB..

Mea culpa, AJ. :-)

>>you didn't really say anything about its performance.
>
>Wrong again Len.
>I said it did a "great job"...

Define "great job."

I have a feeling that if it didn't emit smoke when turned on
you would have called it a "great job." :-)

>>You really only said one existed based on remembering
>>one seen as an article in a magazine.
>
>Wrong again Len.
>I said my old computer had used such a program.

...and how did that old computer get input?

>Here is my original quote:
>"...My old Interact computer using an 8080 at 1 MHz
>with only *4KB* of memory did a great job of Morse and
> RTTY decoding..."
>
>*Your* memory seems somewhat faulty Len,
>maybe you need to upgrade... :-)

No, AJ. I need some credulity. Yours isn't credible.

Maybe I do need to upgrade...to some who have actually
worked such a problem rather than using someone
else's program. What do you say, Anon Jones?

didit

167. Re: Proof of License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-14 06:04:02 UTC
From: melachri@voicenet.com
Message-ID: <3a613f0d.5279205@netnews.voicenet.com>
Source record: 417

On Fri, 12 Jan 2001 23:57:12 GMT, wd9get@amsat.org (Keith E. Brandt, M.D.) wrote:

>My XYL received her technician license back in the good-old-days of the 5 WPM
>code test and the General written. We've been searching, but so far have not
>been able to find her old license to show the VEC so she can upgrade to
>General under the new system. I have heard that there is a webpage either at
>the FCC or ARRL that you can get proof of licensure prior to the cutoff date.
>
>Anyone know where I can find this?
>
>Tnx & 73,
>Keith
>wd9get

Many VEs will accept a photocopy or a scan of a callbook page showing the class of license. Anything prior to Mar 87 qualifies as a Tech Plus with code and full general written.

Unfortunately, my 1983 book shows her as a Novice (under her maiden name?), and my 1988 book is too late for proof. Perhaps someone else has a book in between that can document her status as Tech.

And if that person is interested in selling that book, I would be interested in buying it! :-)

Steve
W3HF

168. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-14 06:04:50 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A614182.66DC0486@IEEE.org>
Source record: 418

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Your use of the word "conceptual" is revealing of your plans to screw
> the ARS with that nonsense.

It is readily apparent that you are unfamiliar with concepts, Dick, but
trust me, some of the rest of us live by them.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

169. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-14 06:10:32 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A6142D8.D85BAD38@IEEE.org>
Source record: 419

Aaron Jones wrote:
> Whatever happened to individual honesty and honor? If a student
> is cheating his way through college it's the professors fault...

It is partially the professor's fault if he knows about it and
allows it to continue.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

170. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-14 06:22:55 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A6145BF.B4D64635@IEEE.org>
Source record: 420

Dick Carroll wrote:
> BS. You learned the letters, you never have learned it to fluency.

Still grasping at straws to try to maintain your shaky self esteem,
I see. I have been fluent in CW since you were ten years old.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

171. Re: Buy a ham ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-14 06:27:42 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A6146DE.38061116@IEEE.org>
Source record: 422

Dick Carroll wrote:
> PACTOR has nothing whatever to do with Morse that is practdiced at the
> level of fluency.

Sure it does, Dick. *Every* short form or Q-signal used for CW
can be used with PACTOR or any other digital mode. The only
difference with Morse code is that the modem function is
performed by human wetware.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

172. Re: Buy a ham ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-14 06:30:48 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <5sh26t4ctvrl3kiuqiqbidocp2ajqlqvsp@4ax.com>
Source record: 421

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
>Define "great job."

It could copy 90% of what I could copy... :-)

>and how did that old computer get input?

Through a joystick port. The Keying output to the transmitter was from
a relay that I wired across the tape deck motor line.

>No, AJ. I need some credulity. Yours isn't credible.

What more do you want to know?

>Maybe I do need to upgrade...to some who have actually
>worked such a problem rather than using someone
>else's program. What do you say, Anon Jones?

I say I don't understand your last paragraph...

173. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-14 07:01:00 UTC
From: W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com>
Message-ID: <93ritmesh1@iac5.navix.net>
Source record: 423

I occasionally wonder why you can only deal in extremes. You connect those that like CW, or at least me with the Nazi's? "One mode, one service, one Reich..." That nonsense may work with your liberal friends that are oh so afraid of being politically correct. It is however wasted on me, as are the redneck comments, and the one nail left.

It is you Len that feels you have the total insight on how the world should work, perhaps I will feel the same way in the next few years as senility engulfs me as well.

Again I enjoyed your post if not your point of view.

73 Fred W4JLE

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20010114005239.03673.00000673@nso-ck.aol.com...
> In article <93q7v3abv1@iac5.navix.net>, "W4JLE" <Fred@w4jle.com> writes:
>
> >Nice post Len, misguided as it may be. I did enjoy your views.
>
> I doubt that sincerity based on the expressions of outright
> sanctimonious self-righteousness presented before the
> as-an-expert-CWer-you-are-superior-to-all nonsense.
>
> If you Really believe in what you say then you should
> petition to FCC to change US amateur radio to only one
> mode: OOK CW. Make every amateur license state
> "Amateur Radiotelegraph Operator" and be done with it.
> Allow NO freedom. One mode, one service, one Reich...
>
> Fred, you are living in the past and with such a strict
> code of morality that it's a wonder you survived this
> long with Godless Sinners all around you. [I'm not
> talking about CW, just the intolerant bigotted red-
> neckism that ran rampant throughout your epistle]
>
> Now cross your legs...we have only one nail left.
>
> didit

174. Re: Proof of License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-14 07:08:21 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <e0k26t0muh4q63d4kfrgbvpbchctqalve3@4ax.com>
Source record: 424

melachri@voicenet.com (Stephen J. Melachrinos) wrote:
>Many VEs will accept a photocopy or a scan of a callbook page showing
>the class of license. Anything prior to Mar 87 qualifies as a Tech
>Plus with code and full general written.
>
>Unfortunately, my 1983 book shows her as a Novice (under her maiden
>name?), and my 1988 book is too late for proof. Perhaps someone else
>has a book in between that can document her status as Tech.

I missed the XYL's name and call if it was given in an earlier post,
but there is a Melinda KA9MHO listed at the same address and likely is
who you are referring to. If so she was first licensed on Dec 25, 1981
and is listed as a Technician in my 1984 callbook...

>And if that person is interested in selling that book, I would be
>interested in buying it! :-)

Sorry... :-)

175. Re: Buy a ham ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-14 07:11:15 UTC
From: W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com>
Message-ID: <93rjgu$f8i$1@iac5.navix.net>
Source record: 425

You gave me an idea Cecil, I have taken a voice recognition program that I had done a long time ago. It is the type of program where each word is displayed and then the human inputs their voice response. Once the word is recognized you can speak faster or slower and it still recognizes the word and prints it to the screen. In any event instead of a voice response, I keyed an oscillator and sent the word in Morse. Once I had set up a few words I then sent faster and slower, used various spacing, and changed the notes pitch. Amazingly it works better than a Morse decoder program I downloaded for a comparison. Using Morse as a language rather than a digital mode seems to work well.

Thank you sending me off in a neat direction!

73 Fred W4JLE

"Cecil" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3A6146DE.38061116@IEEE.org...
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > PACTOR has nothing whatever to do with Morse that is practdiced at the
> > level of fluency.
>
> Sure it does, Dick. *Every* short form or Q-signal used for CW
> can be used with PACTOR or any other digital mode. The only
> difference with Morse code is that the modem function is
> performed by human wetware.
> --
> http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

176. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-14 07:51:58 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <93rlqunga0@208.207.71.177>
Source record: 426

Cecil wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > BS. You learned the letters, you never have learned it to fluency.
>
> Still grasping at straws to try to maintain your shaky self esteem,
> I see. I have been fluent in CW since you were ten years old.

If you had ever been fluent in Morse you could have passed the 20wpm
test.

177. Re: Buy a ham ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-14 13:12:33 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <93s8jvadm1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 428

In article <93r5kq$9ql$3@208.207.71.147>,
Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>
>
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Go swing by 3950 and give your good buddies a hi-5.
>
> Why are you so reluctant to tell us what is on 3950? You seem to be
the
> only one here that knows.
>

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

178. Re: Buy a ham ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-14 13:14:33 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <93s8nn$al5$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 427

In article <93r5kq$9ql$3@208.207.71.147>,
Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>
>
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Go swing by 3950 and give your good buddies a hi-5.
>
> Why are you so reluctant to tell us what is on 3950? You seem to be
the
> only one here that knows.

Because I don't actually know whats there. You see, I am deaf, and I
must stick to keyboard modes. Just follow the link from the JLE bio on
QRZ.com and read all about it.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

179. Re: Buy a ham ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-14 13:21:37 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <93s94vapl1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 429

In article <93qvm7llk0@208.207.71.147>,
Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

I'd wager that fellow had some sort of
> extreme physical impairment. That may well have been the *only* means
he
> had of communicating at all. It happens. I've read of quadruplegics
who
> use a "puffer" switch to key their rigs by blowing air through a
straw.
> But BrianBurkeTurkey would have Riley cite those guys for "poor
amateur
> practice". Shows where he's coming from. As far as I'm cncerned he can
> go back.

Dick, you are the admitted CBer.

I said that people who have the skill to send correctly should do so.
What you said above makes you a liar, but then, we know where you're
coming from.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

180. Re: Buy a ham ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-14 13:28:25 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <93s9hm$b3v$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 430

In article <93r563$9ql$0@208.207.71.147>,
Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

> So what's on 3950??? and WHY do you know so much about it???

Look up JLE on QRZ.com Follow the links. Your bio is probably in
there somewhere.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

181. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-14 13:38:58 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A61ABF2.12A7D624@IEEE.org>
Source record: 431

Followup to rec.radio.amateur.policy

N2EY wrote:
> Your answer does not consitute any kind of proof, just an
> assumption on your part.

It's getting light outside. I have no proof but I assume that
that light is coming from the sun. If it quacks like a Duck ...

> And a built in electronic keyer is not a "key".

A built in electronic keyer is Morse code equipment used by
code-tested hams.

> I have always criticized jammers and other violators, no matter
> what tests they passed.

Proof, please. I just backtracked all your threaded postings.
I couldn't find where you even once condemned code-tested jammers.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

182. Re: The Election & the Commission on Civil Rights

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-14 13:49:17 UTC
From: thegeek@wwa.com
Message-ID: <thegeek-1401010759380001@192.168.1.1>
Source record: 432
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

In article <3A612EF5.BD54BEB1@sccoast.net>, stewartx@sccoast.net wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > I was talking yesterday to a fella who has
> > spent some time in Africa, and he was telling
> > me about conditions there. He said "If I was
> > a black person I'd thank my lucky stars that
> > my ancestors were slow enough to get caught
> > and sent over here". Instead they got Big
> > Jesse and his stuff.
>
>
> I saw an article, with similar sentiments, a couple of years ago,
> written by the black editor of the military's Stars & Stripes newspaper
> following his return from an extended tour in Africa. In the article,
> he said that his trip to Africa changed his entire views about race
> relations in the United States (he then went on to criticize those
> blacks in American who fail to appreciate the opportunities they have).
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net

You guys seem to be having problems stirring up emotions in the ng's lately! I expect soon you'll be responding to your own posts.

Oh yeah, don't believe everything RUSH and Ollie tell you, they seem to have trouble speaking if it's not reciting the republican line (not like the left is any better). The republican party has more mantras than Jesse and Jonny Cochran combined!

Anyway, now we see the true colors of the parties. Eight years ago the Democrats (what a joke) were crying the Republicans were sabotaging the presidency before it even started. The Republicans spent 8 years and MILLIONS of our tax dollars trying to nail Willy saying all along it was to protect the morals of our country (didn't work). Now the tide has turned and it's starting all over again, only the names have changed.

Have fun!
Jay

183. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-14 13:50:08 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A61AE90.84B55815@IEEE.org>
Source record: 433

Dick Carroll wrote:
> If you had ever been fluent in Morse you could have passed the 20wpm
> test.

I could have easily passed the 20wpm test in 1952. But there was no need. I had *ALL* amateur operating privileges at the time. Unlike you, the purpose of my amateur radio license is for the privileges granted, not for the purpose of beating my chest like a gorilla who learns to count to five.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

184. Re: Buy a ham ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-14 14:00:38 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A61B106.84EE5C0E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 434

W4JLE wrote:
>
> You gave me an idea Cecil, I have taken a voice recognition program that I
> had done a long time ago. It is the type of program where each word is
> displayed and then the human inputs their voice response. Once the word is
> recognized you can speak faster or slower and it still recognizes the word
> and prints it to the screen. In any event instead of a voice response, I
> keyed an oscillator and sent the word in Morse. Once I had set up a few
> words I then sent faster and slower, used various spacing, and changed the
> notes pitch. Amazingly it works better than a Morse decoder program I
> downloaded for a comparison. Using Morse as a language rather than a digital
> mode seems to work well.

Fred, Fred, Fred, you could do the same thing with bird calls. There
is much more to human language than your above experiment. Human language
involves the conceptual contextual *understanding* of meanings of language
constructs which is completely missing from your above experiment. As yet,
computers are incapable of *implementing* human language, just as are dogs.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

185. Re: The Election & the Commission on Civil Rights

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-14 14:14:16 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccoll@radiks.net>
Message-ID: <ivi86.890$Bv.1339266@nntp3.onemain.com>
Source record: 435

"Jay Woods" <thegeek@wwa.com> wrote in message
news:thegeek-1401010759380001@192.168.1.1...
> Oh yeah, don't believe everything RUSH and Ollie tell you, they seem to
> have trouble speaking if it's not reciting the republican line (not like
> the left is any better). The republican party has more mantras than
Jesse
> and Jonny Cochran combined!

Ain't that the godawful truth! The GOPpers have a naming department that rivals the Pentagon. The estate tax becomes the Death Tax. The completely ridiculous approach that considers a couple something other than two equal singles (and does not apply in Community Property states) becomes the Marriage Penalty. We end farm subsidies (and re-instate them every year since) and call it the Freedom to Farm bill. You can't introduce legislation without giving it a catchy and probably erroneous title. Anyone else selling committe chairs to the highest fund raisers might be called corrupt in other circles.

Fun and games in the old ballyard.

>
> Have fun!
> Jay

Dick N�BK aging boy wonder

186. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-14 14:29:33 UTC
From: "Steven J Robeson", K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <93sd4adgm1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 436

In article <20010114005239.03673.00000673@nso-ck.aol.com>,
lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:

> Make every amateur license state
> "Amateur Radiotelegraph Operator" and be done with it.
> Allow NO freedom. One mode, one service, one Reich...

Considering your OWN "one license/all priviledges" posture, I am
sure this would fit your agenda nicely, Morse Code or not.....

> Now cross your legs...we have only one nail left.

This was really, REALLY sick. The lowest of the low.

--
"If you're not living life on the edge, you're taking up too much
space..."

http://hometown.aol.com/k4yz/myhomepage/index.html
http://www.qrz.com/k4yz/

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

187. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-14 14:54:44 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010114095444.01150.00001442@ng-cc1.aol.com>
Source record: 437

>From: Cecil Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>> Your answer does not consitute any kind of proof, just an
>> assumption on your part.

>It's getting light outside. I have no proof but I assume that
>that light is coming from the sun.

Do you believe that all assmuptions are equally valid?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

188. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-14 14:58:22 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010114095822.01150.00001446@ng-cc1.aol.com>
Source record: 438

>From: Aaron Jones nomail@nomail.com

>>Nobody has the time to scratch-build and chasing parts
>>is expensive and time consuming,

>Translation:
>Hams can't really homebrew state of the art gear anymore...

The "translation" is more apt to be that Brian is too busy to build things and that he feels that finding parts is not cost effective.

Did you really think he was telling us that he thought that hams have lost hte ability to homebrew equipment?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

189. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-14 15:54:26 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <93si3i$66q$0@208.207.71.175>
Source record: 439
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Richard Harrison wrote:

> Mandatory testing for an optional mode is illogical.
>

So which modes in hama radio are NOT optional?

> Mandatory Morse tests repel far more amateur radio license applicants
> than they attract. A large group of licensees is more likely to get what
> it wants from the government than a small group.

Read it a little closer, Rich. Jim is advocating Morse code testing for any ham who wishes to use CW on the CW segments of ham radio bands. The rest of it is already moot - unless you actually do advocate doing away with CW completely.

>
> The dirty little secret is that pro-code amateurs fight for a code test
> to ensure amateurs are mostly pro-coders.
>

No, that's the dirty little lie promulgated by no-coders. What coded hams who understand the role of CW in ham radio want is for enough hams to be able to use the mode that it is available as needed, and isn't lost to us completely, as many code haters advocate. If you aren't one you could easily be misidentified by your writings.

You need to underestand (evidently you do not) that ham radio is quite different from any other radio service. Our mission is almost infinitely multifaceted, as compared to the narrowly focused objectives of commercial and governmental entities. Just because they have abandoned radiotelegraphy in favor of more cost efficient means, and do not hold any radiotelegraphy assets in reserve doesn't mean that such a plan is appropriate for the amateur radio service, where a large portion of participants use it extensively, and some use no other mode, nor wish to. To ignore their interests just because other later modes are in existance is about as logical as ignoring your left hand just because you are right handed and really don't need that unused left. Hey, just cut it off, the right hand is all I need.

> Some commercial users have valid claims to places in the radio spectrum.
> They have paid the people to use those places. The places occupied by
> amateurs are still owned by the people, in the sense that public lands
> are owned by the people.

So try claiming your personal portion of Yellowstone or Yosemite and see where it gets you.

> People-owned properties should be as accessible as possible to the
> people who own them so that there is the most benefit to the most
> owners. Code testing works against this.

So does all regulation and licensure. So it shall always be, and as people numbers increase so will regulation and restriction of use of limited available assets. Check news reports of newly enacted restrictions on use of National Parks, such as, again, Yosemite and Yellowstone. The several times I've visited Yosemite anyone could drive a private vehicle throughout the entire park. Nowdays you park your car just inside the gate and take a shuttle.

Dick

190. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-14 16:01:58 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A61CD76.13BC80D8@IEEE.org>
Source record: 441
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Dick Carroll wrote:
> To attempt to work code without any training and practical
> experience is akin to attempting to fly an airplane without any prior
> flight training.

Please explain how working CW is a life and death proposition akin
to flying an airplane.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

191. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-14 16:05:25 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <93sio5$7vi$0@208.207.71.175>
Source record: 440
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Lamar your point is well taken, but out of date. Mandatory code testing is as good as gone, and most likely will be gone once the international treaty is changed, probably no sooner than 2003 at the earliest.

What is being debated now is mandatory code testing for users of the mode. If you don't plan to ever use it, and don't change your mind, then you've nothing to fear from it. If you want to work radiotelegraphy, you would be required to learn it and pass a test before being allowed to do so. To attempt to work code without any training and practical experience is akin to attempting to fly an airplane without any prior flight training. It will not work, it can't be done. To attempt to transmit Morse code on ham radio while totally untrained is a violation of FCC rules requiring the exercise of good amateur practice.

Dick

Lamar Owen wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > Yes, that is an eminently noteworthy feature of this 'discussion'. The
> > > Code Opposers, to a man, insist on honoring only their own choice of
> > > definitions of the word 'Language', while every dictionary I have
> > > consulted has numerous differing definitions, a number of which clearly
> > > qualify Morse code as in fact being a language.
> > > That pretty well sums it up.
>
> Just what does Morse being a language have to do with the Code Tests?
> Not the USE of code, but the TESTING of code proficiency?
>
> I am opposed to the code tests. But I am not opposed to the continued
> use of CW by those who enjoy it on bandwidth set aside for that
> purpose. So, if opposing the tests fits your definition of 'Code
> Opposer', then I am prima facie proof of your incorrect assertion that
> the Code Opposers, to a man, use narrow definitions of 'language' -- as
> I do not disagree with Morse being a 'language' in many of the ways
> American Sign is a 'language'. To be technical and nitpicking.
>
> Eliminating the test does not equal eliminating the mode.
> --
> Lamar Owen
> WGCR Internet Radio
> 1 Peter 4:11

192. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-14 16:36:22 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <2uj36tshnhts9he797v9q8n4nb78at7eas@4ax.com>
Source record: 442

w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:

>>From: Aaron Jones nomail@nomail.com

>>>Nobody has the time to scratch-build and chasing parts
>>>is expensive and time consuming,

>>Translation:
>>Hams can't really homebrew state of the art gear anymore...

>The "translation" is more apt to be that Brian is too busy to build things and
>that he feels that finding parts is not cost effective.

Since Brian used the word "nobody" he appeared to be talking about
more hams than just himself. And because Brian has since replied: "I
don't think that's 100% true, but close", he didn't find as much fault
with my translation as you seem to. But I'll bet you're just yanking
my chain again, aren't you Ed... :-)

193. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-14 17:44:48 UTC
From: xjim@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <93soif$m4u$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 443

This is all stuff and nonsense!

I remember when you had a check-box on the 610
in case you were a convicted FELON but during
the Carter administration they struck that down
because the leftists in the government feel the
need to protect the Constitutional rights of
FELONS over the rest of us.

Courts here decided that Convicted FELONS can't
be compelled to register their guns as it would
be a violation of their Fifth Amendment rights!

I think KB1EVA was a plant to make us all look
bad! The FCC under Clinton gave him the callsign!

KB1 Extra Violent Activities!

Jim, ac6tk
PS On my third callsign and they still can't
get it right! (Texas Kilowatt in California?)

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

194. Re: Will you let them take away your guns?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-14 17:59:38 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010114125938.00714.00001781@nso-md.aol.com>
Source record: 445

In article <3A55190B.C60FA4AB@uci.edu>, Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> writes:

>
>You still haven't given me an example of one in which it would be
>appropriate to arm ourselves against our own government. I can't think
>of one, and I certainly can't think of one that we could win.

An example of a citizen militia rising up against tyranny would be a coordinated, mass demonstration by armed citizens on the steps of the Capital, demanding redress of specific grievances. Naturally, the D.C. Police and the military would be called out, but it would be up to them to fire the first shots on citizens who were simply taking advantage of one of their Constitutional rights. When the "lawful authorities" did fire on such citizens, then they would then be responsible for the beginning of Civil War II. At that point, the police and military, composed of the sons, fathers, daughters, and mothers of the revolutionaries, would then be required to fight against potentially tens of millions of armed citizens who wish to live in freedom from government oppression and tyranny. Those would be interesting times, indeed!

73 de Larry, K3LT

195. Re: The Pope now rules the U.S.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-14 17:59:39 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010114125939.00714.00001782@nso-md.aol.com>
Source record: 444

In article <93f7j8$5kh$0@pita.alt.net>, bhamack@my-deja.com (Bill Hammack) writes:

>
>How is it that after seeing the CNN report that a large majority of
>people in congress is Roman Catholic, no one has worried that we have
>150 congress people who place the Pope above their own President.
>
>Is the Pope the de facto ruler of America?

If so, I'm glad His Holiness was there on the job during the Clintoon Administration! When President Elect Bush takes office later this month, His Holiness can take a break from his responsibilities as the de factor ruler of the U.S. I wish to thank him for his service to our country.

73 de Larry, K3LT

196. Re: The Election & the Commission on Civil Rights

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-14 18:16:28 UTC
From: xjim@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <93sqdonip1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 446

> Ain't that the godawful truth!

Actually no. But what can you expect from a
belief system that routinely lies and disregards
legal contracts between the people and
the government in order to exert their
totalitarian authority.

The commission is an illegal proceeding,
only justified by it's propaganda value.

Considering the routine use of lies, hate,
fear, intimidation and propaganda, I think
forcefeeding NAZI propaganda into the
proceedings sums up the gist of this
exercise in retaliation.

I find that the Democrats often telegraph
their thoughts and intentions by first
accusing others of what they are planning.

In the town where I grew up (and defected
from) they have taken up "Touch Screen"
ballots that don't even offer any physical
evidence that you even voted. Recounts
would be impossible, because the only
way the vote could change is if there
was a loss of data.

Where the HELL are we going.

Jim, ac6tk

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

197. Re: The Election & the Commission on Civil Rights

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-14 18:34:44 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccoll@radiks.net>
Message-ID: <Ugm86.947$Bv.1504185@nntp3.onemain.com>
Source record: 447

<xjim@my-deja.com> wrote in message news:93sqdonip1@nnrp1.deja.com...
>
>
> > Ain't that the godawful truth!
>
> Actually no. But what can you expect from a
the

> Jim, ac6tk
>
>
> Sent via Deja.com
> http://www.deja.com/

Jim, just for shits and giggles, try reading the thread before posting

198. Re: Buy a ham ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-14 18:57:36 UTC
From: W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com>
Message-ID: <93ssth$2pl$1@iac5.navix.net>
Source record: 448

Cecil, Cecil, Cecil... You missed the whole point, I don't care one whit about the silly definition. I was relaying to you a technical report based on the serendipitous discovery spawned from the argument of language or code.

The point being that the voice recognition software works better than a standard CW decoder. The fuzzy algorithm needed for speech will satisfy copying poorly sent code better than a digital approach.

Thanks to your sending me in this direction, technicians the world over are now freed from the oppression of those nasty CW types that intentionally malformed characters to frustrate the code challenged. The world is once again safe and we can all sleep well!

"Cecil" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:3A61B106.84EE5C0E@IEEE.org...
> W4JLE wrote:
> >
> > You gave me an idea Cecil, I have taken a voice recognition program that I
> > had done a long time ago. It is the type of program where each word is
> > displayed and then the human inputs their voice response. Once the word is
> > recognized you can speak faster or slower and it still recognizes the word
> > and prints it to the screen. In any event instead of a voice response, I
> > keyed an oscillator and sent the word in Morse. Once I had set up a few
> > words I then sent faster and slower, used various spacing, and changed the
> > notes pitch. Amazingly it works better than a Morse decoder program I
> > downloaded for a comparison. Using Morse as a language rather than a digital
> > mode seems to work well.
>
> Fred, Fred, Fred, you could do the same thing with bird calls. There
> is much more to human language than your above experiment. Human language
> involves the conceptual contextual *understanding* of meanings of language
> constructs which is completely missing from your above experiment. As yet,
> computers are incapable of *implementing* human language, just as are dogs.
> --
> http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

199. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-14 19:03:38 UTC
From: W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com>
Message-ID: <93st8r$36g$1@iac5.navix.net>
Source record: 449

Total nonsense Cecil! Pactor requires the use of a computer or at least a dumb terminal and a decoding device. What ever display is used has a code page appropriate to the country or the language.

Let's go back to your mythical Jap, his terminal displays Kata Kana, now how in the heck are you going to communicate with him if neither reads the others character set.

CW Now and forever for international communications.

"Cecil" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in >
> I've already won the argument, Dick. I can communicate just as well with
> a non-English speaking ham using PACTOR as with Morse code. I can do
> it without any Morse code whatsoever. So are you going to tell me that
> PACTOR is a language?
> --
> http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

200. Re: Buy a ham ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-14 19:34:22 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <93suvvqsc1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 450

In article <93ssth$2pl$1@iac5.navix.net>,
"W4JLE" <Fred@w4jle.com> wrote:
> Cecil, Cecil, Cecil... You missed the whole point, I don't care one
whit
> about the silly definition. I was relaying to you a technical report
based
> on the serendipitous discovery spawned from the argument of language
or
> code.
>
> The point being that the voice recognition software works better than
a
> standard CW decoder. The fuzzy algorithm needed for speech will
satisfy
> copying poorly sent code better than a digital approach.
>
> Thanks to your sending me in this direction, technicians the world
over are
> now freed from the oppression of those nasty CW types that
intentionally
> malformed characters to frustrate the code challenged. The world is
once
> again safe and we can all sleep well!

Fred, you're a true humanitarian. Perhaps you'll win the Hiram Peace Prize for freeing unworthy Tech slime from the jack boot of opression.

Dick will be pissed, as usual.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

201. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-14 19:39:28 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <93sv9g$r74$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 451

In article <93soif$m4u$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
xjim@my-deja.com wrote:
> This is all stuff and nonsense!
>
> I remember when you had a check-box on the 610
> in case you were a convicted FELON but during
> the Carter administration they struck that down
> because the leftists in the government feel the
> need to protect the Constitutional rights of
> FELONS over the rest of us.
>
> Courts here decided that Convicted FELONS can't
> be compelled to register their guns as it would
> be a violation of their Fifth Amendment rights!
>
> I think KB1EVA was a plant to make us all look
> bad! The FCC under Clinton gave him the callsign!
>
> KB1 Extra Violent Activities!
>
> Jim, ac6tk
> PS On my third callsign and they still can't
> get it right! (Texas Kilowatt in California?)

OK, who are you and what are you talking about?

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

202. Re: Will you let them take away your guns?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-14 19:44:49 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <93svjg$rb3$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 452

In article <20010114125938.00714.00001781@nso-md.aol.com>,
yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote:
> In article <3A55190B.C60FA4AB@uci.edu>, Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
writes:
>
> >
> >You still haven't given me an example of one in which it would be
> >appropriate to arm ourselves against our own government. I can't
think
> >of one, and I certainly can't think of one that we could win.
>
> An example of a citizen militia rising up against tyranny would be a
> coordinated, mass demonstration by armed citizens on the steps of
> the Capital, demanding redress of specific grievances. Naturally,
> the D.C. Police and the military would be called out, but it would
> be up to them to fire the first shots on citizens who were simply
> taking advantage of one of their Constitutional rights. When the
> "lawful authorities" did fire on such citizens, then they would then
> be responsible for the beginning of Civil War II. At that point, the
> police and military, composed of the sons, fathers, daughters, and
> mothers of the revolutionaries, would then be required to fight
> against potentially tens of millions of armed citizens who wish to
> live in freedom from government oppression and tyranny. Those
> would be interesting times, indeed!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Then there was the SoCal survey of the Marine Corps asking if they would
fire on American citizens if ordered to do so.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

203. Re: The Pope now rules the U.S.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-14 19:53:35 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <93t03t$ro5$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 453

In article <20010114125939.00714.00001782@nso-md.aol.com>,
yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote:
> In article <93f7j8$5kh$0@pita.alt.net>, bhamack@my-deja.com (Bill
Hammack)
> writes:
>
> >
> >How is it that after seeing the CNN report that a large majority of
> >people in congress is Roman Catholic, no one has worried that we have
> >150 congress people who place the Pope above their own President.
> >
> >Is the Pope the de facto ruler of America?
>
> If so, I'm glad His Holiness was there on the job during the Clintoon
> Administration! When President Elect Bush takes office later this
> month, His Holiness can take a break from his responsibilities as
> the de factor ruler of the U.S. I wish to thank him for his service
to
> our country.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Larry, lets dunk this guy in holy water. I got a buck that says
his candy ass melts away.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

204. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-14 20:21:53 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <93t1os$t3b$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 454

In article <93qtqd$f9m$1@208.207.71.147>,
Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>
>
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > In article <3A5F4A89.D603EB4A@IEEE.org>,
> > Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> > > W1RFI wrote:
> > > > My life expectancy is about 30 years. How about we give it at
least
> > that long
> > > > before we pronounce the mode dead. I will do my part. :-)
> > >
> > > If CW will give me 30 more years, I'll be glad to talk to you. :-)
> >
> > Deal. Lets set up a sked in 2030.
>
> No use. You'll still be bitching and complaining that someone wants
you
> to either learn the code or shut up abojut it.

Suit yourself. I was just trying to give you a few extra years of
bitterness.

We're back to the 2024 sked when I retire, but you better not die on
me.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

205. Re: The Pope now rules the U.S.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-14 20:24:34 UTC
From: "Dr. Conrad Connie" <coontail@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <93t1tt$t4j$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 455
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.conspiracy

```
In article <3A5B2E9E.9A5583FC@oio.net>,
'Doc <w5lz@oio.net> wrote:
>
>
> Bill Hammack wrote:
> >
> > How is it that after seeing the CNN report that a large majority of
> > people in congress is Roman Catholic, no one has worried that we
have
> > 150 congress people who place the Pope above their own President.
> >
> > Is the Pope the de facto ruler of America?
>
> Bill,
> Stick to the conspiracy group, they'll believe anything...
> 'Doc
>

Who cares, Jesus is returning tomorrow night on the 20/20 Show.
Wawa got the interview.
;)

--

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/
```

206. Left wingers getting ready

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-14 20:38:03 UTC
From: W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com>
Message-ID: <93t2q0$619$1@iac5.navix.net>
Source record: 456

Some of the left wing nonsense, this from Ramsey Clark former Attorney General (D)
complete with neutral wording such as "Governor death"... January 20th should be fun. A search of the internet shows all the cock roaches are coming out of the woodwork.

THIRTEEN REASONS TO PROTEST AT BUSH'S INAUGURATION ON JAN. 20

On Jan. 20, thousands of people will march and rally to protest at George W. Bush's inauguration in Washington and San Francisco. We will be demonstrating against the incoming Bush administration and its racist, sexist, anti-gay, militaristic, anti- labor and pro-big business policies. Bush claims to be a "compassionate conservative," but his real "compassion" is reserved for the giant pharmaceutical, oil, banking and other corporations.

We call for a profound social transformation, to a society where people's needs come before profits, where every person has the right to a good-paying job, decent housing, health care, education, childcare and a clean environment. We call for freedom for death-row activist, author and prisoner Mumia Abu-Jamal, Native leader Leonard Peltier and all political prisoners. We cannot rely on the Democratic Party--Clinton led the charge in demolishing social welfare programs, bombing Yugoslavia and keeping the deadly sanctions against Iraq--or on the corrupt corporate elections.

Only a mass people's movement can bring real change, as has always been true. Jan. 20 can be an important step in building this movement, one which links together workers, students, people of all nationalities, women, lesbian, gay, bi and trans people, immigrants, the disabled, seniors and youths.

There are many reasons to join the Jan. 20 counter-inaugural protests. Here are a few:

(1) Bush will become president only due to massive racist disenfranchisement and voting fraud. Not only in Florida, but also across the country, African American votes were disproportionately thrown out. Hundreds of thousands of potential voters, especially in Black, Latino, Native American and poor white communities, have been permanently disenfranchised (forbidden to vote) for having been convicted of a felony. In predominantly African American neighborhoods from Atlanta to Chicago to Miami, outmoded technology and intimidation led to votes being disqualified 20-25 times as often as in adjoining white suburbs. Afraid to be accused of rocking the boat, the pro-system Democratic Party leadership refused to raise the issue of racism during the re-count process.

(2) Gov. Death is moving to Washington. As governor of Texas, Bush presided over more executions--152--than took place in the other 49 states combined during that time. The death penalty is racist and anti-poor. It must be abolished. Bush and his chief law enforcement official, Attorney General- designate John Ashcroft, are rabidly pro-execution.

(3) We must mobilize now to defend women's right to choose. The new Bush administration is anti-women and anti- choice. Women's right to abortion and birth control was won in the streets and it must be defended in the streets. Bush and Ashcroft are both on record as favoring a constitutional amendment banning women's right to choose. Ashcroft is opposed to abortion even in cases of rape, incest or where a woman's life is in danger.

(4) We need funding for universal health care, free education, afford able housing, heat and light, childcare and union jobs, not for the Pentagon. In the richest economy that has ever existed, the basic needs of the entire population could easily be met. Instead of going to meet human needs, how ever, hundreds of billions of dollars annually are spent on destructive and wasteful militarism. The U.S. already has a bigger military budget than the rest of the United Nations Security Council combined. Now Bush wants to vastly increase military spending, including building the so-called "National Missile Defense System." The NMDS is really an offensive rather than defensive system, and is an essential element in a first-strike nuclear war strategy. The Pentagon, which has spent a mind-boggling $4 trillion on nuclear weapons to date, has always refused to renounce the first-strike use of nuclear weapons. Both Bush and his new Secretary of Defense (War) Donald Rumsfeld are ardent supporters of NMDS.

(5) The genocidal sanctions on Iraq must end. In his first speech as Secretary of State-design ate, Colin Powell talked of "re-energizing the sanctions on Iraq." The sanctions-blockade has already taken more than 1.5 million Iraqi lives, half of them children under the age of 5. Powell, Vice President-elect Dick Cheney, James Baker and other George W. advisors launched the Gulf War 10 years ago during the regime of George Bush I. Clinton carried on the sanctions and bombing throughout his eight-year term, and now the new Bush team wants to further step up the war against Iraq.

(6) Stop U.S. intervention in Colombia and all of Latin America. The incoming Bush national security team wants to escalate U.S. intervention in Colombia beyond even Clinton's Plan Colombia. And it's not just Colombia--there is also the threat of wider intervention in Venezuela, Ecuador, Bolivia, Peru, Mexico and Argentina, where people are rising up against the domination of the International Monetary Fund, World Bank and U.S. corporate domination. We must act now to stop a new Vietnam War in Latin America.

(7) The incoming Bush administration is filled with vicious bigots who want to turn back the clock on gains won by lesbian, gay, bi and trans people. Bush is allied with the bigoted religious and non-religious extreme right who want to deny equal rights to lesbian, gay, bi and trans people and force them back into the closet.

(8) The 40-year war against Cuba must end. Bush, like the nine presidents before him, wants to turn Cuba back into a colony of the U.S. as it was before the 1959 revolution. It is time to end the blockade and aggression against a small neighboring country and let Cuba live in peace.

(9) The Bush administration wants to speed up environmental destruction for the sake of corporate profits. Under Gov. Bush, Texas ranked 50th among states in air quality and first in toxic polluters, toxic releases, carcinogens in the air and 13 other polluting categories. Bush put polluting industry representatives in charge of the state's Natural Resources Conservation Council (Texas' version of the EPA). Bush and his nominee for Interior Secretary Gale Norton want to open the Arctic National Wildlife Preserve to oil drilling, just a hint of what is to come unless we mobilize now.

(10) Support an independent home land for the Palestinian people. The U.S. has given Israel hundreds of billions of dollars in aid over the past 50 years, aid used to repress the Palestinians. The U.S. government and Israel are acting as a team against the Palestinians. There will be no peace in the Middle East until there is justice for the Palestinian people.

(11) End U.S. colonialism in Puerto Rico--U.S. Navy out of Vieques! The Bush administration's plan for military expansion includes keeping the island of Vieques as a bombing range. Many Puerto Rican people have been killed or injured, and the environment and economy of Vieques have suffered much destruction. Now is the time to support the Puerto Rican people in their struggle to get the Pentagon out.

(12) Shut down the prison-industrial complex! The U.S. has 5 percent if the world's population and 25 percent of the world's prison population. This amounts to over 2 million people, a majority of them African American, Native and Latino. Prisons are all about brutal repression and super-exploitation against the poor and people of color, not rehabilitation. The economic basis for all of this repression is profits. Wall Street firms and banks invested an estimated $41 billion into the expansion of private prisons last year. Prisoners are forced to work for slave wages for high tech, manufacturing and service companies. Under the Clinton/ Gore administration, more prisons were built than universities. The Bush administration plans to continue this trend. A national movement must be built to shut down these concentration camps. Our youths need union jobs and good schools, not incarceration.

(13) We will march on Jan. 20 to say NO to the anti-worker Bush regime. Bush's Secretary of Labor candidate is an extreme right-winger who is anti-civil rights, anti-women's rights, anti-lesbian and gay, anti-disabled persons, anti- immigrant and ANTI-LABOR! Linda Chavez is the dream Secretary of Labor--for the corporations and bosses. Appointed by Reagan to head the U.S. Civil Rights Commission in 1983, she worked to reverse all the gains of the civil rights movement. Chavez is opposed to there even being a federal minimum wage.

Once

207. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-14 20:44:46 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccoll@radiks.net>
Message-ID: <vbo86.804$V6.420561@nntp1.onemain.com>
Source record: 457

"Brian" <brianburke@my-deja.com> wrote in message
news:93sv9g$r74$1@nnrp1.deja.com...
> > Jim, ac6tk
> > PS On my third callsign and they still can't
> > get it right! (Texas Kilowatt in California?)
>
> OK, who are you and what are you talking about?

Glorioski Brian. The first pithogram from your flying fingers in months.
It actually has meaning. :-))

208. Re: Left wingers getting ready

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-14 22:14:18 UTC
From: Steve <mcsp@usa.net>
Message-ID: <3A6224B9.173A65C5@usa.net>
Source record: 458

Looks like the "crying" liberals have turned into "tantrum throwing" liberals.
With all their childish behavior it was the only logical next step. Maybe it is
time for the parent to give them a slap across the mouth? (hehehe)

~Steve~

W4JLE wrote:

> Some of the left wing nonsense, this from Ramsey Clark former Attorney
> General (D)
> complete with neutral wording such as "Governor death"... January 20th
> should be fun. A search of the internet shows all the cock roaches are
> coming out of the woodwork.
>
> THIRTEEN REASONS TO PROTEST AT BUSH'S INAUGURATION ON JAN. 20

<ignorant B.S. snip>

209. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-14 22:39:06 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010114173906.05250.00001609@ng-ff1.aol.com>
Source record: 459

>From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

>Richard Harrison wrote:

>> Mandatory testing for an optional mode is illogical.

> So which modes in hama radio are NOT optional?

I believe that to be his point; the testing for Morse code should be on a par for the testing for other modes. The only mode that is not optional on HF is Morse code.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

210. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-14 22:42:00 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010114174200.05250.00001610@ng-ff1.aol.com>
Source record: 460

>From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

>Read it a little closer, Rich. Jim is advocating Morse code testing for
>any ham who wishes to use CW on the CW segments of ham radio bands. The
>rest of it is already moot - unless you actually do advocate doing away
>with CW completely.

Why would testing of the encoding method used in Morse code be necessary before granting CW access in the CW portion of the band. Are you afraid hordes of people will learn Morse code wrong and try to get on the air? Those that learn the code will use the mode, just as badly as I did at first and will improve with time if they stick to it.

Would you advocate that the VEs determine that a ham has working RTTY equipment before he or she is permitted to use RTTY on the digital portions of the bands?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

211. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-14 22:48:03 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010114174803.05250.00001612@ng-ff1.aol.com>
Source record: 461

>From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

>What coded
>hams who understand the role of CW in ham radio want is for enough hams
>to be able to use the mode that it is available as needed, and isn't
>lost to us completely, as many code haters advocate. If you aren't one
>you could easily be misidentified by your writings.

I am not a code hater, Dick, so let me add my two-cents worth. IMHO, everything that is good about Morse code on April 14, 2000 was equally good on April 16, 2000. The value will continue to be there if the code tests are removed entirely. I agree that fewer hams will try it, but I also don't believe that its use will end any time soon, if ever, in the Amateur bands.

I believe that the harshness and anger I have seen expressed here by some of the pro-code-test folks is turning people away from the mode. Why do you believe that some of those who say that they want to retain Morse code testing to help preserve the mode are engaging in conduct that is helping to drive people away from it?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

212. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-14 22:54:49 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010114175449.05250.00001614@ng-ff1.aol.com>
Source record: 463

>From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

>You need to underestand (evidently you do not) that ham radio is quite
>different from any other radio service.

It was not significantly different from other radio services when it was created, Dick.

Do you believe that if ham radio had been created deliberately to function entirely differently than the radio services of its day, that it would have attained the level of respect and value that helped preserve it through decades?

>Our mission is almost infinitely multifaceted, as compared to
>the narrowly focused objectives of commercial and governmental entities.

I agree; our diversity is our strength. Having a test that emphasizes one mode over all others is not "infinitely multifaceted" and cannot be expected to foster that diversity in the Amateur Radio Service.

>Just because they have abandoned
>radiotelegraphy in favor of more cost efficient means, and do not hold
>any radiotelegraphy assets in reserve doesn't mean that such a plan is
>appropriate for the amateur radio service, where a large portion of
>participants use it extensively,

Do you think the same thing was said about the use of spark in the Amateur Radio Service? Do you think the Amateur Radio Service would have survived had it not evolved past that?

> and some use no other mode, nor wish
to.

> To ignore their interests just because other later modes are in
>existance is about as logical as ignoring your left hand just because
>you are right handed and really don't need that unused left. Hey, just
>cut it off, the right hand is all I need.

Some use no other mode that RTTY. Do you believe they should be allowed to require that hams demonstrate that they possess the ability to decode RTTY before they are given a license to use CW?

>> Some commercial users have valid claims to places in the radio spectrum.
>> They have paid the people to use those places. The places occupied by
>> amateurs are still owned by the people, in the sense that public lands
>> are owned by the people.

> So try claiming your personal portion of Yellowstone or Yosemite and
>see where it gets you.

Try claiming 7040 kHz and see where it gets you.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

213. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-14 22:55:25 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A622E5D.5340AC9C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 466

Dick Carroll wrote:
> But downgrading he code to the very minimum required by treaty has had
> not had the effect of adding hams to the ranks, in the 10 months the new
> regs have been in effect.

That just means that the code requirement should have been dropped,
not just reduced. What happened to all those hoards of CBers and
freebanders that you predicted would invade the ARS?
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

214. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-14 22:56:51 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010114175651.05250.00001615@ng-ff1.aol.com>
Source record: 464

>From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

>I learned Morse code at speeds greater than 5 WPM because
>it was the current requirement to obtain an Extra-class license!
>If the requirement hadn't existed, neither would my achievement --
>and I would not have benefited from the enjoyment of reasonable
>proficiency in this practical communications skill. It's as simple
>as that.

Did you learn Morse code faster than 20 wpm?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

215. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-14 22:57:31 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010114175731.05250.00001616@ng-ff1.aol.com>
Source record: 462

>From: Cecil Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>I learned Morse code before I ever heard of amateur radio simply
>because it was fun.

I learned it as a Boy Scout. Never did seek the merit badge.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

216. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-14 23:00:36 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010114180036.05250.00001617@ng-ff1.aol.com>
Source record: 465

>From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

> Human nature being what it is, most people will take the path of least
>resistance in order to achieve the greatest amount of instant gratification.

The path of least resistance is one of the unlicensed services, Larry.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

217. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-14 23:01:01 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A622FAD.AD4D4E9@IEEE.org>
Source record: 467

Dick Carroll wrote:
> It seems evident that
> one who cannot visualize a ham copying CW without the necessity of
> converting the sounds to letters then converting the letters to words
> and to then sentences would not be agreeable to considering Morse code
> as a language.

Everyone can visualize that, Dick. It still doesn't make Morse code
a language. Those words you are copying in Morse code are *English*
words.

> Your posting was not ignored, it was read carefully by me. But you're
> right- I don't consider it to be too much of a big deal that to a CW man
> it reslly is a language.

Actually, it is not a language - for you it is obviously a religion.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

218. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-14 23:07:28 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A623130.959AD41@IEEE.org>
Source record: 469

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: Cecil Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
> >I learned Morse code before I ever heard of amateur radio simply
> >because it was fun.
>
> I learned it as a Boy Scout. Never did seek the merit badge.

I found out about it in Cub Scouts. My cousin and I learned it
together but not for a merit badge. We used it for secret messages
in the middle of the night. We were about ten years old.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

219. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-14 23:08:53 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A623185.BA15DB43@IEEE.org>
Source record: 468

W1RFI wrote:
>
> >From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
>
> >I learned Morse code at speeds greater than 5 WPM because
> >it was the current requirement to obtain an Extra-class license!
> >If the requirement hadn't existed, neither would my achievement --
> >and I would not have benefited from the enjoyment of reasonable
> >proficiency in this practical communications skill. It's as simple
> >as that.
>
> Did you learn Morse code faster than 20 wpm?

Nope he stopped at exactly 20.0000001 wpm. :-)
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

220. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-14 23:13:13 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A623289.7398A209@IEEE.org>
Source record: 471

W1RFI wrote:
>
> >From: Cecil Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>
> >> Your answer does not consitute any kind of proof, just an
> >> assumption on your part.
>
> >It's getting light outside. I have no proof but I assume that
> >that light is coming from the sun.
>
> Do you believe that all assmuptions are equally valid?

I'm not sure what an assmuption is. A donkey with mumps? :-)

If it quacks like a duck ... Ed, do you agree with Jim that dits
or dahs sent for the purpose of jamming are not sent with Morse
code equipment?
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

221. Re: Home-Plug HF device interference concerns

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-14 23:20:31 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010114182031.05250.00001630@ng-ff1.aol.com>
Source record: 470

From: billsohl@mindspring.com (Bill Sohl)

>>... last month I met with representatives from HomePlug, an industry
>> consortium that is developing the spec for home-networking devices that
>> will put HF signals onto residential electrical wiring. ARRL has
>> helped persuade them that their spec needs to include notches in
>> the HF bands and they brought some test equipment that let us test
>> the levels they are notching to at W1INF, W1AW and KB1BE.

>>The results were mixed, and this month, I will be doing some
>>additional testing using a noise generator/amplifier I built in the Lab.

>> The results will be used by the manufacturers to set the standard
>> at a level expected not to cause widespread interference to
>> ham radio.

>You said: "The results will be used by the manufacturers to set the
>standard at a level expected not to cause widespread interference to
>ham radio."

>Does that imply that they aren't concerned about seletive
>or locally limited interference to ham radio?

>Just what does
>"widespread" mean in their efforts to limit interference to
>my operations and those of other hams?

Let me preface my answer with a bit of background. First, these devices are quite legal under Part 15 rules. They will need to meet the limits for intentional radiators on HF. It would be perfectly legal for a manufactuer to make an intentional emitter that creates a field of 50 uV/m at 30 meters distance from the radiating source. On 3.5 MHz, this translates to a an S9+10 dB level signal. There is a further provision in Part 15 that requires that such a device not cause harmful interference.

The levels that they are notching are 30 to 50 dB less than what is permitted under Part 15 rules. They don't have to do this, except that they are trying to avoid the interference reports that will inevitably result if they don't. The industry has learned from the lessons of the wireless modem jacks that are being removed from service by AT&T.

The levels for the notches being considered would result in approximately 0.01 microwatts being radiated from an inefficient radiator (the power wiring inside a home) in the typical bandwidth being used by hams. Compare that to the permitted spurious emissions level permitted to hams of 50 milliwatts from an HF transmitter. We are allowed about 67 dB more radiation from our harmonics in our neighbor's TV channel than they are proposing to use in the ham bands.

The general goal at this stage is to ensure that one of these devices installed in a neighboring home will not cause harmful interference. I don't know where the FCC would draw the line on what constitutes "harmful interference," btw. I don't know if the product can be made that good, but ARRL is going to work as closely with an industry that wants to do the right thing as can be done. From there, it may become a regulatory matter.

Sooner or later, with this type of product, the line will be crossed where harmful interference will happen. I suspect that apartments and indoor ham antennas may be a problem. Of course, that already is a problem with many other types of devices. Interestingly, at KB1BE, one of the fluourescent lights in his basement radiated about 10 dB more noise than did the test signals we were coupling into his residential wiring. Part of his antenna was located 15 feet from the house, FWIW.

I don't know how all this is going to turn out, Bill. I do know that there is a limit to what ARRL can ask them to do voluntarily, and that the regulations would permit them to do NOTHING voluntarily.

>What about local interference by one of these devices to
>my operation if a neighbor installs one?

I also raised the question of susceptibility. Although not a rules problem, susceptibility issues DO cause grief for hams with neighbors who don't understand the rules. At this stage, I have a general agreement that they will get some beta units to me for testing purposes.

More to follow, in a more public venue, as soon as more is known.

As an aside, a similar product, home phone networking, has notches in the ham bands. When I met with a rep from the Home Phone Networking Alliance, we tested both immunity and radiation. At W1AW, the one we tested was virtually immune, although with closer antennas, there could have been problems. This rep, btw, is Steve Strauss, NY3B, who is now a member of the ARRL RFI Task Group. Ron McConnell, W2IOL, a rep from one of the VDSL committees, is another.

It is absolutely wonderful to see that, if approached and made aware of ham radio, the industries are willing to take steps to address harmful interference, at least in these cases.

We can all be glad that Larry is permitting this work to continue instead of selling the building and taking out a few prime-time TV ads. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

222. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-14 23:26:53 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A6235BD.F9C93384@IEEE.org>
Source record: 473

W4JLE wrote:
>
> Total nonsense Cecil! Pactor requires the use of a computer or at least a
> dumb terminal and a decoding device. What ever display is used has a code
> page appropriate to the country or the language.
>
> Let's go back to your mythical Jap, his terminal displays Kata Kana, ...

Nope, Japanese terminals either display English characters or allow
the kind of characters to be selectable. You see, the Japanese, long
ago recognized the superiority of a 26 character alphabet and adopted
Romanji for their computer systems. Thus I can send, using PACTOR,
"RST is 579" and my Japanese friends can understand it perfectly
with no Morse code involved. Thus, if Morse code is a language,
then PACTOR is also a language.

I was applications manager for OKI Semiconductor for a number of
years. The parent company was Oki Denki and many of their employees
were hams. All of their personal computers used Roman (English)
characters. Almost all of those hams operated their personal computers
in English, just like I did.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

223. Despicable 14.313 behavior resumes

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-14 23:33:42 UTC
From: Joe Black <jbla88@houston.net>
Message-ID: <3A623756.33C94D8B@houston.net>
Source record: 472
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Fortunately, Riley Hollingsworth got an earful. Time for more official notices?

224. Re: The Election & the Commission on Civil Rights

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 00:43:42 UTC
From: JR <jr@some.net>
Message-ID: <3A6238E3.88AD1236@some.net>
Source record: 474
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Dwight Stewart wrote:

>
>
> Good point. Shortly after the election, there were complaints about
> police at some of the voting booths (it made some minority voters
> nervious).

Probably because they were afraid they might be recognized.

225. Re: Despicable 14.313 behavior resumes

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 01:05:13 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <93tic6$a9q$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 476
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <3A623756.33C94D8B@houston.net>,
Joe Black <jbla88@houston.net> wrote:
> Fortunately, Riley Hollingsworth got an earful. Time for more
> official notices?

Was it more "Battle of the Pre-99 Extras?"

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

226. Re: Despicable 14.313 behavior resumes

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 01:07:58 UTC
From: KC8JBO <roger_kc8jbo@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <93tihbaia1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 475
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <93tic6$a9q$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com> wrote:
> In article <3A623756.33C94D8B@houston.net>,
> Joe Black <jbla88@houston.net> wrote:
> > Fortunately, Riley Hollingsworth got an earful. Time for more
> > official notices?
>
> Was it more "Battle of the Pre-99 Extras?"
>
> Sent via Deja.com
> http://www.deja.com/
>

It was probably Jamming Joe Black playing digital recordings and white
noise.

--
73 de Roger, KC8JBO
EM99 |ARRL|VE [ARRL & W5YI]|ARES |RACES
Yaesu FT-920 |Inverted Vee @ 40 ft.
Yaesu FT-90R

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

227. Re: Left wingers getting ready

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 01:11:17 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <93tini$al4$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 477

In article <93t2q0$619$1@iac5.navix.net>,
"W4JLE" <Fred@w4jle.com> wrote:
> Some of the left wing nonsense, this from Ramsey Clark former Attorney
> General (D)
> complete with neutral wording such as "Governor death"... January 20th
> should be fun. A search of the internet shows all the cock roaches are
> coming out of the woodwork.

I say we put them all in camps in California. They can sue us for
reparations in 50 years, but I've only got about 30 years left.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

228. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 01:19:48 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <93tj7g$b18$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 478

In article <vbo86.804$V6.420561@nntp1.onemain.com>,
"Richard McCollum" <rmccoll@radiks.net> wrote:
>
> "Brian" <brianburke@my-deja.com> wrote in message
> news:93sv9g$r74$1@nnrp1.deja.com...
> > > Jim, ac6tk
> > > PS On my third callsign and they still can't
> > > get it right! (Texas Kilowatt in California?)
> >
> > OK, who are you and what are you talking about?
>
> Glorioski Brian. The first pithogram from your flying fingers in
months.
> It actually has meaning. :-))

Exactly!!! It's as if he were sending with a banana boat swing and I
couldn't copy.

Decipher, please!

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

229. Re: The Pope now rules the U.S.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 01:25:42 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <93tjii$b6b$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 482
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.conspiracy

In article <93t1tt$t4j$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
Dr. Conrad Connie <coontail@my-deja.com> wrote:
> In article <3A5B2E9E.9A5583FC@oio.net>,
> 'Doc <w5lz@oio.net> wrote:
> >
> >
> > Bill Hammack wrote:
> > >
> > > How is it that after seeing the CNN report that a large majority
of
> > > people in congress is Roman Catholic, no one has worried that we
> have
> > > 150 congress people who place the Pope above their own President.
> > >
> > > Is the Pope the de facto ruler of America?
> >
> > Bill,
> > Stick to the conspiracy group, they'll believe anything...
> > 'Doc
> >
>
> Who cares, Jesus is returning tomorrow night on the 20/20 Show.
> Wawa got the interview.
> ;)

I wonder what she had to do to get it?

I heard she smoked a Cuban cigar to get the Fidel interview.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

230. Re: The Pope now rules the U.S.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 01:33:11 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <93tk0nbhv1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 483
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.conspiracy

In article <93fsh5$3ul$1@iac5.navix.net>,
"W4JLE" <Fred@w4jle.com> wrote:
> And after the Catholics, will they go after the Jews...

, the homo-secks-you-alls, wicans, and vegans.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

231. Re: Left wingers getting ready

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 01:34:28 UTC
From: Keith Wood <kw@bctv.com>
Message-ID: <3A6253A4.5543B742@bctv.com>
Source record: 480

Brian wrote:
>
> In article <93t2q0$619$1@iac5.navix.net>,
> "W4JLE" <Fred@w4jle.com> wrote:
> > Some of the left wing nonsense, this from Ramsey Clark former Attorney
> > General (D)
> > complete with neutral wording such as "Governor death"... January 20th
> > should be fun. A search of the internet shows all the cock roaches are
> > coming out of the woodwork.
>
> I say we put them all in camps in California.

GREAT idea! That way we can dedicate the CW portions of the bands JUST
for K6 calls!

232. Re: Despicable 14.313 behavior resumes

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 01:35:43 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010114203543.19385.00001994@ng-fy1.aol.com>
Source record: 479

>From: Brian brianburke@my-deja.com

>Was it more "Battle of the Pre-99 Extras?"

I don't know. What percentage of the pre-99 Extras participated?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

233. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 01:38:10 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010114203810.19385.00001995@ng-fy1.aol.com>
Source record: 481

>From: Cecil Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>If it quacks like a duck ... Ed, do you agree with Jim that dits
>or dahs sent for the purpose of jamming are not sent with Morse
>code equipment?

I believe that most of the strings of dits used for jamming are probably sent with the internal keyers that have been part of most HF rigs for over a decade now. A plug and a wire is all that is needed.

I have no doubt that some of those keyers are also used for Morse code. I also have no doubt that some of them are not.

I have no basis on which to even speculate as to the percentage. Do you?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

234. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 01:40:49 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010114204049.19385.00001996@ng-fy1.aol.com>
Source record: 484

>From: Cecil Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>Everyone can visualize that, Dick. It still doesn't make Morse code
>a language. Those words you are copying in Morse code are *English*
>words.

If they were mispronounced so badly as to be unrecognizable as English, are
they still English?

I think I know how to resolve this. My wife speaks English but is not a ham.
If she understands the words, I am sure everyone will agree wholeheartedly that
they are English.

73,
Ed

235. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 01:41:48 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010114204148.19385.00001997@ng-fy1.aol.com>
Source record: 485

>From: Cecil Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>What happened to all those hoards of CBers and
>freebanders that you predicted would invade the ARS?

Cecil, you must have missed it. The hordes are memorizing a thousand questions
so they won't have to learn anything. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

236. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 01:46:47 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010114204647.19385.00001998@ng-fy1.aol.com>
Source record: 486

>From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

> Can't you just imagine? Instead of tuning the band for the 'weak ones'
>we can tune among the spreading sequences to see who's on the air today.
>Whoopie!

Why would you feel that is has to be one or the other. SS would need to be
kept isolated from the weak-signal parts of the band (especially DSSS), but,
IMHO, the diversity of the Amateur Radio Service should continue.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

237. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 01:48:16 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010114204816.19385.00001999@ng-fy1.aol.com>
Source record: 487

>From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

>Your use of the word "conceptual" is revealing of your plans to screw
>the ARS with that nonsense. 'nother Freudian job...

I am not familiar with any definition of the term "conceptual" that involves screwing anyone.

Have you been taking lessons from Aaron on how to interpret things that are not said? :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

238. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 01:49:54 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010114204954.19385.00002000@ng-fy1.aol.com>
Source record: 488

>From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

>And Cecil says his slips are never Fruedian.

Do you believe they always are?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

239. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 01:51:26 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010114205126.19385.00002001@ng-fy1.aol.com>
Source record: 489

>From: "W4JLE" Fred@w4jle.com

>A man needs to know his limitations, and the sooner all the CW challenged
>people admit it the better.

All of us are "challenged" in something, Fred. What modes do you not operate?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

240. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 01:53:33 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010114205333.19385.00002003@ng-fy1.aol.com>
Source record: 490

>From: Cecil Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>W4JLE wrote:

>> You would loose that bet as well Cecil, I still am better than you because
>>I do CW ...

>No offense, Fred, but if you are not joking, you need some
>professional help.

He may be right. Those that can do CW proficiently better than others are indeed better -- at CW. I am probably better than the both of you at doing RF-exposure evaluations for ham stations. (Typical time, with book in hand -- about a minute.) All that proves is that I have developed that skill.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

241. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 01:54:48 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010114205448.19385.00002004@ng-fy1.aol.com>
Source record: 491

>From: "W4JLE" Fred@w4jle.com

>I am sorry that your little butt is chapped because you don't know, nor can
>you learn CW, but that's the way life goes!

Do you think that saying such a thing will promote more people to take up CW --
or fewer?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

242. Re: Despicable 14.313 behavior resumes

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 02:01:41 UTC
From: DX405 <lightnin9@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <93tmh7$9g6$1@dagobah.blueriver.net>
Source record: 499
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Hopefully KC8JBO will be getting a notice for his on air behavior. He needs
to be off the air like WB2OTK and some of the others.
"Joe Black" <jbla88@houston.net> wrote in message
news:3A623756.33C94D8B@houston.net...
> Fortunately, Riley Hollingsworth got an earful. Time for more official
> notices?

243. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 02:01:52 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010114210152.19385.00002005@ng-fy1.aol.com>
Source record: 492

>From: "Leland C. Scott"

>With all the crying by pro-coders, and the ARRL thinking about voting to
>keep the Morse code requirement, the ARRL should be renamed the "Antique
>Radio Relic League".

I don't know what the Board has in mind, but it will be considering this very issue at the January Board meeting. If it didn't think that a change in policy was possible, it would not have to consider the matter at all. It has an existing policy right now.

> I am a current member of the ARRL by the way, and I am
>using my membership to send my view to the ARRL leadership that the Morse
>code test requirements should be dropped at the next WARC. It's high time
>ham radio moved in to the future. I am working from the inside to change
>things, and I would urge others, who are not currently ARRL members to join,
>and make your view known, one way or the other.

Although I agree with the reasons to join the League, I will also add that you do NOT have to be a member to voice your opinion. In the first place, the Board members generally don't take the time to check each and every input to see if the correspondent is a member. Especially in this matter, the Board is quite aware that a number of hams are not members because of what they see ARRL's position on CW testing to be.

I am going to make my views known to Tom Frenaye, and I urge others to do the same with their Director, even if they live in the New England Division and want to cancel out my vote.

See http://www.arrl.org/divisions and follow the email links.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI
ARRL Lab

244. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 02:08:55 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010114210855.19385.00002008@ng-fy1.aol.com>
Source record: 493

>From: "W4JLE" Fred@w4jle.com

>Gee Ed!, I thought I had seen you at Woodstock...

Actually, I am an old hippie, though I never did make it to Woodstock. There was a lot of good and bad in those days, and I tried to hold on to the good.

I am glad that I learned that the problems of the world are not solved by singing songs in the park. We did that on days we weren't solving the world's problems, too.

Actually, the lessons I was opining about were the ones I learned in Sunday school. Maybe I was niave, but I still believe in some of those things. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

245. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 02:14:18 UTC
From: W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com>
Message-ID: <93tmghiom1@iac5.navix.net>
Source record: 495

I have never operated spread spectrum or psk31.

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20010114205126.19385.00002001@ng-fy1.aol.com...
> >From: "W4JLE" Fred@w4jle.com
>
> >A man needs to know his limitations, and the sooner all the CW challenged
> >people admit it the better.
>
> All of us are "challenged" in something, Fred. What modes do you not
operate?
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

246. Re: Buy a ham ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 02:15:18 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010114211518.19385.00002017@ng-fy1.aol.com>
Source record: 494

>From: K0HB K0HB@arrl.org

>Were they deliberately bad, or were they just unskilled? If unskilled,
>maybe they just needed some more "amateur practice". Feel free to send
>out an OO notice to the next example of this violation that you hear.

My guess is that they were probably infirm and just loved CW too much to give it up. That is why I did my best to give them QSOs, though I must confess that I did cut the QSOs short.

My statement that the sending was bad enough to be considered in violation of good amateur practice does not mean that I feel the operator should be prosecuted.

'Sides, I am not an OO. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

247. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 02:15:40 UTC
From: W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com>
Message-ID: <93tmj2$ir6$1@iac5.navix.net>
Source record: 496

Oh Yah! Well I got this book by this W1RFI guy and I can figure that stuff too!

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message news:20010114205333.19385.00002003@ng-fy1.aol.com...
> >From: Cecil Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>
> >W4JLE wrote:
>
> >> You would loose that bet as well Cecil, I still am better than you because
> >>I do CW ...
>
> >No offense, Fred, but if you are not joking, you need some
> >professional help.
>
> He may be right. Those that can do CW proficiently better than others are
> indeed better -- at CW. I am probably better than the both of you at doing
> RF-exposure evaluations for ham stations. (Typical time, with book in hand --
> about a minute.) All that proves is that I have developed that skill.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

248. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 02:21:43 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010114212143.15225.00000347@ng-fy1.aol.com>
Source record: 497

>From: "W4JLE" Fred@w4jle.com

>I have never operated spread spectrum or psk31.

Then those that do are better than you -- at operating spread spectrum or psk31.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

249. Re: Buy a ham ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 02:32:12 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010114213212.15225.00000350@ng-fy1.aol.com>
Source record: 498

>From: "W4JLE" Fred@w4jle.com

>I suspect that Ed is the one that sends the nightly W1AW code practice, and
>he uses a handkey.

Sorry, Fred, I am not that good with the old J38. And ESPECIALLY not for a
whole night. Give me about an hour and glass arm makes it sound bad enough
that Brian would be chastizing me. :-)

73,
Ed, W1RFI

250. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 02:50:15 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <93toh7$9kp$0@208.207.71.158>
Source record: 500
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Cecil wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > To attempt to work code without any training and practical
> > experience is akin to attempting to fly an airplane without any prior
> > flight training.
>
> Please explain how working CW is a life and death proposition akin
> to flying an airplane.

There you go again, making phantom linkages. No such assertation was
made. The comparison stands.

251. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 03:10:36 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010114221036.29597.00001791@nso-mi.aol.com>
Source record: 502

In article <3A609C11.399D1FC9@IEEE.org>, Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>> Human nature being what it is, most
>> people will take the path of least resistance in order to achieve
>> the greatest amount of instant gratification.
>
>Are you implying that CW is not gratifying?

Cecil:

Of course it is, but that gratification is delayed by the necessity to learn the Morse code and gain satisfactory proficiency in that skill. Plugging a microphone into an HF rig, pushing the button and talking is "instant" gratification, therefore, the strong push to eliminate remaining code testing requirements. Of course, this is obvious to everyone but you.

73 de Larry, K3LT

252. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 03:10:37 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010114221037.29597.00001792@nso-mi.aol.com>
Source record: 501

In article <3A609E83.893BFFF@IEEE.org>, Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>Are you implying that you must be forced to do something before
>you get anything done? That sounds like sheer laziness to me.
>I learned Morse code before I ever heard of amateur radio simply
>because it was fun.

Cecil:

No, I'm saying that I respond to incentives do do things, like everyone else. Ham radio is not a necessity of life, like working at my job in order to make a living. I do a lot of things on the job with the only incentive being that I need to keep my job and progress within it. As a radio amateur, I required an incentive to seek higher privileges, because I could have chosen to whine on 2-meters for the rest of my life while waiting for code testing to be abolished. That didn't work for me, because I wanted HF privileges then and there -- without waiting for them. Thus, my incentive to learn and gain practical proficiency in Morse/CW -- a mode which I have enjoyed greatly ever since I was "forced" to learn it!

73 de Larry, K3LT

253. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 03:10:37 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010114221037.29597.00001793@nso-mi.aol.com>
Source record: 503

In article <3a60d1d4.5580338@news.mindspring.com>, billsohl@mindspring.com (Bill Sohl) writes:

>
>As to the zero-WPM...that has nothing to do with
>fixing any problem other than the recognition of the
>fact that there is no longer any valid reason to
>test for code knowledge. It's that simple.

Bill:

How about the reason that testing for code knowledge, at progressively higher speeds, and for progressively increasing HF privileges, causes radio amateurs to attain a practical communications skill?

73 de Larry, K3LT

254. Re: Despicable 14.313 behavior (?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 03:29:05 UTC
From: Golden delicious <zemu09090@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <58u86.28956$U4.812484@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 504
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Joe Black" <jbla88@houston.net> wrote in message news:3A623756.33C94D8B@houston.net...
> Fortunately, Riley Hollingsworth got an earful. Time for more official
> notices?

Hope so. Wonder if he was listening earlier also?

At around 9:15 AM Central on 14.313 on 14 Jan 2001
two stations from a maritime "net" on 14.300 helped a maritime ham station phone
patch to an individual who openly announced on the patch
that he was not a licenced operator but would meet up with the maritime
ham regardless, on the frequency of 12.350 mHz USB.
Listened on 12.350 after their 14.313 ham "phone patch" was concluded.
They used the callsigns "sasperella" and "shooting star".
Whole activity was questionable from beginning to end.
Nice to see that 20m ham nets facilitate comms on non-ham freqs
by potentially unauthorized individuals. Makes the Service look real nice.

Did you hear this too R.H. ?

255. Re: Despicable 14.313 behavior (?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 04:13:30 UTC
From: DX405 <lightnin9@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <93tu96$9mr$1@dagobah.blueriver.net>
Source record: 507
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Yes, the activities of the nets needs to be investigated.
"Golden delicious" <zemu09090@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:58u86.28956$U4.812484@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
>
> "Joe Black" <jbla88@houston.net> wrote in message
news:3A623756.33C94D8B@houston.net...
> > Fortunately, Riley Hollingsworth got an earful. Time for more official
> > notices?
>
> Hope so. Wonder if he was listening earlier also?
>
> At around 9:15 AM Central on 14.313 on 14 Jan 2001
> two stations from a maritime "net" on 14.300 helped a maritime ham station
phone
> patch to an individual who openly announced on the patch
> that he was not a licenced operator but would meet up with the maritime
> ham regardless, on the frequency of 12.350 mHz USB.
> Listened on 12.350 after their 14.313 ham "phone patch" was concluded.
> They used the callsigns "sasperella" and "shooting star".
> Whole activity was questionable from beginning to end.
> Nice to see that 20m ham nets facilitate comms on non-ham freqs
> by potentially unauthorized individuals. Makes the Service look real nice.
>
> Did you hear this too R.H. ?
>
>
>
>
>

256. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 04:20:46 UTC
From: billsohl@mindspring.com
Message-ID: <3a627a30.14349239@news.mindspring.com>
Source record: 505

On 15 Jan 2001 03:10:37 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>In article <3a60d1d4.5580338@news.mindspring.com>, billsohl@mindspring.com
>(Bill Sohl) writes:
>
>>
>>As to the zero-WPM...that has nothing to do with
>>fixing any problem other than the recognition of the
>>fact that there is no longer any valid reason to
>>test for code knowledge. It's that simple.
>
>Bill:
>How about the reason that testing for code knowledge, at
>progressively higher speeds, and for progressively increasing
>HF privileges, causes radio amateurs to attain a practical
>communications skill?
>73 de Larry, K3LT

That would be a valid reason IF there was a government
need for amateurs to attain that skill. You can argue that
as you choose, but I fully believe that you'd never convince
the administrations of the world that the skill is needed
today.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

257. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 04:29:13 UTC
From: W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com>
Message-ID: <93tugcntj1@iac5.navix.net>
Source record: 506

Yep, they sure are. Now would you care to place a wager if there were me and a nocoder, which could get on the air using the mode they were not proficient in the quickest.

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message news:20010114212143.15225.00000347@ng-fy1.aol.com...
> >From: "W4JLE" Fred@w4jle.com
>
> >I have never operated spread spectrum or psk31.
>
> Then those that do are better than you -- at operating spread spectrum or
> psk31.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

258. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 04:59:02 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A628396.95A7B801@IEEE.org>
Source record: 508
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.policy

```
Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> Cecil wrote:
> >
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > To attempt to work code without any training and practical
> > > experience is akin to attempting to fly an airplane without any prior
> > > flight training.
> >
> > Please explain how working CW is a life and death proposition akin
> > to flying an airplane.
>
> There you go again, making phantom linkages. No such assertation was
> made. The comparison stands.

You are the one who made the phantom linkage. Working CW is NOT
akin to flying an airplane.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca
```

259. Re: Despicable 14.313 behavior (?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 04:59:48 UTC
From: jeffreyh@Hawaii.Edu
Message-ID: <93u044$72$1@news.hawaii.edu>
Source record: 509
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Golden delicious <zemu09090@hotmail.com> wrote:
>At around 9:15 AM Central on 14.313 on 14 Jan 2001
>two stations from a maritime "net" on 14.300 helped a maritime ham
>station phone
>patch to an individual who openly announced on the patch
>that he was not a licenced operator but would meet up with the maritime
>ham regardless, on the frequency of 12.350 mHz USB.

If I understand what you've written, the person on the telephone
said he was not a ham. That's perfectly acceptable.

>Listened on 12.350 after their 14.313 ham "phone patch" was concluded.
>They used the callsigns "sasperella" and "shooting star".

Those would probably be the names of their boats. Boat names in
lieu of callsigns are permitted on the VHF marine channels --
perhaps the FCC now permits that also on the HF marine frequencies
now.

>Whole activity was questionable from beginning to end.
>Nice to see that 20m ham nets facilitate comms on non-ham freqs

Coordinating two boats to meet up on a marine band frequency
is perfectly acceptable.

Jeff KH6O

260. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 05:27:24 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A628A3C.56FFED75@IEEE.org>
Source record: 510

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> How about the reason that testing for code knowledge, at
> progressively higher speeds, and for progressively increasing
> HF privileges, causes radio amateurs to attain a practical
> communications skill?

If it's not fun, it's not practical, Larry. Everybody does not share your likes and dislikes. What is wrong with live and let live?
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

261. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 05:30:10 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A628AE2.7EAF57AE@IEEE.org>
Source record: 511

Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote:
> >How about the reason that testing for code knowledge, at
> >progressively higher speeds, and for progressively increasing
> >HF privileges, causes radio amateurs to attain a practical
> >communications skill?
>
> That would be a valid reason IF there was a government
> need for amateurs to attain that skill. You can argue that
> as you choose, but I fully believe that you'd never convince
> the administrations of the world that the skill is needed
> today.

As a matter of fact, one by one, those administrations of the
world are indicating by their actions that they don't agree
with Larry. Didn't I read that Canada is in the process of
adopting a 5wpm maximum code requirement?
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

If registering guns will prevent crime,
will registering penises prevent rape?

262. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 05:32:03 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A628B53.27D6BE86@IEEE.org>
Source record: 512

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> >Are you implying that you must be forced to do something before
> >you get anything done? That sounds like sheer laziness to me.
> >I learned Morse code before I ever heard of amateur radio simply
> >because it was fun.
>
> No, I'm saying that I respond to incentives do do things, like everyone
> else.

Fun is one of the best incentives I know.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

263. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 05:34:05 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A628BCD.800B7C24@IEEE.org>
Source record: 513

W1RFI wrote:
>
> >From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
>
> >And Cecil says his slips are never Fruedian.
>
> Do you believe they always are?

Who the heck was Frued anyway?
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

264. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 05:36:20 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A628C54.F5798B7E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 514

W1RFI wrote:
> I have no basis on which to even speculate as to the percentage. Do you?

Nope, Jim and I are not arguing percentages. All it takes is one jammer
using Morse code equipment and I win the argument.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

265. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 05:37:48 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A628CAC.894C7AE6@IEEE.org>
Source record: 515

W1RFI wrote:
>
> >From: Cecil Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>
> >What happened to all those hoards of CBers and
> >freebanders that you predicted would invade the ARS?
>
> Cecil, you must have missed it. The hordes are memorizing a thousand questions
> so they won't have to learn anything. :-)

I guess they still must be memorizing cuz they didn't pass
the exams yet, huh?
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

266. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 05:40:48 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A628D60.F853E2CB@IEEE.org>
Source record: 516

W1RFI wrote:
> I think I know how to resolve this. My wife speaks English but is not a ham.
> If she understands the words, I am sure everyone will agree wholeheartedly that
> they are English.

Well, the next time you have a QSO, take down everything character by
character and word for word and show it to your wife. If she understands
most of it, it was in the English language and you were just the modem.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

267. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 06:02:17 UTC
From: "Leland C. Scott" <no-spam@junk-mail.net>
Message-ID: <Jnw86.11272$ft6.203476@typhoon.mw.mediaone.net>
Source record: 517

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20010114210152.19385.00002005@ng-fy1.aol.com...
> I am going to make my views known to Tom Frenaye, and I urge others to do
the
> same with their Director, even if they live in the New England Division
and
> want to cancel out my vote.

Good for you Ed! I don't know what your stand on the issue really is, but
that does not really matter either. What does matter is that both you and I
did something other than bitch about it on this news group, by contacting
our ARRL division directors. If we don't talk to them they don't know what
we think, or want!

--
73's,

Leland C. Scott
KC8LDO

ARRL member
NCI member

"You ask what Morse Code is good for? I'll tell you. Morse
Code is used exclusively by Electronics Based life forms to
communicate amongst themselves using advanced Organic
Digital Signal Processors, running state of the art Artificial
Intelligence Software, to perform the highly complex
transmit encryption, receive decryption and error correction
functions."

268. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 11:02:14 UTC
From: Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com>
Message-ID: <3A62D8B6.8D392808@dvol.com>
Source record: 518

Len Over 21 wrote:

> >radios are simply impractical. But they just don't cut the mustard for
> >serious vhf/uhf weak signal work.
>
> "Mustard" needs some definition. :-)
>
> According to the www.icomamerica.com specs, the receiver
> sensitivity is down there near internal noise limit.

>
Yeah, but what is the internal noise level? They speaketh with forked tongues. The Icoms of the world know that most of the users will be doing non-critical FM yakking with the baby boxes. When one gets into moonbounce, very weak cw and ssb tropo scatter work etc. the performance requirements get a lot stiffer in areas like noise figure, dynamic range, filter quality, DSP capabilities, etc. where the desktoppers have the advantage over the "radios of convenience".
>

> Prices keep going up on everything. More features, greater band
> capability equates to more money. If you think that is bad, look
> at the ones which have an integral spectrum analyzer for
> receiving... :-)

>
I'm not sure I agree that prices are actually going up - depending on how you define "prices". My sense is that given a constant $2k the bang for the buck has been rising at a very significant rate. Over the long haul in time a ham today gets a helluva lot more capabilities and performance per on-the-job labor hours than he could years ago, no comparison. A Collins S-Line sucked up say two months worth of paychecks in 1970. Today two-three weeks worth of paychecks gets an xcvr with far better capabilities, a big increase in features and better performance than an S-Line has. Very roughly speaking. Those so-called spectrum analyzers are a flaming joke.
>

> >> Yes, I agree that the 220 MHz band transceivers are scarce.
> >> Saw only single-band and dual-band models from four
> >> manufacturers covering that band.
> >
> >The auction is coming . .
>
> Off-hand, based on FCC notices and the general electronics
> trades' info, the more important bands for commercial
> applications have moved up beyond 900 MHz. The drivers
> for moving well up into the microwave region are various

> wireless applications and the ability of semiconductors to
> work well into tens of GHz. I'd say the 220 band spectrum
> is going to stay as it is for a while.

>
I agree that hams in the centimeter bands have a lot of pressure which can only get worse. But I can also visualize 222-225 being eyed by the aviation folk who are already in that neighborhood and have a big spectrum crunch.
>

> >Nobody has the time to scratch-build and chasing parts is expensive and time
> >consuming, there's just no ROI on the dollars or the hours unless it's for
> >experimentation. Kit building seems to be on the upswing, however.
>
> The "ROI" thing is individual and subjective. The technology is
> known, but the sources of information on it are scattered.

>
Goes beyond that. The ham who works 40 hours per week and lives an hour away from the job will use a different ROI yardstick than a retiree will. I'm still doin' my forty plus, I'll build but only when it makes a lot more sense than buying, usually when what I want isn't in the catalogs.
>

> . . calibration). One can't make a SOTA radio project without
> calibrated test equipment...probably why so many project
> article authors are working as pros in electronics companies
> where they can accurately measure radio performance.

>
Doesn't do much to entice 15-year-olds into ham radio per the good old daze.
>

> didit
>
> PS: Keep a 3/8" open-end, closed-end wrench handy. It is
> just right for SMA connectors common at commercial VHF
> and higher RF stuff.

>
Junque. I'm still doing BNCs, no wrench required.
>

> I think it replaced the pocket protector
> as an RF-nerd sign back in the mid- to late-70s. :-)

>
Still have one intact in a bottom drawer. Complete with five pencils (one being red of course) plus my six-inch Post bamboo mini slide rule. With my name machine-engraved on it of course. Last time I wore it was around 1965. Like somebody told the hats-on-backward crowd recently, "don't get on the nerds, they'll be your bosses someday."
>

w3rv

269. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 12:24:39 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010115072439.09203.00001186@ng-cr1.aol.com>
Source record: 519

>From: Brian Kelly kelly@dvol.com

>> According to the www.icomamerica.com specs, the receiver
>> sensitivity is down there near internal noise limit.

>Yeah, but what is the internal noise level?
That is exactly what a sensitivity measurement measures.

> When one gets into moonbounce, very weak cw and
>ssb tropo scatter work etc. the performance requirements get a
>lot stiffer in areas like noise figure,

Noise figure is another way of expressing sensitivity.

> dynamic range,

Dynamic range is a measure of the ability of a receiver to remain sensitive in the presence of strong signals not in the passband of the receiver. IMHO, the dynamic range of most receivers sold to hams is adequate, most of the time. EME enthusiasts usually do not schedule their events and QSOs the day of the ARRL VHF Sweepstakes, when there are apt to be strong signals up and down the band. If those strong signals are not present, dynamic range is not usually a receiver issue.

> filter quality,

Filter quality does sometimes buy you something. If you are listening to a weak one and there is a strong signal just outside the filter passband, it is nice to be able to get rid of it nearly completely. Most of the time, though, the filters in the intermediate-priced rigs are quite adequate for the task, and if those strong signals are not present just outside the passband, the improved skirt selectivity of some of the higher end rigs has no significant effect on what is heard in the receiver baseband.

> DSP capabilities, etc.

For the most part, DSP=filtering, wtih some dynamic range implications. Actually, in the areas you cite, the DSP implementation in the big rigs results in a poorer close-in dynamic range (<20 kHz spacing) than does the use of a moderate filter before the high-gain stages of the receiver. Some DSP radios do use such a filter, but in those cases, the DSP is a secondary benefit, with the filtering providing most of the selectivity.

>where the desktoppers have the dvantage over the "radios of convenience".

I agree, on the whole, the >$3000.00 radios have better performance capability than the radios in the $1500.00 price class. The ham who erects the big tower and high-gain antennas will need every dB of dynamic range that is available.

The ham who has a modest antenna system, though, probably will not. For that ham, a low-end radio makes a lot of economic and technical sense.

Speaking of dynamic range, the best dynamic range ever measured in the ARRL Lab at 5 kHz spacing belongs to the Elecraft K2 on 20 meters.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

270. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 12:26:15 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <93uq93$85r$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 526

In article <93tugcntj1@iac5.navix.net>,
"W4JLE" <Fred@w4jle.com> wrote:
> Yep, they sure are. Now would you care to place a wager if there were
me and
> a nocoder, which could get on the air using the mode they were not
> proficient in the quickest.

Try english sometime, but back to your wager.

That counts me out since I not a no-coder, but I suspect that you would
hurt yourself just to try to prove a point. I'll put a dollar on the
crazy Extra who's so full of himself and has so much to prove.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

271. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 12:26:58 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010115072658.09203.00001187@ng-cr1.aol.com>
Source record: 520

>From: "Leland C. Scott"

>Good for you Ed! I don't know what your stand on the issue really is, but
>that does not really matter either. What does matter is that both you and I
>did something other than bitch about it on this news group, by contacting
>our ARRL division directors. If we don't talk to them they don't know what
>we think, or want!
>
>--
>73's,
>
>Leland C. Scott
>KC8LDO
>
>ARRL member
>NCI member
>
>"You ask what Morse Code is good for? I'll tell you. Morse
>Code is used exclusively by Electronics Based life forms to
>communicate amongst themselves using advanced Organic
>Digital Signal Processors, running state of the art Artificial
>Intelligence Software, to perform the highly complex
>transmit encryption, receive decryption and error correction
>functions."

That is exactly what is needed to influence ARRL policy. Hams should also make their views known to the FCC when such matters are on the regulatory plate. They should also support organizations that represent their views, such as FISTS or NCI.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

272. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 12:30:41 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010115073041.09203.00001188@ng-cr1.aol.com>
Source record: 521

>From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

>Plugging a microphone into an HF rig, pushing the button and
>talking is "instant" gratification, therefore, the strong push to
>eliminate remaining code testing requirements.

Many of those seeking to end Morse-code testing requirements already have that "instant" gratification available to them.

>Of course, this is obvious to everyone but you.

What is obvious about Bill Sohl's desire to end Morse code testing? He can already yak on any amateur frequency.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

273. Re: Despicable 14.313 behavior resumes

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 12:34:07 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <93uqo0$8hg$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 525

In article <20010114203543.19385.00001994@ng-fy1.aol.com>,
w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:
> >From: Brian brianburke@my-deja.com
>
> >Was it more "Battle of the Pre-99 Extras?"
>
> I don't know. What percentage of the pre-99 Extras participated?
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

Hey Ed, I'm asking the questions around here. ;)

OK, what percentage of the pre-99 Extras participated?

Or better yet, of the participants, what percentage did the pre-99
Extras make?

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

274. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 12:34:13 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010115073413.09203.00001189@ng-cr1.aol.com>
Source record: 523

>From: "W4JLE" Fred@w4jle.com

>Yep, they sure are. Now would you care to place a wager if there were me and
>a nocoder, which could get on the air using the mode they were not
>proficient in the quickest.

Here are the terms. Let's select someone with a no-code license and you. He or she will be asked to construct a Morse-code transmitter and make a Morse code QSO. You will be asked to construct a spread-spectrum transmitter and make a Morse code QSO. Winner gets an ARRL Handbook from the "bent-cover" bin.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

275. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 12:35:14 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010115073514.09203.00001190@ng-cr1.aol.com>
Source record: 522

>From: "W4JLE" Fred@w4jle.com

>Oh Yah! Well I got this book by this W1RFI guy and I can figure that stuff
>too!

I am sure you can, but compared to me, you are very slow at it.

Does that make me a better ham except in that one area?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

276. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 12:37:26 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010115073726.09203.00001191@ng-cr1.aol.com>
Source record: 524

>From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

>If growth isn't one of "our major problems," what do you think they
>are? And how will a zero-WPM, one-class license fix them?

I will answer the first question later in the week when I can type out a long answer.

I cannot answer the second because I do not believe that we should have a one-class license system. I also do not believe that our licensing system should contain no Morse code testing. I believe that Morse code proficiency should be tested the same way we test for proficiency in other modes.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

277. Re: Buy a ham ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 12:41:35 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010115074135.09203.00001192@ng-cr1.aol.com>
Source record: 527

>From: Brian brianburke@my-deja.com

>Ed, I knew you'd eventually agree with the Amateur's Code, good amateur
>practice, and Part 97.

I have always agreed with the need for good amateur practice, Brian. I just don't agree with you that deviations from standard spacing that can still be easily copied by most operators is not good amateur practice.

>I'm always amazed at how people will abandon
>reason just to argue with me.

If you think that the only reason I hold my view is so I can argue with you, you are quite mistaken.

>If they so vehemently object to what Part 97 says, they ought to try to change it.

As can you. I don't recall that you have filed any RFMs about the need to closely control the spacing of sent CW. To my knowledge, no one has ever received an NAL for poor CW timing, so obviously the FCC and most of the amateur community believe that existing practice is adequate and is within the letter of the law.

You ought to try to change it.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

278. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 12:45:42 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010115074542.09203.00001193@ng-cr1.aol.com>
Source record: 528

>From: Brian brianburke@my-deja.com
>

>None whatsoever. VE's will tell you which questions you got wrong, but
>typically don't have time to dig out your exam booklet and go over them
>with you.

When I took my General before the FCC, most of the time, I knew which questions I guessed at.

>So it is unrealistic to consider learning a part of the VE
>process.

Are you saying that people will only learn if others lead them by the nose? Are you another one who believes that hordes of people want to be hams and memorize ove a thousand answers to questions so they won't learn anything?

>Of course, we could add to their load...

Why do most of the solutions that are posed by those who claim that there are major problems in the present testing system always involve work that must be done by somebody else?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

279. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 12:47:06 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010115074706.09203.00001194@ng-cr1.aol.com>
Source record: 530

>From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

> No use. You'll still be bitching and complaining that someone wants you
>to either learn the code or shut up abojut it.

He already knows the code, Dick; he is just doing the best he can with it.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

280. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 12:48:14 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010115074814.09203.00001195@ng-cr1.aol.com>
Source record: 529

>From: Aaron Jones nomail@nomail.com

>And since I seldom work (or hear) anybody under age 40
>on CW anymore, I'd say that in 30 to 40 years 95% (or more) of the CW
>ops will be SK's.

Show up at the QRP bash at Dayton; I will introduce you to a lot of CW ops younger than 40.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

281. Re: Buy a ham ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 12:51:08 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010115075108.09203.00001197@ng-cr1.aol.com>
Source record: 531

>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)

>All the members liked that? Some members liked that? A few
>members liked that?

None of the members laughed at the author. That seems to be the standard at
issue here.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

282. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 12:55:15 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010115075515.09203.00001198@ng-cr1.aol.com>
Source record: 533

>From: Cecil Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>Truth is, using well defined Spread Spectrum techniques, hams could share
>any UHF band with almost any other service by allocating a specific set of
>spreading codes to hams.

The bottom line, Cecil, is that such sharing is going to take place whether hams use SS on those bands or not. The proliferation of unlicensed devices, some of which are permitted 1 W with unlimited antenna gain, on some of "our" microwave bands is already starting to have an effect.

It remains to be seen whether the FCC will back ham radio in cases of actual harmful interference. Even if they are willing to do so, the problem of locating individual offenders is a daunting challenge, and the problems of aggregate noise levels from multiple devices may represent something the FCC won't address. I am doing what I can to deal with this one, but I am not making any promises.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

283. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 12:56:59 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010115075659.09203.00001199@ng-cr1.aol.com>
Source record: 532

>From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

>The most destructive act the FCC has ever taken was to make the Novice
>license renewable and give it 10 meter phone. For far too many that
>removed most of the incentive to upgrade. That was the difference. It
>instantly took most Novices off learning and practicing on the CW bands
>and instantly handed them a microphone.

Most of those Novices either upgraded or failed to renew.

Do you believe they would have renewed if they had been limited only to Morse
code operation?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

284. Re: Will you let them take away your guns?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 14:19:54 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010115091954.00714.00001896@nso-md.aol.com>
Source record: 534

In article <93svjg$rb3$1@nnrp1.deja.com>, Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
writes:

>
>Then there was the SoCal survey of the Marine Corps asking if they would
>fire on American citizens if ordered to do so.

Brian:

What was the result of that survey?

73 de Larry, K3LT

285. Re: Despicable 14.313 behavior resumes

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 14:19:54 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010115091954.00714.00001895@nso-md.aol.com>
Source record: 536

In article <20010114203543.19385.00001994@ng-fy1.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>
>>From: Brian brianburke@my-deja.com
>
>>Was it more "Battle of the Pre-99 Extras?"
>
>I don't know. What percentage of the pre-99 Extras participated?

Brian/Ed:

What is the significance of 1999? Restructuring and the "nickle Extra" took place in April, 2000. If that's what you're talking about, you'd have to say "The pre-4/15/2000 Extras," to indicate Extra-class operators who had taken and passed the 20 WPM code test element.

73 de Larry, K3LT

286. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 14:19:55 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010115091955.00714.00001897@nso-md.aol.com>
Source record: 535

In article <20010114175651.05250.00001615@ng-ff1.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>Did you learn Morse code faster than 20 wpm?

Ed:

Well, I can send/receive faster than 20 wpm, so I guess I must have! I passed my 20 wpm test with a perfect score, and have the 20 wpm Endorsement from W1AW. So, based on the emperical evidence, I must have "learned" Morse code at a speed of at least 20 WPM. Thanks for asking!

73 de Larry, K3LT

287. Re: Despicable 14.313 behavior (?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 14:28:21 UTC
From: K0HB <k0hb@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <93v1dudqr1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 537
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <58u86.28956$U4.812484@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>,
"Golden delicious" <zemu09090@hotmail.com> wrote:

> At around 9:15 AM Central on 14.313 on 14 Jan 2001
> two stations from a maritime "net" on 14.300 helped a maritime
> ham station phone patch to an individual who openly announced
> on the patch that he was not a licenced operator but would meet
> up with the maritime ham regardless, on the frequency of 12.350
> mHz USB.

And your problem with this is what? The non-ham sailor picked
a maritime HF frequency; presumably his vessel carries a marine
HF license, and the two stations carried out communications
on 12.350.

73, Hans, K0HB

--
"1943 Poster Child for The National Precocious Little Bastard Campaign"

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

288. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 14:30:18 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <93v1hr$du0$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 538

In article <20010115074542.09203.00001193@ng-cr1.aol.com>,
w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:
> >From: Brian brianburke@my-deja.com
> >
>
> >None whatsoever. VE's will tell you which questions you got wrong,
but
> >typically don't have time to dig out your exam booklet and go over
them
> >with you.
>
> When I took my General before the FCC, most of the time, I knew which
questions
> I guessed at.

Thats pretty fantastic memorization, most of the time. If your
memory is so good remembering the ones you guessed at, why didn't you
remember the exact answer as given in the Q pool? How many times did
you have to take the exams?

> >So it is unrealistic to consider learning a part of the VE
> >process.
>
> Are you saying that people will only learn if others lead them by the
nose?

No. Are you?

I said, "So it is unrealistic to consider learning a part of the VE
process."

> Are you another one who believes that hordes of people want to be hams
and
> memorize ove a thousand answers to questions so they won't learn
anything?

No. Are you?

> >Of course, we could add to their load...
>
> Why do most of the solutions that are posed by those who claim that
there are
> major problems in the present testing system always involve work that
must be
> done by somebody else?

Teachers Unions? No, putting it on the VEs was offered as an unworkable solution.

OK, after each exam session, one of the flunkees takes control of the test material. The flunkees then go through the material, exam by exam, and raise questions about the ones marked in red. After all of the incorrect answers have been reviewed, the flunkee reassembles all of the exams, QA sheets, written exam and code exam answer keys, and copies of the CSCE's in their proper order and eturns them to the lead VE.

I agree. This can be done without the VE's assistance. Why should they need absolute control over the test material?

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

289. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 14:38:18 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <93v20qebk1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 539

In article <20010115073514.09203.00001190@ng-cr1.aol.com>,
w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:
> >From: "W4JLE" Fred@w4jle.com
>
> >Oh Yah! Well I got this book by this W1RFI guy and I can figure that
stuff
> >too!
>
> I am sure you can, but compared to me, you are very slow at it.
>
> Does that make me a better ham except in that one area?
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

Do you have a web page dedicated to 14.313?

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

290. Re: Buy a ham ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 14:40:04 UTC
From: K0HB <k0hb@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <93v243eed1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 540

In article <93r2gigfh1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com> wrote:

> Been hanging on 3950 a little too long?

3950? That's way up there in the General voice sub-band, isn't it?
I'm not sure my radio would tune that frequency!

Good luck on this one now!

73, Hans, K0HB
--
Grand Exhalted Liberator of the Electric Smoke

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

291. HA HA HA: Bush won popular vote!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 15:04:53 UTC
From: kking@no-mail.com
Message-ID: <93v3il$826$0@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 541
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Go to Newsmax.com, look at headline article . . .

New Count Shows Bush May Have Won Popular Vote
NewsMax.com
Wednesday, December 20, 2000

Despite the widely accepted claim that Al Gore won the popular vote by some 300,000 votes, a new count of state totals appears to show George Bush was the real winner by nearly 2 million votes.

According to respected news analyst Mary Mostert, a report sent to her by reader Don Boyd showed that Gore got a total of 50,753,172 votes nationwide while Bush got 52,685,804 giving him a winning margin of 1,932,632.

Wrote Mostert "While I have not checked all 50 states with the Secretary of State official returns, I have checked all the big states and a number of the smaller states. All the ones I have checked are accurate, or modified very slightly with late absentee ballots, which tilted towards George W. Bush. For those who want to personally check these figures, go to the "Original Source" which has all the election information by state. Nearly all the states now have their OFFICIAL, returns posted.

These figures were reportedly obtained from the Office of the Secretary of State from each state but haven't been confirmed. Where are Al Gore's cheer leaders known as the news media??

GORE

Alabama 692,611
Alaska 79,004
Arizona 685,341
Arkansas 422,768
California 5,835,996
Colorado 738,227
Connecticut 816,015
Delaware 180,068
D.C. 171,923
Florida 2,912,253
Hawaii 205,286
Idaho 138,637
Illinois 2,589,026

Indiana 901,980
Iowa 638,517
Kansas 399,276
Kentucky 638,923
Louisana 792,344
Maine 319,951
Maryland 1,144,008
Mass 1,616,487
Mich 1,953,139
Minn 1,168,226
Miss 404,614
Missouri 1,110,776
Montana 137,126
Nebraska 231,776
Nevada 279,978
New Hampshire 266,348
New Jersey 1,788,850
New Mexico 286,783
New York 4,107,697
N. Carolina 1,257,692
N. Dakota 95,284
Ohio 2,183,628
Oklahoma 474,276
Oregon 720,342
PA 2,485,967
RI 249,508
SC 566,039
SD 118,804
TN 981,720
TX 2,433,746
UT 203,053
VM 149,022
VA 1,217,290
WA 1,247,652
WV 295,497
WI 1,242,987
WY 60,481

Totals 50,753,172

BUSH
Alabama 941,173
Alaska 167,398
Arizona 781,652
Arkansas 472,940
California 4,544,136
Colorado 883,748
Connecticut 561,094
Delaware 137,288
D.C. 18,073
Florida 2,912,790

Georgia 1,419,720
Hawaii 137,845
Idaho 336,937
Illinois 2,019,421
Indiana 1,245,836
Iowa 634,373
Kansas 622,332
Kentucky 872,520
Louisana 972,871
Maine 286,616
Maryland 813,827
Mass 878,502
Mich 4,232,501
Minn 1,109,659
Miss 572,844
Missouri 1,118,504
Montana 240,178
Nebraska 433,850
Nevada 301,575
New Hampshire 273,559
New Jersey 1,284,173
New Mexico 286,417
New York 2,403,374
N. Carolina 1,631,163
N. Dakota 174,852
Ohio 2,350,363
Oklahoma 744,337
Oregon 713,577
PA 2,281,127
RI 130,555
SC 786,892
SD 190,700
TN 1,061,949
TX 3,799,639
UT 515,096
VA 1,437,490
WA 1,108,864
WV 336,473
WI 1,237,279
WY 147,947

Totals 52,685,804

Bush Wins BY: 1,932,632

Can we now expect the media which is busy counting votes in
Florida to take a look at these figures and report the results
should they prove that Gore lost the popular vote by nearly
two million votes?

292. Re: HA HA HA: Bush won popular vote!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 15:28:18 UTC
From: "Dr. Conrad Connie" <coontail@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <93v4u6$h2d$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 542
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <93v3il$826$0@dosa.alt.net>,
kking@no-mail.com (Kerry King) wrote:
>
> Go to Newsmax.com, look at headline article . . .
>
> New Count Shows Bush May Have Won Popular Vote
> NewsMax.com
> Wednesday, December 20, 2000
>
> Despite the widely accepted claim that Al Gore won the popular
> vote by some 300,000 votes, a new count of state totals
> appears to show George Bush was the real winner by nearly 2
> million votes.
>

>
> These figures were reportedly obtained from the Office of the
> Secretary of State from each state but {haven't been confirmed.}
> Where are Al Gore's cheer leaders known as the news media??

No they haven't been confirmed and in fact if they have, why hasn't
this total appeared on the ABC News web page ?

Hahahaha.. this is so typical of the right wing Limbrain cabal.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

293. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 15:34:09 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A631871.EA863369@IEEE.org>
Source record: 543

W1RFI wrote:
> Do you believe they would have renewed if they had been limited only to Morse
> code operation?

I would have, Ed. I only got the conditional license so I could
continue operating 40m CW in the Novice bands.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

294. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 15:36:39 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A631907.ABB0E90F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 545

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> Well, I can send/receive faster than 20 wpm, so I guess I must
> have! I passed my 20 wpm test with a perfect score, and have
> the 20 wpm Endorsement from W1AW. So, based on the
> emperical evidence, I must have "learned" Morse code at a
> speed of at least 20 WPM. Thanks for asking!

You missed his point, Larry. Did anyone require you to achieve
a Morse code speed in excess of 20wpm? If not, why did you go
above 20wpm?
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

295. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 15:39:17 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A6319A5.BAF86262@IEEE.org>
Source record: 546

W1RFI wrote:
> The proliferation of unlicensed devices,
> some of which are permitted 1 W with unlimited antenna gain, on some of "our"
> microwave bands is already starting to have an effect.

"Unlimited antenna gain"? Wow! How about a nice active antenna? :-)
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

296. W4JLE Welefare Extra?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 15:45:22 UTC
From: kk5yy@arrl.net
Message-ID: <3a630e92.336428289@nntp.mindspring.com>
Source record: 544

Well Folks,

With all the sound and fury signifying nothing I just had to look into Fred's bona fides, very interesting reading.

It seems that just before the change in the code requirements Fred was and Advanced Class amateur holding the call W4JLE now it seems he hold an Amateur Extra license effective June 03, 2000 this is well past the change in code requirements for Amateur Extra. One can only presume from all this that Fred waited until the code requirements were reduced before upgrading. The question is, why?

In my own cynical way I have to presume that Fred, despite all the sound and fury, was unable to pass Element 1C and so had to wait until the bar was lowered to get his Amateur Extra. This casts doubt on all of his blathering about traffic handling, superiority, the value of other, etc. I'm sure there is a wonderful excuse and lots of aspersions to be cast at me for this revelation but the public record speaks for itself.

In the hash light of these new revelations I am forced to conclude Freddie had been fibbing to us and I'm afraid I won't be able to consider anything he says from now on to be credible. Oh well, he never had anything interesting to say anyway. Please be careful Fred, word on the street is that you go to Hell for lying.

297. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 16:19:57 UTC
From: Lamar Owen <lamar.owen@wgcr.org>
Message-ID: <3A63232D.27A71176@wgcr.org>
Source record: 547
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Lamar your point is well taken, but out of date. Mandatory code testing
> is as good as gone, and most likely will be gone once the international
> treaty is changed, probably no sooner than 2003 at the earliest.

I didn't get involved in this thread because of that, Dick. No, I bothered reading the thread because a pro-code proponent expressed that he wasn't surprised that a NoCode licensee killed someone. That's pretty inflammatory.

But, it is not yet a done deal. ARRL is soliciting comment on whether they should change their code stance or not -- while it may not change the WRC outcome, it certainly could change how the FCC deals with the WRC results.

> What is being debated now is mandatory code testing for users of the
> mode. If you don't plan to ever use it, and don't change your mind, then
> you've nothing to fear from it.

You know, that is an interesting proposition. But is it practical?

> To attempt to work code without any training and practical
> experience is akin to attempting to fly an airplane without any prior
> flight training. It will not work, it can't be done. To attempt to
> transmit Morse code on ham radio while totally untrained is a violation
> of FCC rules requiring the exercise of good amateur practice.

Why can't I work CW with my MFJ 1278 (it _does_ do CW)? Do I need the training in manual CW to enjoy automatic CW? Should I then be required to learn to copy Baudot or ASCIII by hand before using the same 1278 to work RTTY, AMTOR, or PacTOR?

With the 1278 on my rig, you wouldn't be able to tell if I were working manual or automatic.

And, there is really no difference in the use of the 1278 for automatic CW and the use of 'contest keyers' to make endless CQ's easy.

It's not at all akin to flying an airplane -- it's more akin to using a calculator without knowing how to do it by hand.
--
Lamar Owen
WGCR Internet Radio
1 Peter 4:11

298. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 17:00:26 UTC
From: Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com>
Message-ID: <3A632CAA.EAAD8B81@dvol.com>
Source record: 548

W1RFI wrote:

> . . . .
> EME enthusiasts usually do not schedule their events and QSOs the day of the
> ARRL VHF Sweepstakes, when there are apt to be strong signals up and down the
> band. If those strong signals are not present, dynamic range is not usually a
> receiver issue.

>
EME aside, the guys who are VHF contesters or dxers and the band is open need all
the dynamic range they can get just like the lowbanders do. All ya need is two of
those critters on the same block on the air at the same time.
>

> > filter quality,. . . .

> and if
> those strong signals are not present just outside the passband, the improved
> skirt selectivity of some of the higher end rigs has no significant effect on
> what is heard in the receiver baseband.

>
Absolutely. Much of the need for filter quality is a function of what one does with
the radio. The casual ragchewers aren't as demanding as the dx contesters for
instance. Getting off the VHF thread a bit one does not want to go into the piles
on the bottom end of 80 in the big dx contests with mediochre filters or dynamic
range. Collins and Inrad filters are worth the money to those who can justify the
additional expense.
>
> DSP capabilities, etc.

>
> For the most part, DSP=filtering, wtih some dynamic range implications.
> Actually, in the areas you cite, the DSP implementation in the big rigs results
> in a poorer close-in dynamic range (<20 kHz spacing) than does the use of a
> moderate filter before the high-gain stages of the receiver.

>
DSP technology simply is not yet ready for prime time in this respect. Needs to be
moved out to the antenna connector then we'll see it catch up with the Real Filters
in the IFs.
>

>
> >where the desktoppers have the dvantage over the "radios of convenience".
>
> I agree, on the whole, the >$3000.00 radios have better performance capability

> than the radios in the $1500.00 price class. The ham who erects the big tower
> and high-gain antennas will need every dB of dynamic range that is available.
> The ham who has a modest antenna system, though, probably will not. For that
> ham, a low-end radio makes a lot of economic and technical sense.

>
Roger that. I buy used $3k radios for $1.5k and get the best of both. Heh.
>

> Speaking of dynamic range, the best dynamic range ever measured in the ARRL Lab
> at 5 kHz spacing belongs to the Elecraft K2 on 20 meters.

>
Whizzy little box. My JRC NRD-545 didn't come in far behind the K2 in your
front-end tests. But I'll tellya what: The 545 is one of those filterless all-DSP
radios and as far as the skirts go the cascaded Inrad filters in my antique
TS-940SAT spank the pants off the DSP skirts of the 545. And the 200Hz xtal filter
in my 75S-3B artifact take it one more step.
>
Speaking of lab tests: When are you gonna put the FT-817 thru it's paces? If that
little puppy proves to be something more than a backpacker's toy it should have a
significant market.
>

> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

>
w3rv

299. Re: Buy a ham ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 17:09:44 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <93vaso$2on$0@208.207.71.134>
Source record: 549

Brian wrote:
>
> In article <93qvm7llk0@208.207.71.147>,
> Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>
> I'd wager that fellow had some sort of
> > extreme physical impairment. That may well have been the *only* means
> he
> > had of communicating at all. It happens. I've read of quadruplegics
> who
> > use a "puffer" switch to key their rigs by blowing air through a
> straw.
> > But BrianBurkeTurkey would have Riley cite those guys for "poor
> amateur
> > practice". Shows where he's coming from. As far as I'm cncerned he can
> > go back.
>
> Dick, you are the admitted CBer.
>
> I said that people who have the skill to send correctly should do so.
> What you said above makes you a liar, but then, we know where you're
> coming from.

What you said is there for all the world to read, and it isn't what you say you said. "Admitted CBer"? Nope. Clearly Stated Legal User of CB for mobile RV use, prior to FRS which works *much* better. But you already know all that. You just like to stir in the outhouse. As always. You and Cecil deserve each other.

300. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 17:13:27 UTC
From: ccox@chopped-ham-filtre.uhc.com.invalid
Message-ID: <93vb3n$b97c$1@pike.uhc.com>
Source record: 550
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In rec.radio.amateur.antenna Lamar Owen <lamar.owen@wgcr.org> wrote:

: Why can't I work CW with my MFJ 1278 (it _does_ do CW)? Do I need the
: training in manual CW to enjoy automatic CW? Should I then be required
: to learn to copy Baudot or ASCIII by hand before using the same 1278 to
: work RTTY, AMTOR, or PacTOR?

: With the 1278 on my rig, you wouldn't be able to tell if I were working
: manual or automatic.

: And, there is really no difference in the use of the 1278 for automatic
: CW and the use of 'contest keyers' to make endless CQ's easy.

Actually, there is quite a significant a difference.

For the other digital modes (ASCII, Baudot, Pactor, Amtor, etc) the sending transmission will certainly be machine-generated. In the case of CW, that is the exception. From my experience (and from reading other peoples results too) the machine CW readers typically have major problems decoding anything that is not machine-generated.

--
Chris Cox, N0UK/G4JEC NIC Handle: CC345
UnitedHealthGroup, Inc., MN10-W116, UNIX Services & Consulting
6300 Olson Memorial Highway, Golden Valley, MN 55427
email: ccox@uhc.com (work) chrisc@chris.org (home)
A computer without MS Windows is like a dog without bricks
tied to its head.
LINUX - aka Microsoft Windows/NT - The Final Service Pack

301. Re: W4JLE Welefare Extra?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 17:16:48 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccoll@radiks.net>
Message-ID: <_dG86.1588$Bv.2402706@nntp3.onemain.com>
Source record: 551

"Gerald Schmitt" <kk5yy@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:3a630e92.336428289@nntp.mindspring.com...
>
> Well Folks,
>
> With all the sound and fury signifying nothing I just had to look into
> Fred's bona fides, very interesting reading.
>

Admirable! Now who in Sam Hill is Gerald Schmitt?

Dick, N&#65533;BK, Aging Boy Wonder

302. Re: The Election & the Commission on Civil Rights

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 17:27:55 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <93vbur$5bg$0@208.207.71.134>
Source record: 553
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Jay Woods wrote:
>
> In article <3A612EF5.BD54BEB1@sccoast.net>, stewartx@sccoast.net wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > >
> > > I was talking yesterday to a fella who has
> > > spent some time in Africa, and he was telling
> > > me about conditions there. He said "If I was
> > > a black person I'd thank my lucky stars that
> > > my ancestors were slow enough to get caught
> > > and sent over here". Instead they got Big
> > > Jesse and his stuff.
> >
> >
> > I saw an article, with similar sentiments, a couple of years ago,
> > written by the black editor of the military's Stars & Stripes newspaper
> > following his return from an extended tour in Africa. In the article,
> > he said that his trip to Africa changed his entire views about race
> > relations in the United States (he then went on to criticize those
> > blacks in American who fail to appreciate the opportunities they have).
> >
> >
> > Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
> >
> > http://www.qsl.net/w5net
>
> You guys seem to be having problems stirring up emotions in the ng's
> lately! I expect soon you'll be responding to your own posts.
>
> Oh yeah, don't believe everything RUSH and Ollie tell you, they seem to
> have trouble speaking if it's not reciting the republican line

RUSH? OLLIE? Who are they? Not anyone I ever listen to. I couldn't tell you when either is on what media or where. I know what I believe. I imagine those guys are right a lot of the time, too, but I don't use my time to listen to any of it. And I turn the channel with the Big Creep comes on the tube, Big AL too. hope I don't have to develop the same outlook on Dubya. Don't think it'll ever happen. I know I won't on Cheney.

I got an email a couple days ago from a young relative in California wanting everyone to sign a petition to have The Big Creep sign the Alaskan wildlife something-or-other into a national monument so no one

can ever drill for oil there. Young feller meantime is about to find himself sitting in the dark and cold because the stumblebums that pass for government officials there don't have sense enough to know that their electric utilities can't buy high and sell low without eventual bankruptcy. Whatta buncha clowns. I guess they've already got all the Ca coastal oil locked away. Guess they can always use candles. Won't do much good for all their Silucon Valley servers though. So much for High Tech.

> (not like
> the left is any better).

Well THAT you've got right.

> The republican party has more mantras than Jesse
> and Jonny Cochran combined!

Can you imagine a politicial of any stripe without a mantra of some sort?>

303. Re: Despicable 14.313 behavior (?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 17:29:15 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nospam.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.g77k081.pminews@ca.news.verio.net>
Source record: 552
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On 15 Jan 2001 04:59:48 GMT, Jeffrey Herman wrote:

>>Listened on 12.350 after their 14.313 ham "phone patch" was concluded.
>>They used the callsigns "sasperella" and "shooting star".
>
>Those would probably be the names of their boats. Boat names in
>lieu of callsigns are permitted on the VHF marine channels --
>perhaps the FCC now permits that also on the HF marine frequencies
>now.

Not according to the Rules. What happens in real life is
something else.....

>Coordinating two boats to meet up on a marine band frequency
>is perfectly acceptable.

The authorized carrier frequency is 12.353 kHz...

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

304. Re: The Election & the Commission on Civil Rights

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 17:33:02 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <93vc8e$67b$0@208.207.71.134>
Source record: 554

Richard McCollum wrote:
>
> "Jay Woods" <thegeek@wwa.com> wrote in message
> news:thegeek-1401010759380001@192.168.1.1...
> > Oh yeah, don't believe everything RUSH and Ollie tell you, they seem to
> > have trouble speaking if it's not reciting the republican line (not like
> > the left is any better). The republican party has more mantras than
> Jesse
> > and Jonny Cochran combined!
>
> Ain't that the godawful truth! The GOPpers have a naming department that
> rivals the Pentagon. The estate tax becomes the Death Tax. The
> completely ridiculous approach that considers a couple something other
> than two equal singles (and does not apply in Community Property states)
> becomes the Marriage Penalty. We end farm subsidies (and re-instate them
> every year since) and call it the Freedom to Farm bill. You can't
> introduce legislation without giving it a catchy and probably erroneous
> title. Anyone else selling committe chairs to the highest fund raisers
> might be called corrupt in other circles.

Giventhe alternatives, I'd rather see that than to sell hard drives to
the Chinese which contain all our nuke information.

And wasn't it neat how Janet Reno settled Riady's case the week before
Slick checks out? Sure helps keep him quiet about all Slick's treasonous
Chinese fundraising.

>
> Fun and games in the old ballyard.
>

Always

305. Re: Buy a ham ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 17:39:52 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <93vcl8$67b$1@208.207.71.134>
Source record: 555

Brian wrote:
>
> In article <93ssth$2pl$1@iac5.navix.net>,
> "W4JLE" <Fred@w4jle.com> wrote:
> > Cecil, Cecil, Cecil... You missed the whole point, I don't care one
> whit
> > about the silly definition. I was relaying to you a technical report
> based
> > on the serendipitous discovery spawned from the argument of language
> or
> > code.
> >
> > The point being that the voice recognition software works better than
> a
> > standard CW decoder. The fuzzy algorithm needed for speech will
> satisfy
> > copying poorly sent code better than a digital approach.
> >
> > Thanks to your sending me in this direction, technicians the world
> over are
> > now freed from the oppression of those nasty CW types that
> intentionally
> > malformed characters to frustrate the code challenged. The world is
> once
> > again safe and we can all sleep well!
>
> Fred, you're a true humanitarian. Perhaps you'll win the Hiram Peace
> Prize for freeing unworthy Tech slime from the jack boot of opression.
>
> Dick will be pissed, as usual.

Not me, I'm happy as hell for ya, kid. Now you don't have even
imaginary justification to call me a lid just because I won't make
myself send my Morse code to your inept "specifications".

306. Re: Left wingers getting ready

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 17:46:40 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <93vd20$85m$0@208.207.71.134>
Source record: 556

W4JLE wrote:
>
> Some of the left wing nonsense, this from Ramsey Clark former Attorney
> General (D)
> complete with neutral wording such as "Governor death"... January 20th
> should be fun. A search of the internet shows all the cock roaches are
> coming out of the woodwork.

Don't worry about 'em, Fred, they're relatively harmless. They just
make a lot of noise and consume bandwidth.
Real people keep their rifles in the closet. All those nuts have is a
bumper sticker that says "Gunfree and Proud of it".

> THIRTEEN REASONS TO PROTEST AT BUSH'S INAUGURATION ON JAN. 20
>
> On Jan. 20, thousands of people will march and rally to protest at George
> W. Bush's inauguration in Washington and San Francisco. We will be
> demonstrating against the incoming Bush administration and its racist,

307. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 17:50:57 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <93vda1$8p0$0@208.207.71.134>
Source record: 557

W1RFI wrote:
>
> >From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
>
> >Read it a little closer, Rich. Jim is advocating Morse code testing for
> >any ham who wishes to use CW on the CW segments of ham radio bands. The
> >rest of it is already moot - unless you actually do advocate doing away
> >with CW completely.
>
> Why would testing of the encoding method used in Morse code be necessary before
> granting CW access in the CW portion of the band. Are you afraid hordes of
> people will learn Morse code wrong and try to get on the air? Those that learn
> the code will use the mode, just as badly as I did at first and will improve
> with time if they stick to it.
>

Sot hen you've changed your mind about totally incompetent attempts at
sending Morse code on the air constituting poor Amateur practice?

> Would you advocate that the VEs determine that a ham has working RTTY equipment
> before he or she is permitted to use RTTY on the digital portions of the bands?
>

That remark is inconsistant with reality and you know it. But then much
of what goes on in the regulatory world today is.

308. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 18:02:04 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <93vdusald0@208.207.71.134>
Source record: 558

Cecil wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > But downgrading he code to the very minimum required by treaty has had
> > not had the effect of adding hams to the ranks, in the 10 months the new
> > regs have been in effect.
>
> That just means that the code requirement should have been dropped,
> not just reduced.

Bet you a lobster that the same thing occurs when the do dropthe code
test entirely.

What happened to all those hoards of CBers and
> freebanders that you predicted would invade the ARS?

They arrived early. In the form of lots of no coders and slow coders.
No real surprise, lots of them have came through the VE system. And many
have gone on to other more productive "freeband" activities where they
find conditions and 'services' better than 27 mhz and they don't have to
put up with dodging ham radio regulations and renewed enforcement.
Things do evolve. Ham radio is evolving -mutating would be a better
choice of words,like a cancer- into something unrecognizable. Ah well,
no good thing lasts forever. Ham radio is no different in that respect.

309. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 18:49:51 UTC
From: rwclark@seanet.com
Message-ID: <3a7142b7.407700141@news.seanet.com>
Source record: 559
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Mon, 15 Jan 2001 11:19:57 -0500, Lamar Owen <lamar.owen@wgcr.org>
wrote:

>
>I didn't get involved in this thread because of that, Dick. No, I
>bothered reading the thread because a pro-code proponent expressed that
>he wasn't surprised that a NoCode licensee killed someone. That's
>pretty inflammatory.
>

Hi Lamar,

You are right about what started this, but of the 384+ postings, this thread spin-off from prior, repugnant topics almost ceased from the beginning to conform to that trash. There are hardly more than 4 or 5 that responded to that where the remaining 380 postings have simply focused on the obvious inflammatory subject of the CW requirement.

I suppose that the originator of this (not W. G. Ewald, but Fraudtenna) might clamor that those 380+ postings are off topic, but thankfully Fraudtenna has abandoned the dung heap they tried to build as a monument to their moral authority.

In a sense, the topic No-code kills has evolved into a statement that no-code replacing CW requirements is killing amateur radio. That certainly is inflammatory enough to stimulate the number of postings and participants.

73's
Richard Clark, KB7QHC

310. RM-10018

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 19:00:47 UTC
From: K0HB <k0hb@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <93vhcpsrf1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 560

--
Before the
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Washington, D.C. 20544

January 15, 2001

In the matter of)
)
Amendment of Part 97 of the) RM-10018
Commission's Rules to Allow)
Increased Frequency Privileges to)
Amateurs having Proficiency in)
Telegraphy in Accordance with the)
International Requirements)

To: The Commission

COMMENTS ON RM-10018

The commenter, Hans Brakob, an FCC Amateur Radio Licensee
for several decades, assigned station call K0HB, agrees
in principle with the petition of Joseph Speroni, AH0A,
and proposes an expansion of the frequencies allowed.

1. Because of attrition (no new Novices being licensed),
current Novice licensees (and Technician licensees who have
passed the 5WPM Morse code test) face a continuously
diminishing ability to engage in Morse contacts in their
current CW band segments.

2. While these segments are also available for use by other
license classes, most licensees with higher class licenses
tend to avoid the Novice sub-bands so as not to infringe
on this reserved practice territory. This well-meaning
reluctance to infringe may be misplaced, but it is real,
and has at least two undesirable consequences.

3. First, it creates an "ghetto" where Novices are isolated
from mainstream Amateur Radio and do not gain exposure
to the benefits of interacting with more experienced and
skilled operators, and

4. Second, because of attrition, these already-underutilized
band segments will see less and less activity while other
adjacent segments become more crowded because of increasing
popularity of other emerging data modes like PSK31.

5. I further propose that this concept be applied to the
"General" segments of all MF/HF amateur bands, not just the
4 bands proposed in the instant petition. If Novices were
allowed to participate in the full range of CW operations
(CW only at reduced power of 200W) on all bands, such as
traffic handling, radiosporting ("contests"), and DX�ing,
they would be much more likely to gain in skills and enthusiasm,
and aspire to gain the theoretical knowledge to upgrade to the
increased power and mode capabilities of General or Extra
license classes.

Respectfully submitted,

H. Hans Brakob, K0HB
1610 Weston Lane
Plymouth, MN 55447-2855

--
"1943 Poster Child for The National Precocious Little Bastard Campaign"

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

311. Re: Despicable 14.313 behavior (?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 19:31:23 UTC
From: jeffreyh@Hawaii.Edu
Message-ID: <93vj6blqc1@news.hawaii.edu>
Source record: 562
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

>On 15 Jan 2001 04:59:48 GMT, Jeffrey Herman wrote:
>
>>>Listened on 12.350 after their 14.313 ham "phone patch" was concluded.
>>>They used the callsigns "sasperella" and "shooting star".

I didn't write that, Phil. Make sure you get the attribution lines
correct when you edit.

Jeff KH6O

312. Al Gross

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 19:35:51 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccoll@radiks.net>
Message-ID: <6gl86.1653$Bv.2488021@nntp3.onemain.com>
Source record: 561

Last week's Economist had an obit for Al Gross who was the father of just about every wireless mobile device known to man. I believe that he was W8PAL.

Anyone have any contact with him??

313. Re: Al Gross

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 19:59:03 UTC
From: K0HB <k0hb@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <93vkq3$43$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 563

In article <6gI86.1653$Bv.2488021@nntp3.onemain.com>,
"Richard McCollum" <rmccoll@radiks.net> wrote:

> Last week's Economist had an obit for Al Gross who was the
> father of just about every wireless mobile device known to
> man. I believe that he was W8PAL.
>
> Anyone have any contact with him??

No, but I'll keep trying to break through. If you contact him before I
do, let me know the temperature at his current QTH.

73, Hans, K0HB

--
> >Frisbeetarianism: The belief that when you die,
> >your soul goes up the on roof and gets stuck.

> What roof would this be? Does everyone get stuck on the same roof?
> Or do we get a roof of our own?

The Roof of the Universe. And in the Last Days, when the Great Frisbee
that shineth in the sky hath gone out, then shalt the Almighty Thrower
ascend the Ladder of Life and collect the souls of those who have flown
free, and take them The Eternal Park, where we shall sail upon the
Spring Breezes for ever and ever, and be Fetched by the Holy Dog. Amen.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

314. Re: W4JLE Welefare Extra?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 20:20:27 UTC
From: W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com>
Message-ID: <93vm5n$pj0$1@iac5.navix.net>
Source record: 564

Nice quote from Macbeth, however I happen to have a certificate from a midnight session of the last day showing I upgraded under the old scheme. Never really cared about getting the Extra until they were about to remove the code requirement. To be honest, I have been laying back in the weeds waiting for someone to bring this up since the change in regs. Yes, the public record speaks for it's self, one simply has to understand what it is saying.

If you look, you will see that the date you quote is a second change since that time. Go to the FCC database and check the progression.

Why should I cast aspersions toward you, I leave those tactics to those that have no rational arguments. If you have any doubts about my qualifications, you need only ask and I will be glad to point you in the right direction. This will save you from making invalid conclusions.

73 Fred W4JLE
"Gerald Schmitt" <kk5yy@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:3a630e92.336428289@nntp.mindspring.com...
>
> Well Folks,
>
> With all the sound and fury signifying nothing I just had to look into
> Fred's bona fides, very interesting reading.
>
> It seems that just before the change in the code requirements Fred was
> and Advanced Class amateur holding the call W4JLE now it seems he
> hold an Amateur Extra license effective June 03, 2000 this is well
> past the change in code requirements for Amateur Extra. One can
> only presume from all this that Fred waited until the code
> requirements were reduced before upgrading. The question is, why?
>
> In my own cynical way I have to presume that Fred, despite all the
> sound and fury, was unable to pass Element 1C and so had to wait
> until the bar was lowered to get his Amateur Extra. This casts
> doubt on all of his blathering about traffic handling, superiority,
> the value of other, etc. I'm sure there is a wonderful excuse and
> lots of aspersions to be cast at me for this revelation but the
> public record speaks for itself.
>
> In the hash light of these new revelations I am forced to conclude
> Freddie had been fibbing to us and I'm afraid I won't be able
> to consider anything he says from now on to be credible. Oh well,
> he never had anything interesting to say anyway. Please be
> careful Fred, word on the street is that you go to Hell for lying.

>
>

315. No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 20:26:52 UTC
From: Vincent Biancomano <103520.355@CompuServe.COM>
Message-ID: <93vmecmoe1@sshuraab-i-1.production.compuserve.com>
Source record: 565

VB>I've also outlined the details for
VB>18 years, in published form. ARRL has some of those
VB>papers.

>This message is sent to both Vince and the Technical Information Service
>at ARRL.

>Do you have file copies of some of these documents and published
>articles/letters that outline proposals for a better examination system?
>I'd love to see them. If they are only in hardcopy form, I'd even be
>willing to pay either party reasonable expenses for photocopies,
>postage, and research time. This request is being made of both parties
>(Vince and ARRL TIS) and includes any and all published articles by
>Vince Biancomano, WB2EZG (not just those concerned with a better
>examination system). For any unpublished documents from Vince in
>possession of the ARRL, please contact Vince regarding any required
>release permissions.

I'll make it easy for you to find, Paul: Among my letters to ARRL include
my newsletters sent to the division membership during all my runs for director
(that's an ARRL rule). Easy to locate, all in public forum. One of them
especially went into detailed discussion about what to do to protect/improve
the Service re: deregulation. They will also have my 300-word statements (as
part of the ARRL mailouts) on file. They will also have on file two letters
concerning my proposal to initiate the (first) Spectrum Protection Act (which
they allowed me credit for on at least one of my 300-word statements).

Other information you ask for is of a technical-article nature: October
1972, March 1974, and January 1977 QST (that one a Cover Plaque).

If ARRL has none of these, a summary of all those suggestions to improve
the exam process per se was filed with FCC in their restructuring proposal.
On the FCC site, in public forum. In only 4 pages, as I remember.

Just to keep you knowledgeable, my runs for director were based on
what was possible for the voter, not impossible. Far from your
'dictatorial' label, my platform specifically pushed binding referenda
in the Hudson Division: a no-nonsense binding vote by membership
to be held on the most important (major) issues that the director would
be bound to in his vote on the Board. One or more of my opponents
spent time racing about the division with the message that it couldn't
be done, and/or it wouldn't be good. The 'binding referenda' idea
made them nervous. In that context, there's also a letter on file to an
ARRL reform committee re: nasty politics that came about at my
expense during my run to push binding referenda.

During the course of my "runs" (two of them three-man races, two of them two-man races) my message evoked three major responses:

1. You won't really bring binding referenda, will you!
2. Your message about binding referenda is scaring a lot of people.
3. You come on as too honest, thus we're confused.

Comment (1) told me that someone was trying very hard to convince them I wouldn't do what I promised, or that the voters were looking for a way out when faced with a solution to their supposed 'we're never heard' problem.

Comment (2) confirmed that people complain about not having say, but if given say, they'd run. Comment (3) pleased me greatly, because it told me that, by definition, I wasn't a politician. Comment (3) said clearly that voters indeed _expect_ bull in a politician: that is, they expect a lot of nonsense.

One 80+ year old ham told me back then "Vince, people don't want solutions, they say they want control but they just want to hear themselves complain. They want to be kicked in the *** so hard that they cry. Believe me, son, that's what they really want."

I believe him, now. The business about voters wanting to discuss the "issues" is hoary nonsense. They generally don't. They want someone to tell them what they want to hear, then lead them by the hand, then complain about it later that they have no say, just so that they have something to complain about.

In that context, I learned a lot about what a good politician does. And a lot about the 'herd' instinct in humans. Happily, too, I learned I'm not a politician because I refused to enter the world of double-speak. I talked issues, my opponent(s) danced around them and talked about nothing, actually. Which is, interestingly enough, why I don't hold politicians in high regard. The best politicians are rather like circus and magic people, when you come down to it: now you see it, now you don't. They're actually into entertainment.

Sleep well, Paul.

Regards,
Vince, WB2EZG

316. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 20:35:15 UTC
From: W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com>
Message-ID: <93vn1g$q6e$1@iac5.navix.net>
Source record: 566

Brings up an interesting point Ed, how many folks operate spread spectrum Morse? Does anyone in fact do this? (serious question)

Why the construction requirement? Do I need to build a computer for the PSK31 as well?

I will concede that someone who has the ability to construct a spread spectrum transceiver is superior to me in that respect.

Back when my eyes were good and my hands were steady the smallest active element I had to deal with was a 6AQ5, now I can barely see a surface mounted component, let alone solder the dam thing.

73 Fred W4JLE

news:20010115073413.09203.00001189@ng-cr1.aol.com...
> >From: "W4JLE" Fred@w4jle.com
>
> >Yep, they sure are. Now would you care to place a wager if there were me and
> >a nocoder, which could get on the air using the mode they were not
> >proficient in the quickest.
>
> Here are the terms. Let's select someone with a no-code license and you. He
> or she will be asked to construct a Morse-code transmitter and make a Morse
> code QSO. You will be asked to construct a spread-spectrum transmitter and
> make a Morse code QSO. Winner gets an ARRL Handbook from the "bent-cover" bin.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>

317. Re: Despicable 14.313 behavior resumes

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 20:40:52 UTC
From: firebottle@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <93vn8i$2cq$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 568
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <93tmh7$9g6$1@dagobah.blueriver.net>,
"DX405" <lightnin9@hotmail.com> wrote:
> Hopefully KC8JBO will be getting a notice for his on air behavior.

Strange, I didn't hear KC8JBO, just a bunch of identifieds. Riley can't do much with the unidentifieds.

He needs to be off the air like WB2OTK and some of the others.

What others?? The people who were thought to be the " Biggest " troublemakers are gone, examples: KV4FZ, KT4TR, W4FQF, W4LLI, K4OKA, K4VVV (Little Richard drunken disc jockey), gone from 14.313, but the qrm'ing continues. Rich WB2OTK wasn't/isn't the problem. The problem is the inability of the FCC (and, this isn't Riley's problem) to fund people to track them down.

It's doubtful if any " official notices will come out of this. Most of the rhetoric has been from NG's and newbies.

.

> "Joe Black" <jbla88@houston.net> wrote in message
> news:3A623756.33C94D8B@houston.net...
> > Fortunately, Riley Hollingsworth got an earful. Time for more
official
> > notice

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

318. Re: HA HA HA: Bush won popular vote!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 20:43:03 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <93vncl$2eg$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 567
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

```
why hasn't
> this total appeared on the ABC News web page ?
>
> Hahahaha.. this is so typical of the right wing Limbrain cabal.
>
> Sent via Deja.com
> http://www.deja.com/
>
See above...beginning with Hahahaha..
Change right to left
Change Limbrain cabal to Klintoon goofs.

Dan/W4NTI

--
"Just tellin the truth, and they cain't stand it."

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/
```

319. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 20:55:06 UTC
From: W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com>
Message-ID: <93vo6mqvf1@iac5.navix.net>
Source record: 569

Of course it does, same as it makes me better at that skill than one who has never figured an exposure problem.

Ed, the demonization of someone being superior is a product of the feel good generation. Soccer games for kids that do not keep score ,so no one feels bad. Gradeless classes for the same reason. One could go on forever listing the esteem building exercises.

The reason you see such vitriolic response, is for many this is the first time in their life they have been told they don't measure up. Do you not sense the "it's my God given right to be equal in all respects regardless of effort" attitude in the responses?

I exist, therefore I deserve... (stolen from another post)

Does a superior skill make be better than someone else in the grand scheme of things? Nope! But the interpretation today is if you claim a superiority in any field, you are doing it to "hurt the feelings" of those that don't have the skill.

I personally don't give a red rat's hindparts if anyone ever learns or uses CW, I do care that they find it offensive that someone else has acquired the skill and that the longest threads on the newsgroup are the apologists for the code challenged.

Enjoy what ever privileges they may have and knock off the nonsense, until then I shall enjoy demonstrating the absurd with absurdity.

73 Fred W4JLE

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20010115073514.09203.00001190@ng-cr1.aol.com...
> >From: "W4JLE" Fred@w4jle.com
>
> >Oh Yah! Well I got this book by this W1RFI guy and I can figure that
stuff
> >too!
>
> I am sure you can, but compared to me, you are very slow at it.
>
> Does that make me a better ham except in that one area?
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

320. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 20:56:43 UTC
From: W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com>
Message-ID: <93vo9n$r0e$1@iac5.navix.net>
Source record: 570

Ed's VFO is in-op that high in the band, you will have to explain what goes on, on 14.313 before Ed can answer.

"Brian" <brianburke@my-deja.com> wrote in message news:93v20qebk1@nnrp1.deja.com...
> In article <20010115073514.09203.00001190@ng-cr1.aol.com>,
> w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:
> > >From: "W4JLE" Fred@w4jle.com
> >
> > >Oh Yah! Well I got this book by this W1RFI guy and I can figure that
> stuff
> > >too!
> >
> > I am sure you can, but compared to me, you are very slow at it.
> >
> > Does that make me a better ham except in that one area?
> >
> > 73,
> > Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
> Do you have a web page dedicated to 14.313?
>
>
> Sent via Deja.com
> http://www.deja.com/

321. Re: Despicable 14.313 behavior resumes

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 21:00:23 UTC
From: KC8JBO <roger_kc8jbo@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <93vod2$3eu$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 571
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <93vn8i$2cq$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
firebottle@my-deja.com wrote:
> In article <93tmh7$9g6$1@dagobah.blueriver.net>,
> "DX405" <lightnin9@hotmail.com> wrote:
> > Hopefully KC8JBO will be getting a notice for his on air behavior.
>
> Strange, I didn't hear KC8JBO, just a bunch of identifieds. Riley
> can't do much with the unidentifieds.

That's because I don't operate on 14.313....
Lllllloyd hasn't figured that out yet.

> He needs to be off the air like WB2OTK and some of the others.
>
> What others?? The people who were thought to be the " Biggest "
> troublemakers are gone, examples: KV4FZ, KT4TR, W4FQF, W4LLI, K4OKA,
> K4VVV (Little Richard drunken disc jockey), gone from 14.313, but
the
> qrm'ing continues. Rich WB2OTK wasn't/isn't the problem. The problem
is
> the inability of the FCC (and, this isn't Riley's problem) to fund
> people to track them down.
>
> It's doubtful if any " official notices will come out of this. Most of
> the rhetoric has been from NG's and newbies.

LOL!!!!!!!!

> > "Joe Black" <jbla88@houston.net> wrote in message
> > news:3A623756.33C94D8B@houston.net...
> > > Fortunately, Riley Hollingsworth got an earful. Time for more
> official
> > > notice
>
> Sent via Deja.com
> http://www.deja.com/
>

--
73 de Roger, KC8JBO
EM99 |ARRL|VE [ARRL & W5YI]|ARES |RACES
Yaesu FT-920 |Inverted Vee @ 40 ft.
Yaesu FT-90R

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

322. Re: Despicable 14.313 behavior resumes

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 21:02:02 UTC
From: KC8JBO <roger_kc8jbo@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <93vog4$3gi$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 572
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <93tmh7$9g6$1@dagobah.blueriver.net>,
"DX405" <lightnin9@hotmail.com> wrote:
> Hopefully KC8JBO will be getting a notice for his on air behavior. He
needs
> to be off the air like WB2OTK and some of the others.

Hopefully, "DX405" will get a better job so he can afford something
other than CHEAP-ASS RADIO SHACK RADIOS.
But cheap is as cheap does......

> "Joe Black" <jbla88@houston.net> wrote in message
> news:3A623756.33C94D8B@houston.net...
> > Fortunately, Riley Hollingsworth got an earful. Time for more
official
> > notices?
>
>

--
73 de Roger, KC8JBO
EM99 |ARRL|VE [ARRL & W5YI]|ARES |RACES
Yaesu FT-920 |Inverted Vee @ 40 ft.
Yaesu FT-90R

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

323. Re: W4JLE Welefare Extra?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 21:11:04 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <rJJ86.824$e5.2146968@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 573

W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com> wrote:

> If you have any doubts about my qualifications, you need only ask ...

If anyone has doubts about my qualifications wrt CW, they can meet me on 40 M and judge for themselves. That will be a better indicator than the code speed of the test I took in 1976.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

324. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 21:13:54 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <6MJ86.825$e5.2147019@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 574

W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com> wrote:

> Real hams send dit's and dah's, the rest try to find something else to
> establish their pseudo self esteem.

Do you believe my dits and dahs are more valuable to the Amateur Radio
Service than the rest of my accomplishments?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

325. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 21:15:07 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <eNJ86.826$e5.2147078@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 575

Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

> His superiority will get traffic passed on radiotelegraphy.

True enough. What percentage of traffic is passed using CW?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

326. Re: RM-10018

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 21:16:23 UTC
From: "Steven J Robeson", K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <93vpau$4ep$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 578

In article <93vhcpsrf1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
K0HB <k0hb@my-deja.com> wrote:
> --
> Before the
> FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
> Washington, D.C. 20544
>
> January 15, 2001
>
> In the matter of)
>)
> Amendment of Part 97 of the) RM-10018
> Commission's Rules to Allow)
> Increased Frequency Privileges to)
> Amateurs having Proficiency in)
> Telegraphy in Accordance with the)
> International Requirements)
>
> To: The Commission
>
> COMMENTS ON RM-1001

Snip

I like it.

73

Steve, K4YZ
> --
> "1943 Poster Child for The National Precocious Little Bastard
Campaign"
>
> Sent via Deja.com
> http://www.deja.com/
>

--
"If You're Not A Ham....You're SPAM!"

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

327. Re: Al Gross

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 21:19:06 UTC
From: "Steven J Robeson", K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <93vpg1$4go$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 580

In article <6gI86.1653$Bv.2488021@nntp3.onemain.com>,
"Richard McCollum" <rmccoll@radiks.net> wrote:

>Last week's Economist had an obit for Al Gross who was the father of
>just about every wireless mobile device known to man. I believe that
>he was W8PAL.

>>Anyone have any contact with him?

Not recently, Dick, but I did have a 20M CW QSO with Elvis last
week.

73

Steve, K4YZ

"If You're Not A Ham, You're SPAM!"

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

328. Re: Despicable 14.313 behavior resumes

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 21:20:05 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <93vphs$4hh$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 579

In article <20010115091954.00714.00001895@nso-md.aol.com>,
yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote:
> In article <20010114203543.19385.00001994@ng-fy1.aol.com>,
w1rfi@aol.com
> (W1RFI) writes:
>
> >
> >>From: Brian brianburke@my-deja.com
> >
> >>Was it more "Battle of the Pre-99 Extras?"
> >
> >I don't know. What percentage of the pre-99 Extras participated?
>
> Brian/Ed:
>
> What is the significance of 1999? Restructuring and the "nickle
> Extra" took place in April, 2000. If that's what you're talking
about,
> you'd have to say "The pre-4/15/2000 Extras," to indicate Extra-
> class operators who had taken and passed the 20 WPM code
> test element.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>
I'd like to know what was said/done....Sounded like it did 5 years ago,
matter of fact, had the same jammer tapes. So, whats the point?

Dan/W4NTI

--
"Just tellin the truth, and they cain't stand it."

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

329. Re: Despicable 14.313 behavior resumes

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 21:23:08 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <93vpni$4l8$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 581
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <93vn8i$2cq$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
firebottle@my-deja.com wrote:
> In article <93tmh7$9g6$1@dagobah.blueriver.net>,
> "DX405" <lightnin9@hotmail.com> wrote:
> > Hopefully KC8JBO will be getting a notice for his on air behavior.
>
> Strange, I didn't hear KC8JBO, just a bunch of identifieds. Riley
can't
> do much with the unidentifieds.
>
> He needs to be off the air like WB2OTK and some of the others.
>
> What others?? The people who were thought to be the " Biggest "
> troublemakers are gone, examples: KV4FZ, KT4TR, W4FQF, W4LLI, K4OKA,
> K4VVV (Little Richard drunken disc jockey), gone from 14.313, but
the
> qrm'ing continues. Rich WB2OTK wasn't/isn't the problem. The problem
is
> the inability of the FCC (and, this isn't Riley's problem) to fund
> people to track them down.
>
> It's doubtful if any " official notices will come out of this. Most of
> the rhetoric has been from NG's and newbies.
>
> .
>
> > "Joe Black" <jbla88@houston.net> wrote in message
> > news:3A623756.33C94D8B@houston.net...
> > > Fortunately, Riley Hollingsworth got an earful. Time for more
> official
> > > notice
>
> Sent via Deja.com
> http://www.deja.com/
>
Exactly what I, and others have said for years. Its the 3rd element,
not the 'major players'. Remember when NR5T, Douglas, was blammed for
all sorts of crap? He goes away, and still got the crap. Duuuuuuu!

Dan/W4NTI

--
"Just tellin the truth, and they cain't stand it."

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

330. Re: Despicable 14.313 behavior resumes

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 21:25:31 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <93vps0$4vn$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 584
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <93vog4$3gi$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
KC8JBO <roger_kc8jbo@my-deja.com> wrote:
> In article <93tmh7$9g6$1@dagobah.blueriver.net>,
> "DX405" <lightnin9@hotmail.com> wrote:
> > Hopefully KC8JBO will be getting a notice for his on air behavior.
He
> needs
> > to be off the air like WB2OTK and some of the others.
>
> Hopefully, "DX405" will get a better job so he can afford something
> other than CHEAP-ASS RADIO SHACK RADIOS.
> But cheap is as cheap does......
>
> > "Joe Black" <jbla88@houston.net> wrote in message
> > news:3A623756.33C94D8B@houston.net...
> > > Fortunately, Riley Hollingsworth got an earful. Time for more
> official
> > > notices?
> >
> >
>
> --
> 73 de Roger, KC8JBO
> EM99 |ARRL|VE [ARRL & W5YI]|ARES |RACES
> Yaesu FT-920 |Inverted Vee @ 40 ft.
> Yaesu FT-90R
>
> Sent via Deja.com
> http://www.deja.com/
>
He didn't even pay for it....ask him about it.

Dan/W4NTI

--
"Just tellin the truth, and they cain't stand it."

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

331. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 21:25:41 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <8XJ86.827$e5.2148398@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 576

W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com> wrote:

> Does a superior skill make be better than someone else in the grand
scheme
> of things? Nope! But the interpretation today is if you claim a
superiority
> in any field, you are doing it to "hurt the feelings" of those that don't
> have the skill.

I don't think anyone would take any objection at all to a statement that you are superior in a particular field. Let me try it:

I can copy 45 wpm in my head and 25 wpm on paper, so I am a superior CW operator to those who cannot. -- Ed

What they would object to is a statement they believe implies that such as skill makes me superior to them, without any mention of what field. My superior CW skills may indeed make me a superior ham, unless that non-coded op has an even greater accomplishment somewhere else that overshadows mine. And, I will add, that I do NOT believe that my CW copying skills are the greatest accomplishment I have in ham radio. Nor do I believe that my own accomplishments put me at the top of the "superiority" heap; there are others who have, IMHO, done more for ham radio than I have.

> I personally don't give a red rat's hindparts if anyone ever learns or
uses
> CW, I do care that they find it offensive that someone else has acquired
the
> skill and that the longest threads on the newsgroup are the apologists for
> the code challenged.

I don't find it offensive that you have aquired CW skills, nor do I find it offensive that others have not.

Although I agree that it is important to keep score in a soccer game, I do not believe that it is necessary to keep score in everything in life. Maybe this would all make more sense to you if you viewed it as personal accomplishment instead of another game of who-tops-who. I judge my own accomplishments only by my own standards. I do not need to hold them up to anyone else's accomplishments to feel that I have done something worthwhile.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

>
> Enjoy what ever privileges they may have and knock off the nonsense, until
> then I shall enjoy demonstrating the absurd with absurdity.

>
> 73 Fred W4JLE
>
> "W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20010115073514.09203.00001190@ng-cr1.aol.com...
> > >From: "W4JLE" Fred@w4jle.com
> >
> > >Oh Yah! Well I got this book by this W1RFI guy and I can figure that
> stuff
> > >too!
> >
> > I am sure you can, but compared to me, you are very slow at it.
> >
> > Does that make me a better ham except in that one area?
> >
> > 73,
> > Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
>

332. Re: W4JLE Welefare Extra?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 21:27:55 UTC
From: kk5yy@arrl.net
Message-ID: <3a646aa2.360000040@nntp.mindspring.com>
Source record: 577

On Mon, 15 Jan 2001 15:20:27 -0500, "W4JLE" <Fred@w4jle.com> wrote:

>Nice quote from Macbeth, however I happen to have a certificate from a
>midnight session of the last day showing I upgraded under the old scheme.
>Never really cared about getting the Extra until they were about to remove
>the code requirement. To be honest, I have been laying back in the weeds
>waiting for someone to bring this up since the change in regs. Yes, the
>public record speaks for it's self, one simply has to understand what it is
>saying.

Sorry Fred I don't believe you. All the April 15 stuff was long
finished by June 03 sorry OM that dog won't hunt.
>
>If you look, you will see that the date you quote is a second change since
>that time. Go to the FCC database and check the progression.
>
>Why should I cast aspersions toward you, I leave those tactics to those that
>have no rational arguments. If you have any doubts about my qualifications,
>you need only ask and I will be glad to point you in the right direction.
>This will save you from making invalid conclusions.

You don't seem to me to be the best source for the real story. You
seem to make much out of other folks abilities and such I just
thought your feet of clay might need a little sun.

>
>73 Fred W4JLE
>"Gerald Schmitt" <kk5yy@arrl.net> wrote in message
>news:3a630e92.336428289@nntp.mindspring.com...
>>
>> Well Folks,
>>
>> With all the sound and fury signifying nothing I just had to look into
>> Fred's bona fides, very interesting reading.
>>
>> It seems that just before the change in the code requirements Fred was
>> and Advanced Class amateur holding the call W4JLE now it seems he
>> hold an Amateur Extra license effective June 03, 2000 this is well
>> past the change in code requirements for Amateur Extra. One can
>> only presume from all this that Fred waited until the code
>> requirements were reduced before upgrading. The question is, why?
>>
>> In my own cynical way I have to presume that Fred, despite all the
>> sound and fury, was unable to pass Element 1C and so had to wait
>> until the bar was lowered to get his Amateur Extra. This casts

>> doubt on all of his blathering about traffic handling, superiority,
>> the value of other, etc. I'm sure there is a wonderful excuse and
>> lots of aspersions to be cast at me for this revelation but the
>> public record speaks for itself.
>>
>> In the hash light of these new revelations I am forced to conclude
>> Freddie had been fibbing to us and I'm afraid I won't be able
>> to consider anything he says from now on to be credible. Oh well,
>> he never had anything interesting to say anyway. Please be
>> careful Fred, word on the street is that you go to Hell for lying.
>>
>>
>
>

333. Re: Despicable 14.313 behavior (?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 21:30:12 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <93vq4p$52t$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 583
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <58u86.28956$U4.812484@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>,
"Golden delicious" <zemu09090@hotmail.com> wrote:
>
> "Joe Black" <jbla88@houston.net> wrote in message
news:3A623756.33C94D8B@houston.net...
> > Fortunately, Riley Hollingsworth got an earful. Time for more
official
> > notices?
>
> Hope so. Wonder if he was listening earlier also?
>
> At around 9:15 AM Central on 14.313 on 14 Jan 2001
> two stations from a maritime "net" on 14.300 helped a maritime ham
station phone
> patch to an individual who openly announced on the patch
> that he was not a licenced operator but would meet up with the
maritime
> ham regardless, on the frequency of 12.350 mHz USB.
> Listened on 12.350 after their 14.313 ham "phone patch" was concluded.
> They used the callsigns "sasperella" and "shooting star".
> Whole activity was questionable from beginning to end.
> Nice to see that 20m ham nets facilitate comms on non-ham freqs
> by potentially unauthorized individuals. Makes the Service look real
nice.
>
> Did you hear this too R.H. ?
>
>
Probably not.....like the 5 mhz 'stumpjumper' frequency?

Dan/W4NTI

--
"Just tellin the truth, and they cain't stand it."

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

334. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 21:32:54 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <W1K86.828$e5.2149093@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 582

W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com> wrote:

> Why the construction requirement? Do I need to build a computer for the
> PSK31 as well?

If we are going to have a wager that is analogous to the requirement to manually decode Morse code, I think the manual requirements of construction are an important part of the analogy.

> I will concede that someone who has the ability to construct a spread
> spectrum transceiver is superior to me in that respect.

Yes, just like your ability to receive Morse code fast makes you superior to him in that respect.

Just remember, there are about 650,000 of us, and if we are all assigned a superiority rank, only one of us will be #1. The rest of us are all probably somewhere well down the list.

> Back when my eyes were good and my hands were steady the smallest active
> element I had to deal with was a 6AQ5, now I can barely see a surface
> mounted component, let alone solder the dam thing.

Fortunately, you can look at a lifetime of accomplishments and not have to rely on any single of one of them for a sense of self worth. Maybe that applies to all of us.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

>
> 73 Fred W4JLE
>
> news:20010115073413.09203.00001189@ng-cr1.aol.com...
> > >From: "W4JLE" Fred@w4jle.com
> >
> > >Yep, they sure are. Now would you care to place a wager if there were
me
> and
> > >a nocoder, which could get on the air using the mode they were not
> > >proficient in the quickest.
> >
> > Here are the terms. Let's select someone with a no-code license and
you.
> He
> > or she will be asked to construct a Morse-code transmitter and make a
> Morse

> > code QSO. You will be asked to construct a spread-spectrum transmitter
> and
> > make a Morse code QSO. Winner gets an ARRL Handbook from the
"bent-cover"
> bin.
> >
> > 73,
> > Ed Hare, W1RFI
> >
>
>

335. Re: Buy a ham ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 21:42:01 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <saK86.829$e5.2149970@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 585

Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

> Yet certain ARRL officials advocate that anyone who wants should be
> free to attempt to operate CW anytime and anywhere on the bands they
> wish. So can we then presume that ARRL advocates ignoring certain rules
> that advance a PC agenda WRT Morse code?

Did the ARRL advocate ignoring the rules, or changing the rules?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

336. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 21:53:12 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <YkK86.830$e5.2151089@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 586

Len Over 21 <lenover21@aol.com> wrote:

> Jim: The "boring" part is due to spread-spectrum not being
> intuitive...and few have explained either direct-sequence or
> frequency-hopping in simpler terms or in terms that long-
> timers can accept. Long-timers referring to being used to
> conventional narrowband frequency tuning as practiced in
> amateur radio today.

I think the biggest issue here is that some think of SS as a 'digital' mode.
The most common application for SS is for voice communications.

> One amateur band somewhere in the spectrum would be
> ideal for DSSS or FHSS trials. I would think it woud be
> preferrable in an urban area having many potential users,
> such as VHF or UHF with a repeater.

I think that 2.4 GHz would probably be the best first choice. There is
certainly a lot of equipment coming available for that frequency range.

> There is one problem at present, a very big one, and that is
> standardization of the SS characteristics. At present
> the characteristics are individual to a manufacturer and
> hardly any are alike enough to be interoperable. In order
> to use it for a trial, every participant MUST be using the
> SAME characteristic.

Or different characteristics and not hearing each other. :-)

Maybe the Bluetooth spec would be a reasonable starting place. Start with
the chipsets or steal the board out of the first low-cost device to have a
Bluetooth board in it.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

337. Re: HA HA HA: Bush won popular vote!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 22:00:57 UTC
From: W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com>
Message-ID: <93vs23$12b$1@iac5.navix.net>
Source record: 587
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

I think you have the mental ability to answer your own question, however if you actually need the reason ABC has not posted the final results, e-mail me and I will be glad to enlighten you about the liberal media without taking up newsgroup bandwidth. I seriously hope you are kidding about ABC being your final authority on anything. Tell me what you have seen on ABC about the brutal killings in Kansas?

"Dr. Conrad Connie" <coontail@my-deja.com> wrote in message news:93v4u6$h2d$1@nnrp1.deja.com...
>
> No they haven't been confirmed and in fact if they have, why hasn't
> this total appeared on the ABC News web page ?
>
> Hahahaha.. this is so typical of the right wing Limbrain cabal.
>
>
> Sent via Deja.com
> http://www.deja.com/

338. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 22:04:34 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <CvK86.831$e5.2152049@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 588

Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com> wrote:

>> When I took my General before the FCC, most of the time, I knew which
>> questions I guessed at.

> Thats pretty fantastic memorization, most of the time.

Why would you consider it fantastic memorization that to this day, I still remember that I didn't have a clue about the question about the impedance of open wire line, or that I didn't know what a parasitic oscillation was, but knew it had some effect on interference, so I guess right. A memory that can't hold onto such generalizations is a pretty poor one.

> If your memory is so good remembering the ones you guessed at, why didn't
you
> remember the exact answer as given in the Q pool?

There was no question pool in those days.

> How many times did you have to take the exams?

Once. Other than blowing a few questions, it was pretty easy for me.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

339. Re: W4JLE Welefare Extra?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 22:05:55 UTC
From: W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com>
Message-ID: <93vsbd$19p$1@iac5.navix.net>
Source record: 589

OK, Gerald you have it all figured out. Now as Ed suggested would you care
to set a skid?

"Gerald Schmitt" <kk5yy@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:3a646aa2.360000040@nntp.mindspring.com...
> On Mon, 15 Jan 2001 15:20:27 -0500, "W4JLE" <Fred@w4jle.com> wrote:
>
> >Nice quote from Macbeth, however I happen to have a certificate from a
> >midnight session of the last day showing I upgraded under the old scheme.
> >Never really cared about getting the Extra until they were about to
remove
> >the code requirement. To be honest, I have been laying back in the weeds
> >waiting for someone to bring this up since the change in regs. Yes, the
> >public record speaks for it's self, one simply has to understand what it
is
> >saying.
>
> Sorry Fred I don't believe you. All the April 15 stuff was long
> finished by June 03 sorry OM that dog won't hunt.
> >
> >If you look, you will see that the date you quote is a second change
since
> >that time. Go to the FCC database and check the progression.
> >
> >Why should I cast aspersions toward you, I leave those tactics to those
that
> >have no rational arguments. If you have any doubts about my
qualifications,
> >you need only ask and I will be glad to point you in the right direction.
> >This will save you from making invalid conclusions.
>
> You don't seem to me to be the best source for the real story. You
> seem to make much out of other folks abilities and such I just
> thought your feet of clay might need a little sun.
>
> >
> >73 Fred W4JLE
> >"Gerald Schmitt" <kk5yy@arrl.net> wrote in message
> >news:3a630e92.336428289@nntp.mindspring.com...
> >>
> >> Well Folks,
> >>
> >> With all the sound and fury signifying nothing I just had to look into
> >> Fred's bona fides, very interesting reading.

> >>
> >> It seems that just before the change in the code requirements Fred was
> >> and Advanced Class amateur holding the call W4JLE now it seems he
> >> hold an Amateur Extra license effective June 03, 2000 this is well
> >> past the change in code requirements for Amateur Extra. One can
> >> only presume from all this that Fred waited until the code
> >> requirements were reduced before upgrading. The question is, why?
> >>
> >> In my own cynical way I have to presume that Fred, despite all the
> >> sound and fury, was unable to pass Element 1C and so had to wait
> >> until the bar was lowered to get his Amateur Extra. This casts
> >> doubt on all of his blathering about traffic handling, superiority,
> >> the value of other, etc. I'm sure there is a wonderful excuse and
> >> lots of aspersions to be cast at me for this revelation but the
> >> public record speaks for itself.
> >>
> >> In the hash light of these new revelations I am forced to conclude
> >> Freddie had been fibbing to us and I'm afraid I won't be able
> >> to consider anything he says from now on to be credible. Oh well,
> >> he never had anything interesting to say anyway. Please be
> >> careful Fred, word on the street is that you go to Hell for lying.
> >>
> >>
> >
> >
>

340. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 22:08:56 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <IzK86.832$e5.2152240@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 590

Vincent Biancomano <103520.355@CompuServe.COM> wrote:

> The FCC hasn't wanted any part of ham radio since at
> least the early 80s, remember?

Does that explain why they invested the hundreds of staff hours that restructuring took and have stepped up amateur enforcement?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

341. Re: W4JLE Welefare Extra?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 22:11:52 UTC
From: W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com>
Message-ID: <93vsmj$1hn$1@iac5.navix.net>
Source record: 591

Agreed Ed, I did ask him to set a sked and see if the old glass arm still
works :>)

You never did answer the question if anyone actually operates SS Morse?

"Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:rJJ86.824$e5.2146968@news.ntplx.net...
> W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com> wrote:
>
> > If you have any doubts about my qualifications, you need only ask ...
>
> If anyone has doubts about my qualifications wrt CW, they can meet me on
40
> M and judge for themselves. That will be a better indicator than the code
> speed of the test I took in 1976.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
>

342. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 22:12:05 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <GCK86.833$e5.2152478@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 592

Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com> wrote:

> >If a college class uses the same test questions year
> >after year, is that the fault of the study guide publisher?

> If a college (or the Bash era FCC) does not combat cheating by
> changing the tests frequently, does that make the person who uses the
> illicit material any less of a moral cheater?? Is it OK to steal
> physical property just because someone is careless with it?

Do you believe that it should be illegal for people to talk about the content of the tests after they have taken them? Do you believe it should be illegal to print information about the content of the tests after they have been taken?

Do explain how the Bill of Rights fits in with your answer.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

343. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 22:15:16 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <FFK86.834$e5.2152704@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 593

Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com> wrote:

> Speaking of lab tests: When are you gonna put the FT-817 thru it's paces? If that
> little puppy proves to be something more than a backpacker's toy it should have a
> significant market.

Don't know when it will be published, but it is on the fast track, I am sure. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

344. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 22:23:49 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <GNK86.835$e5.2153714@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 594

Larry Roll K3LT <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote:

> I became a ham after years as an electronics hobbyist, and passed my
> written tests largely on the basis of knowledge I had acquired over
> that time -- through self-study from a variety of sources, and
> hands-on experience in project building.

FB. Let's save that for later...

> I didn't get my ham ticket for the singular purpose of being able to
empower myself
> by projecting my voice over long distances at the press of a button.

From what I have read of your posts, you think everyone else gets their
licenses only so they can project their vioces over long distances at the
press of a button.

> Moreover, having had that capability for my entire career ham career, I've
always sought,
> and utilized, more challenging modes.

But no one else does?

> I consider myself to be well-qualified to hold the highest, most
> distinctive class of license.

I believe that you are well qualified, and more. But you didn't get all of
that qualification solely as a result of studying for your tests, it comes
from years of being a ham and:

> I became a ham after years as an electronics hobbyist, and passed my
> written tests largely on the basis of knowledge I had acquired over
> that time -- through self-study from a variety of sources, and
> hands-on experience in project building.

> I've had nothing handed over to me on a silver platter;

Sure you did, at least as far a licensing is concerned, you took a test that
was much more simple than the level of knowledge you possess right now.

> becoming a ham meant enough to me to learn the practical communications
> skill which is Morse/CW.

You are correct; being a ham means enough to people that they will learn.
That is why they want to be hams.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

345. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 22:25:43 UTC
From: Vincent Biancomano <103520.355@CompuServe.COM>
Message-ID: <93vtd7$q0e$1@sshuraac-i-1.production.compuserve.com>
Source record: 595

>Does that explain why they invested the hundreds of staff hours
>that restructuring took and have stepped up amateur enforcement?

Yes, fully. Personally, I truly believe it was timed with
"Amateur" restructuring to move hams down from VHF to HF,
and geared to show newbies to the HF bands that HF was a
hospitable place to live. That's my opinion, and I'll stay by it.
Knowing the history of the deregulation issue, I believe it's a
fully logical conclusion.

Regards,
Vince, WB2EZG

346. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 22:26:17 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <_PK86.836$e5.2154018@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 596

Larry Roll K3LT <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote:

> How about the reason that testing for code knowledge, at
> progressively higher speeds, and for progressively increasing
> HF privileges, causes radio amateurs to attain a practical
> communications skill?

Would you advocate that the rules be written to require all amateurs to possess the skills *and* equipment to operate any particular mode or lose their license? That would be a better way of ensuring that they met that goal.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

347. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 22:28:27 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <%RK86.837$e5.2154344@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 597

Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:

> > I have no basis on which to even speculate as to the percentage. Do you?

> Nope, Jim and I are not arguing percentages. All it takes is one jammer
> using Morse code equipment and I win the argument.

And Vince said that if even one person memorized the answers to the question pools, it wasn't a test...

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

348. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 22:31:31 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <UUK86.838$e5.2154591@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 598

Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

> > Why would testing of the encoding method used in Morse code be necessary before
> > granting CW access in the CW portion of the band. Are you afraid hordes of
> > people will learn Morse code wrong and try to get on the air? Those that learn
> > the code will use the mode, just as badly as I did at first and will improve
> > with time if they stick to it.

> Sot hen you've changed your mind about totally incompetent attempts at
> sending Morse code on the air constituting poor Amateur practice?

I do not believe that the people who were sending code poorly were new operators, Dick.

> > Would you advocate that the VEs determine that a ham has working RTTY equipment
> > before he or she is permitted to use RTTY on the digital portions of the bands?

> That remark is inconsistant with reality and you know it.

Yes, I do know it. But it is exactly analogous to the belief that an applicant must demonstrate proficiency in Morse code before being allowed to try the mode on HF. People would learn the mode, or write some really cool software, before trying it, would they not?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

349. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 22:33:13 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <tWK86.839$e5.2154813@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 599

Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

> And many have gone on to other more productive "freeband" activities where
they
> find conditions and 'services' better than 27 mhz and they don't have to
> put up with dodging ham radio regulations and renewed enforcement.

The nerve of them, actually following the rules!

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

350. Re: W4JLE Welefare Extra?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 22:39:43 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccoll@radiks.net>
Message-ID: <GZK86.162$Ks.160363@nntp1.onemain.com>
Source record: 600

Not that it makes a lot of difference but one Gerald G. Schmitt, KK5YY of Los Alamos seems to have gotten his Extra 30 May presumably as a Welfare Extra. Pot, Kettle, Black?

351. Re: Despicable 14.313 behavior resumes

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 23:07:38 UTC
From: KC8JBO <roger_kc8jbo@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <93vvrj$af3$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 601
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

```
In article <93vpni$4l8$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@my-deja.com> wrote:
> In article <93vn8i$2cq$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
> firebottle@my-deja.com wrote:
> > In article <93tmh7$9g6$1@dagobah.blueriver.net>,
> > "DX405" <lightnin9@hotmail.com> wrote:
> > > Hopefully KC8JBO will be getting a notice for his on air behavior.
> >
> > Strange, I didn't hear KC8JBO, just a bunch of identifieds. Riley
> can't
> > do much with the unidentifieds.
> >
> > He needs to be off the air like WB2OTK and some of the others.
> >
> > What others?? The people who were thought to be the " Biggest "
> > troublemakers are gone, examples: KV4FZ, KT4TR, W4FQF, W4LLI, K4OKA,
> > K4VVV ( Little Richard drunken disc jockey ), gone from 14.313, but
> the
> > qrm'ing continues. Rich WB2OTK wasn't/isn't the problem. The problem
> is
> > the inability of the FCC ( and, this isn't Riley's problem ) to fund
> > people to track them down.
> >
> > It's doubtful if any " official notices will come out of this. Most
of
> > the rhetoric has been from NG's and newbies.
> >
> > .
> >
> > > "Joe Black" <jbla88@houston.net> wrote in message
> > > news:3A623756.33C94D8B@houston.net...
> > > > Fortunately, Riley Hollingsworth got an earful. Time for more
> > official
> > > > notice
> >
> > Sent via Deja.com
> > http://www.deja.com/
> >
> Exactly what I, and others have said for years. Its the 3rd element,
> not the 'major players'. Remember when NR5T, Douglas, was blammed for
> all sorts of crap? He goes away, and still got the crap. Duuuuuuu!
>
> Dan/W4NTI
```

Or how Polly Parrot FQF, swore I QRMed for years when all I had was my
Kenwood R-5000 RECEIVER.

--
73 de Roger, KC8JBO
EM99 |ARRL|VE [ARRL & W5YI]|ARES |RACES
Yaesu FT-920 |Inverted Vee @ 40 ft.
Yaesu FT-90R

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

352. Re: Despicable 14.313 behavior resumes

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 23:08:58 UTC
From: KC8JBO <roger_kc8jbo@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <93vvu3afo1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 602
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

```
In article <93vps0$4vn$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@my-deja.com> wrote:
> In article <93vog4$3gi$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
> KC8JBO <roger_kc8jbo@my-deja.com> wrote:
> > In article <93tmh7$9g6$1@dagobah.blueriver.net>,
> > "DX405" <lightnin9@hotmail.com> wrote:
> > > Hopefully KC8JBO will be getting a notice for his on air behavior.
> He
> > needs
> > > to be off the air like WB2OTK and some of the others.
> >
> > Hopefully, "DX405" will get a better job so he can afford something
> > other than CHEAP-ASS RADIO SHACK RADIOS.
> > But cheap is as cheap does......
> >
> > > "Joe Black" <jbla88@houston.net> wrote in message
> > > news:3A623756.33C94D8B@houston.net...
> > > > Fortunately, Riley Hollingsworth got an earful. Time for more
> > official
> > > > notices?
> > >
> > >
> >
> > --
> > 73 de Roger, KC8JBO
> > EM99 |ARRL|VE [ARRL & W5YI]|ARES |RACES
> > Yaesu FT-920 |Inverted Vee @ 40 ft.
> > Yaesu FT-90R
> >
> > Sent via Deja.com
> > http://www.deja.com/
> >
> He didn't even pay for it....ask him about it.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
> --
> "Just tellin the truth, and they cain't stand it."
>
> Sent via Deja.com
> http://www.deja.com/
>
```

BWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA!!!
You mean he did a "Monica" for *that*???????? Damn....
ROFLMAO!!!!!!!!!!

--
73 de Roger, KC8JBO
EM99 |ARRL|VE [ARRL & W5YI]|ARES |RACES
Yaesu FT-920 |Inverted Vee @ 40 ft.
Yaesu FT-90R

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

353. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 23:26:21 UTC
From: W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com>
Message-ID: <940124$4lr$1@iac5.navix.net>
Source record: 603

No explanations are necessary for statements one extracts from the nether regions of their anatomy.

"I believe it, ergo it is fact" is the operative phrase here.

"Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net> wrote in message news:IzK86.832$e5.2152240@news.ntplx.net...
> Vincent Biancomano <103520.355@CompuServe.COM> wrote:
>
> > The FCC hasn't wanted any part of ham radio since at
> > least the early 80s, remember?
>
> Does that explain why they invested the hundreds of staff hours that
> restructuring took and have stepped up amateur enforcement?
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
>

354. Re: Left wingers getting ready

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 23:29:24 UTC
From: libertarian1@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <940149bhr1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 605
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.radio.pirate,alt.fan.art-bell,alt.politics.libertarian

In article <93t2q0$619$1@iac5.navix.net>,
"W4JLE" <Fred@w4jle.com> wrote:
> Some of the left wing nonsense, this from Ramsey Clark former Attorney
> General (D)
> complete with neutral wording such as "Governor death"... January 20th
> should be fun. A search of the internet shows all the cock roaches are
> coming out of the woodwork.
>

It's not just a leftwing issue. Libertarians are opposed to the
censorious policies of BOTH Republicans and Democrats locking Third
Parties out.....

The whole Left-Right congame is over!!!!!!!!!

http://maxpages.com/statistcongame

L1

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

355. Re: W4JLE Welefare Extra?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 23:29:53 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <940156bia1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 604

In article <rJJ86.824$e5.2146968@news.ntplx.net>,
"Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net> wrote:
> W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com> wrote:
>
> > If you have any doubts about my qualifications, you need only ask
...
>
> If anyone has doubts about my qualifications wrt CW, they can meet me
on 40
> M and judge for themselves. That will be a better indicator than the
code
> speed of the test I took in 1976.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

But Ed, you didn't say that you were better than everyone else. And you
didn't attend some midnight exam session...

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

356. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 23:35:53 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <9401gp$bp0$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 606

In article <CvK86.831$e5.2152049@news.ntplx.net>,
"Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net> wrote:
> Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com> wrote:
>
> >> When I took my General before the FCC, most of the time, I knew
which
> >> questions I guessed at.
>
> > Thats pretty fantastic memorization, most of the time.
>
> Why would you consider it fantastic memorization that to this day, I
still
> remember that I didn't have a clue about the question about the
impedance of
> open wire line, or that I didn't know what a parasitic oscillation
was, but
> knew it had some effect on interference, so I guess right. A memory
that
> can't hold onto such generalizations is a pretty poor one.
>
> > If your memory is so good remembering the ones you guessed at, why
didn't
> you
> > remember the exact answer as given in the Q pool?
>
> There was no question pool in those days.
>
> > How many times did you have to take the exams?
>
> Once. Other than blowing a few questions, it was pretty easy for me.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

Have you stopped learning?

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

357. Re: HA HA HA: Bush won popular vote!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 23:47:03 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <94025lcgt1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 607
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <93v4u6$h2d$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
Dr. Conrad Connie <coontail@my-deja.com> wrote:
> In article <93v3il$826$0@dosa.alt.net>,
> kking@no-mail.com (Kerry King) wrote:
> >
> > Go to Newsmax.com, look at headline article . . .
> >
> > New Count Shows Bush May Have Won Popular Vote
> > NewsMax.com
> > Wednesday, December 20, 2000
> >
> > Despite the widely accepted claim that Al Gore won the popular
> > vote by some 300,000 votes, a new count of state totals
> > appears to show George Bush was the real winner by nearly 2
> > million votes.
> >
>
> >
> > These figures were reportedly obtained from the Office of the
> > Secretary of State from each state but {haven't been confirmed.}
> > Where are Al Gore's cheer leaders known as the news media??
>
> No they haven't been confirmed and in fact if they have, why hasn't
> this total appeared on the ABC News web page ?
>
> Hahahaha.. this is so typical of the right wing Limbrain cabal.

Dr. Commie, are you completely nuts?

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

358. Re: W4JLE Welefare Extra?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-15 23:59:39 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <BbM86.845$e5.2162093@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 608

W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com> wrote:

> You never did answer the question if anyone actually operates SS Morse?

Not to my knowledge, Fred. While one could do FH or DSSS with Morse encoding, on-off-keying would be a pretty bad choice for SS. One could use one of the FSK or PSK modes with Morse encoding, but it would not be optimum, either.

Of course, not all amateur radio needs to be optimum to be fun. Perhaps a simple BPSK signal, with Morse encoding, could be frequency hopped successfully.

The big bummer here for me is that I have far more dreams that time; I think that RFI and related spectrum issues for ARRL will probably represent the majority of my accomplishments for a while. Of course, I do have this Hare-brained idea for a 2X QRP EME QSO. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

359. Re: W4JLE Welefare Extra?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 00:01:53 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <GdM86.846$e5.2162283@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 610

Richard McCollum <rmccoll@radiks.net> wrote:

> Not that it makes a lot of difference but one Gerald G. Schmitt, KK5YY of
> Los Alamos seems to have gotten his Extra 30 May presumably as a Welfare
> Extra. Pot, Kettle, Black?

Why would you equate passing an upgrade with name calling, Richard? Whether upgraded on April 14 or April 16, those who upgrade have done no more wrong than to do what the law requires to get a particular type of license.

If someone wants to upgrade after April 15, what tests are they going to be given an opportunity to take?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

360. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 00:02:33 UTC
From: Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com>
Message-ID: <3A638F99.17D9E71C@dvol.com>
Source record: 609

"Ed Hare, W1RFI" wrote:

> Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com> wrote:
>
> . . . When are you gonna put the FT-817 thru it's paces? . .
>
> Don't know when it will be published, but it is on the fast track, I am
> sure. :-)

>
Just DO it, it's your lab right? Oh, never mind . . !
>

> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

>
w3rv

361. Re: W4JLE Welefare Extra?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 00:04:38 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <fgM86.847$e5.2162528@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 611

Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com> wrote:

> But Ed, you didn't say that you were better than everyone else. And you
> didn't attend some midnight exam session...

Well, I am not better than everyone else. I may be better than some, in some things, and I suppose that if any of were really given the authority to tally up the score, I might even be better than some overall, but others would blow me away. I much prefer that I not be judged at all; just let me be a ham who operates as required by Part 97.

I did attend a midnight session of the Royal Order of the Wouff Hong. Does that count for anything?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

362. Re: Buy a ham ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 00:06:10 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <94039d$d9j$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 614

In article <93vaso$2on$0@208.207.71.134>,
Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>
>
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > In article <93qvm7llk0@208.207.71.147>,
> > Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
> >
> > I'd wager that fellow had some sort of
> > > extreme physical impairment. That may well have been the *only*
means
> > he
> > > had of communicating at all. It happens. I've read of
quadruplegics
> > who
> > > use a "puffer" switch to key their rigs by blowing air through a
> > straw.
> > > But BrianBurkeTurkey would have Riley cite those guys for "poor
> > amateur
> > > practice". Shows where he's coming from. As far as I'm cncerned he
can
> > > go back.
> >
> > Dick, you are the admitted CBer.
> >
> > I said that people who have the skill to send correctly should do
so.
> > What you said above makes you a liar, but then, we know where you're
> > coming from.
>
> What you said is there for all the world to read, and it isn't what
you
> say you said.

Of course it is, CB Dick. Follow the thread up and you'll see my
position again and again. Its there for all the rest of the world to
read. But no, you won't do that. You're better than the rest of us.

"Admitted CBer"? Nope. Clearly Stated Legal User of CB
for
> mobile RV use,

So you admit it yet again? Didn't you post a CB call sign once?

> prior to FRS which works *much* better.

Which works better? Your ability to make a clear statement is underwhelming.

> But you already know all that.

I only know what you tell us. It may not be the truth but its all I have to go on.

> You just like to stir in the outhouse. As always. You and
> Cecil deserve each other.

We sure don't deserve you.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

363. Re: Buy a ham ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 00:08:49 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <akM86.848$e5.2162878@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 612

Len Over 21 <lenover21@aol.com> wrote:

> Do you REALLY think that a full explanation of the program
> along with flow charts would be "acceptible" to a member-
> ship that prizes manual code skill over nearly anything else
> in amateur radio?!? I don't think so based on input from
> others concerning their expertise and "necessity" of manual
> code skill...'others' include those not in this newsgroup.

Although I am sure that some of our members prize manual code speed over nearly anything else, but let's take a little poll right here. Of those that are ARRL members, how many of you would like to see an article that describes how to use software to reliably read Morse code in the presence of noise and poor timing?

Count me as vote #1 for yes. I pony up my dues every few years.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

364. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 00:10:09 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <9403gtdkl1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 615

In article <93vo9n$r0e$1@iac5.navix.net>,
"W4JLE" <Fred@w4jle.com> wrote:
> Ed's VFO is in-op that high in the band, you will have to explain what
goes
> on, on 14.313 before Ed can answer.

Excuse me? I think Ed is more than capable of speaking for hisself.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

365. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 00:16:21 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <frM86.849$e5.2163286@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 613

Larry Roll K3LT <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote:

> If growth isn't one of "our major problems," what do you think they
> are? And how will a zero-WPM, one-class license fix them?

First, let me be clear that I do not believe we should have a one-class license system. Though I believe that not grandfathering existing licencees when incentive licensing was put into effect was a mistake, I think that the premise of incentive licensing is appropriate.

The biggest problem I think we face, Larry, is one of spectrum. That will be solved as much by useage of the bands as it will anything else. Let me turn the question around and ask you how having a multi-WPM test series will solve that problem?

Another problem is that we are not seen as being relevant by many in industry and at the FCC. How will having a multi-WPM test series solve that problem? IMHO, this is the most important reason to replace the Morse code tests with tests relating to newer technology.

When the no-code VHF license was introduced, there was a sudden influx of newcomers for which there simply was not sufficient Elmering. How will having a multi-speed code test series solve that problem.

I see the petty bickering that is taking place here and elsewhere and the sour grapes and/or gloating as being harmful to the amateur radio service. How wil having a multi-speed code test series solve that problem.

What problems do you think are facing the Amateur Radio Service and how do you think having a multi-speed code-test series will solve them?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

366. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 00:17:10 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A639306.C2E63C4B@IEEE.org>
Source record: 617

Dean Craft wrote:
> I congratulate the no-coders and wannabees because they have done an
> outstanding job on the segregation routine.

That's because they want to be accepted into ham radio and obsolete hams thinking obsolete thoughts won't accept them. The thing that defines a ham is a ham license. If you don't believe it, ask the FCC. I have all amateur privileges. It matters not a whit that my palsy and arthritis prohibits me from sending 20wpm anymore.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

367. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 00:20:42 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <kvM86.850$e5.2163583@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 616

Vincent Biancomano <103520.355@CompuServe.COM> wrote:

> Yes, fully. Personally, I truly believe it was timed with
> "Amateur" restructuring to move hams down from VHF to HF,
> and geared to show newbies to the HF bands that HF was a
> hospitable place to live. That's my opinion, and I'll stay by it.
> Knowing the history of the deregulation issue, I believe it's a
> fully logical conclusion.

In this logical conclusion, are there now fewer VHF-only licencees than there were before the FCC took the sneaky back door approach you believe they did? If so, cite the source. If not, explain why it backfired.

Why do you think that the FCC didn't simply reallocate spectrum if they felt that they didn't want us there? The real action is above 1.2 GHz (higher frequencies generally mean that spectrum can be resused every few miles, so it is quite useful nowadays to be high up). Do you believe that restructuring is going to have a significant impact on amateur occupation above 1.2 GHz? What do you think that effect will be?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

368. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 00:23:46 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <9404aa$e70$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 618

In article <93vo6mqvf1@iac5.navix.net>,
"W4JLE" <Fred@w4jle.com> wrote:

> Enjoy what ever privileges they may have and knock off the nonsense,
until
> then I shall enjoy demonstrating the absurd with absurdity.
>
> 73 Fred W4JLE

OK Fred, enough of the self-demonstrations.

-We'll- knock of the "nonsense."

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

369. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 00:25:56 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A639514.C637DA53@IEEE.org>
Source record: 620

Dean Craft wrote:
> Until the
> advent of political correctness, anyone wishing to participate in most
> elements of society would do so under guidelines adopted for, and applied
> to, all candidates. Those guidelines were directed toward having all
> participation started on common ground.
>
> It is now unacceptable in most of society to require anything of anyone if
> they wish to participate in whatever may be popular at any given time. Our
> society is being driven to the lowest common denominator called existence.
> We are; therefore we are deserving.
>
> There is no longer a place for pride in individualism; no longer a place for
> pride in personal achievement; individual accomplishments can no longer be
> rewarded without condescending review or outright hostility.
>
> All simply because someone may be excluded from rewards enjoyed by someone
> else.
>
> You get the final word Cecil.

Thanks Dean, for the off topic posting. Nothing you said has anything to do
with the code requirement. It is not political correctness, it is progress.
The old guidelines are obsolete. Common ground cannot last forever. If it did,
we would all have to ride a horse before taking a driver's exam. Equal access
to public property is guaranteed by The Constitution. Pride is not a requirement.
Outmoded rituals are not a requirement. The simple fact is that the Morse code
requirement is obsolete in the 21st century. The rest of the services realize
it and it is an albatross around the neck of the Amateur Radio Service.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

If registering guns will prevent crime,
will registering penises prevent rape?

370. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 00:30:30 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <wEM86.852$e5.2164833@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 619

Sure, Ed will speak for himself. I first wandered across 14.313 about 5 years ago, out of curiosity. It was bad enough that I didn't go back for years. A few months ago, I listened to 14.313 and heard -- a maritime net. Glad it was better, but I haven't listened since.

Is there a specific reason I should? I don't operate much SSB. My Omni D does tune 14.313. Once in a while, I go all the way up to the county hunters net on 14.336. More often find me on 14.060 (QRP) or 14.0565 (the CW county hunters hangout).

73, Ed Hare, W1RFI

371. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 00:35:25 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <7JM86.854$e5.2165172@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 621

Vincent Biancomano <103520.355@CompuServe.COM> wrote:

> >Just how many ways can you ask what the unit
> >of electrical resistance is?

> First, that's not a technical question, which is the
> subject under discussion.

It is a rules question? Or an operating question?

> Second, I'd wager you never actually saw that question
> asked on any actual exam you ever took. I never saw that
> question on even my Novice exam.

It was definately prominently featured in the study guide for the Novice exam I took. I really don't remember much about the Novice exam, but I am sure it appeared on at least one version of the Novice test.

I was absolutely astounded at how easy those 4 pages of study guide for the 1963 Novice exam really were. All of the questions I thought I remembered about feed lines and antennas and propagation weren't there at all. Frequencies, power levels, a few rules and Ohm's law just about covered it.

> it's time for hams taking those exams to start complaining
> about dumbing down.

I scanned the 4 pages; I think I have them at home. I will have to post them, if I remember to email them here. Maybe we should make the entry-level exams hard again so that new hams have to study 4 pages to get them.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

>
> Regards,
> Vince, WB2EZG

372. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 00:39:21 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <94057p$f31$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 629

In article <93vn1g$q6e$1@iac5.navix.net>,
"W4JLE" <Fred@w4jle.com> wrote:

> Why the construction requirement?

> Back when my eyes were good and my hands were steady the smallest
active
> element I had to deal with was a 6AQ5, now I can barely see a surface
> mounted component, let alone solder the dam thing.

Fred, oops. You were supposed to be better than everyone else.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

373. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 00:41:55 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010115194155.29597.00001932@nso-mi.aol.com>
Source record: 622

In article <3A628396.95A7B801@IEEE.org>, Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>> Cecil wrote:
>> >
>> > Dick Carroll wrote:
>> > > To attempt to work code without any training and practical
>> > > experience is akin to attempting to fly an airplane without any prior
>> > > flight training.
>> >
>> > Please explain how working CW is a life and death proposition akin
>> > to flying an airplane.
>>
>> There you go again, making phantom linkages. No such assertation was
>> made. The comparison stands.
>
>You are the one who made the phantom linkage. Working CW is NOT
>akin to flying an airplane.
>--
>http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca
>

Cecil:

What if a situation arose where people's lives depended on
communicating with the outside world, and the only mode that
would work was some form of Morse/CW? Ever hear of a
fractured larynx? What if the only HF transceiver available
had a choice between SSB or CW, and there was only a single
gel cell battery to power it? How long could it transmit on QRP
CW as opposed to SSB at 100 watts?

The problem with the Morse/CW mode is that in order to
effectively exploit its practical advantages, one needs to know
the Morse code! Can you at least agree to that?

73 de Larry, K3LT

374. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 00:41:55 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010115194155.29597.00001931@nso-mi.aol.com>
Source record: 625

In article <3a627a30.14349239@news.mindspring.com>, billsohl@mindspring.com (Bill Sohl) writes:

>
>That would be a valid reason IF there was a government
>need for amateurs to attain that skill. You can argue that
>as you choose, but I fully believe that you'd never convince
>the administrations of the world that the skill is needed
>today.

Bill:

No, I guess I couldn't, because the slouching whiners are very effectively drowning me out. At least I can grasp reality.

73 de Larry, K3LT

375. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 00:41:56 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010115194156.29597.00001933@nso-mi.aol.com>
Source record: 626

In article <3A628A3C.56FFED75@IEEE.org>, Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>> How about the reason that testing for code knowledge, at
>> progressively higher speeds, and for progressively increasing
>> HF privileges, causes radio amateurs to attain a practical
>> communications skill?
>
>If it's not fun, it's not practical, Larry. Everybody does not
>share your likes and dislikes. What is wrong with live and let
>live?

Cecil:

Don't look now, but a person can live a perfectly normal, healthy,
and happy life without ever becoming an amateur radio operator.
I am the only licensed ham in my immediate family, and I assure
you, my parents, brothers, sisters, girlfriend, nieces, nephews,
and scores of friends are all very happy, indeed, without a ham
license in their possession. You really need to come up with
a better argument than that!

73 de Larry, K3LT

376. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 00:41:56 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010115194156.29597.00001934@nso-mi.aol.com>
Source record: 627

In article <3A628B53.27D6BE86@IEEE.org>, Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>> No, I'm saying that I respond to incentives do do things, like everyone
>> else.
>
>Fun is one of the best incentives I know.

Cecil:

And the fun of Morse/CW operation is exactly what kept me going,
after I overcame my zenophobia and put in a good effort to learn
the code. I now regret the 14 years of fun I missed while I spent
that time loudly objecting to code testing requirements.

73 de Larry, K3LT

377. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 00:41:57 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010115194157.29597.00001935@nso-mi.aol.com>
Source record: 623

In article <20010115073041.09203.00001188@ng-cr1.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>
>>Plugging a microphone into an HF rig, pushing the button and
>>talking is "instant" gratification, therefore, the strong push to
>>eliminate remaining code testing requirements.
>
>Many of those seeking to end Morse-code testing requirements already have
>that
>"instant" gratification available to them.

Ed:

Yes, on 2-meters, perhaps a 200 kHz segment on 10-meters if they found a way to survive the brutal 5 WPM code test already.

>
>>Of course, this is obvious to everyone but you.
>
>What is obvious about Bill Sohl's desire to end Morse code testing? He can
>already yak on any amateur frequency.

Obviously, he wants to be a big man among the slouchers in his club. Being supportive of continued code testing is a highly unpopular political position; it requires anyone who holds it to take a lot of anger from the slouchers -- something I've lived with for years. Bill obviously doesn't "need" that kind of grief. I don't either, but I get it anyway, because I am not afraid to express my opinions clearly and with conviction. Bill goes with the flow, and gets to enjoy the good will of his fellow hams. I go against the grain, and get hatred and regular back-stabbings. I can very well understand why a person who desired a normal social life among his fellow amateurs would take Bill's position. After all, being "politically correct" is a high priority among hams these days.

73 de Larry, K3LT

378. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 00:41:58 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010115194158.29597.00001936@nso-mi.aol.com>
Source record: 624

In article <20010115073726.09203.00001191@ng-cr1.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>
>>If growth isn't one of "our major problems," what do you think they
>>are? And how will a zero-WPM, one-class license fix them?
>
>I will answer the first question later in the week when I can type out a long
>answer.

Ed:

I'll look forward to reading it. Please send me a copy via E-mail, since I don't usually bother reading the newsgripe during the work week, since I'm usually never home before 7 PM and usually have to be out of bed again by 4 AM.

>I cannot answer the second because I do not believe that we should have a
>one-class license system.

Please consider that what you believe we should have, and what we end up with, are likely to be two different things. I can easily see all ham radio privileges given away with a single multiple-choice "written" test. It would be the ARRL's last desperate attempt to entice people to join up, considering the abject failure of Restructuring so far.

>I also do not believe that our licensing system
>should contain no Morse code testing. I believe that Morse code proficiency
>should be tested the same way we test for proficiency in other modes.

I see. So asking multiple-guess questions *about* Morse code operation is now the equivalent of actually testing people on the skill of sending/receiving Morse code texts? That is nothing but more dumbing down; more pandering to the lowest common denominator. You forgot to tell us how this is going to lead to high-speed, high-throughput digital communications magic being performed on the HF airwaves -- or how it is going to drag thousands of young people away from their Web browsers, DVD players, and Sony Playstations! Oh well, give it a try, anyway -- I don't think anything like the opinions of current, pre-April 15, 2000 code tested hams is going to stop you!

73 de Larry, K3LT

379. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 00:42:54 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <aQM86.855$e5.2165535@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 628

Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com> wrote:

> Just DO it, it's your lab right? Oh, never mind . . !

The Lab testing is under my control and I try to make sure that equipment is tested within a few days of its arrival. Usually, a rig like that will spend about 5-8 days in the screen room, being tested thoroughly from DC to daylight.

Sometimes, a key accessory, like a filter, may be on back order, so that can delay the process. From there, the radios go to a reviewer, or, more likely, several reviewers. That is the part that is NOT under my control, even if the reviewer happens to be a Lab guy. The reviewers are contract authors, paid the standard page rates. (Policy is that staff, officers or Technical Advisors can do reviews.)

The test results, btw, are summarized in the test-result table in the review, and for most rigs into an expanded test-result report. I put a sample up at http://www.arrl.org/tis/info/pdf/k2.pdf, if you want a quick link. (This is on the public site.)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

380. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 00:45:00 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A63998C.E4EDB9D8@IEEE.org>
Source record: 631

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> Bill obviously doesn't "need" that kind of grief. I don't
> either, but I get it anyway, because I am not afraid to express my
> opinions clearly and with conviction.

Larry, are you a split personality? Last thing you said about the
subject is that the 5wpm requirement might as well be done away
with. That's what Bill is advocating. Both of you guys agree that
there's no longer a good reason to have a 5wpm requirement.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

381. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 00:48:08 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A639A48.9397BB9A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 632

"Ed Hare, W1RFI" wrote:
> I think the biggest issue here is that some think of SS as a 'digital' mode.
> The most common application for SS is for voice communications.

Yep, it's digital voice. Just shows how outdated our nomenclature is.
Seems the sub-band divisions should maybe be classified narrow band
and broad band.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

382. Re: W4JLE Welefare Extra?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 00:51:45 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccoll@radiks.net>
Message-ID: <IUM86.106$H3.16166@nntp2.onemain.com>
Source record: 630

"Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:GdM86.846$e5.2162283@news.ntplx.net...
> Richard McCollum <rmccoll@radiks.net> wrote:
>
> > Not that it makes a lot of difference but one Gerald G. Schmitt, KK5YY
of
> > Los Alamos seems to have gotten his Extra 30 May presumably as a
Welfare
> > Extra. Pot, Kettle, Black?
>
> Why would you equate passing an upgrade with name calling, Richard?
Whether
> upgraded on April 14 or April 16, those who upgrade have done no more
wrong
> than to do what the law requires to get a particular type of license.
>
> If someone wants to upgrade after April 15, what tests are they going to
be
> given an opportunity to take?
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

Not an argument in the world Fearless Leader. Which is precisely the
point: who cares? When it becomes an issue to 'out' someone, I get
curious.
>
>

383. Re: Will you let them take away your guns?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 00:58:21 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <9406b9$g40$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 636

In article <20010115091954.00714.00001896@nso-md.aol.com>,
yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote:
> In article <93svjg$rb3$1@nnrp1.deja.com>, Brian
<brianburke@my-deja.com>
> writes:
>
> >
> >Then there was the SoCal survey of the Marine Corps asking if they
would
> >fire on American citizens if ordered to do so.
>
> Brian:
>
> What was the result of that survey?
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Don't know. The only thing reported was that the question got asked. I
think I heard it on the Ollie North show out of a Rolla MO fm station.

In Ohio, we know what that answer is in relation to our National Guard.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

384. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 00:58:24 UTC
From: Vincent Biancomano <103520.355@CompuServe.COM>
Message-ID: <9406bg$jq1$1@sshuraaa-i-1.production.compuserve.com>
Source record: 633

>In this logical conclusion, are there now fewer VHF-only
>licencees than there were before the FCC took the sneaky back
>door approach you believe they did? If so, cite the source. If
>not, explain why it backfired.

Where does logic say the number of VHF licensees at this second directly relate to FCC's initial move to restructure and deregulate? Where are the comments that say the FCC "took a sneaky back door" approach? As John Madden would say, FCC's actions were "smash mouth, in your face football." Go back in Dejanews as far as you want: my comments have always been that deregulation was a done deal from the start. I don't know what you think you're doing, son, but it ain't getting done.

Regards,
Vince, WB2EZG

385. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 00:59:08 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A639CDC.AC34CD30@IEEE.org>
Source record: 635

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> >If it's not fun, it's not practical, Larry.
>
> Don't look now, but a person can live a perfectly normal, healthy,
> and happy life without ever becoming an amateur radio operator.
> I am the only licensed ham in my immediate family, and I assure
> you, my parents, brothers, sisters, girlfriend, nieces, nephews,
> and scores of friends are all very happy, indeed, without a ham
> license in their possession. You really need to come up with
> a better argument than that!

You seemed to have missed the point entirely, Larry. I was talking about CW. In the present amateur radio environment, if it's not fun, it's not practical. There is no other incentive for a ham to know Morse code anymore except for the fun involved. If you want to recruit new hams to Morse code, I would suggest you stop telling everyone what a pain in the arse it was for you.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

386. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 01:00:40 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A639D38.B74B12ED@IEEE.org>
Source record: 637

"Ed Hare, W1RFI" wrote:
>
> Larry Roll K3LT <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote:
>
> > How about the reason that testing for code knowledge, at
> > progressively higher speeds, and for progressively increasing
> > HF privileges, causes radio amateurs to attain a practical
> > communications skill?
>
> Would you advocate that the rules be written to require all amateurs to
> possess the skills *and* equipment to operate any particular mode or lose
> their license? That would be a better way of ensuring that they met that
> goal.

There's absolutely no reason to require the skill if the equipment is
not also required. How can one use CW for emergencies without any
equipment?
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

387. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 01:03:05 UTC
From: Vincent Biancomano <103520.355@CompuServe.COM>
Message-ID: <9406k9$jq1$2@sshuraaa-i-1.production.compuserve.com>
Source record: 634

VB> First, that's not a technical question, which is the
VB> subject under discussion.

>It is a rules question? Or an operating question?

Neither. I just told you: that would be asking for a definition.

VB> Second, I'd wager you never actually saw that question
VB> asked on any actual exam you ever took. I never saw that
VB> question on even my Novice exam.

>It was definately prominently featured in the study guide for
>the Novice exam I took.

Either way, NOT the actual exam.

>I really don't remember much about the Novice exam, but I am
>sure it appeared on at least one version of the Novice test.

I'm sure it didn't. Through wasting my, and your time yet, Ed?

Regards,
Vince, WB2EZG

388. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 01:06:39 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A639E9F.304EE3D8@IEEE.org>
Source record: 638

"Ed Hare, W1RFI" wrote:
>
> Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> > Nope, Jim and I are not arguing percentages. All it takes is one jammer
> > using Morse code equipment and I win the argument.
>
> And Vince said that if even one person memorized the answers to the question
> pools, it wasn't a test...

The arguments are different. Jim says there is not one code-tested jammer
using Morse code equipment. I say there is at least one and probably more.

Vince's statement is an if-then statement which is, of course, false
since no test is perfect.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

389. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 01:08:19 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A639F03.E2E9859E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 640

Dick Carroll wrote:
> That remark is inconsistant with reality and you know it.

Dick, I don't often think of you in church but this Sunday I did.
The preacher said, "To belittle is to be little." I instantly
thought of you.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

390. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 01:12:35 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A63A003.99CFF6D5@IEEE.org>
Source record: 644

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> What if a situation arose where people's lives depended on
> communicating with the outside world, and the only mode that
> would work was some form of Morse/CW?

Here we go with the "what if" stuff. What if the aliens landed
and cut out all our vocal chords? Get real, Larry. Your scenarios
have the chance of a snowball in hell. They have never happened
and their chances of ever happening are infinitesimal. You would
do better to use your energy on real-world possibilities.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

391. Re: Buy a ham ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 01:13:57 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <94078egom1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 641

In article <93vcl8$67b$1@208.207.71.134>,
Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> speweth:
>
> Brian wrote:

> > Fred, you're a true humanitarian. Perhaps you'll win the Hiram
Peace
> > Prize for freeing unworthy Tech slime from the jack boot of
opression.
> >
> > Dick will be pissed, as usual.
>
> Not me, I'm happy as hell for ya, kid. Now you don't have even
> imaginary justification to call me a lid just because I won't make
> myself send my Morse code to your inept "specifications".

Dick, send whatever kind of bad code you want. Just be sure to use your
own call sign.

I have every confidence that you'll place your jack boot of opression on
the necks of other unsuspecting Techs, some how, some where, some day.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

392. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 01:15:34 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A63A0B6.3612071F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 645

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Bet you a lobster that the same thing occurs when the do dropthe code
> test entirely.

Last year you were betting that hoards of CBers and freebanders were
about to invade the ARS. Which is it?
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

393. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 01:17:24 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9407f4$q2b$0@208.206.142.85>
Source record: 639

W1RFI wrote:
>
> >From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
>
> >You need to underestand (evidently you do not) that ham radio is quite
> >different from any other radio service.
>
> It was not significantly different from other radio services when it was
> created, Dick.

Yes, we know that Ed.that was then.This is now. BIG difference. Once
it was all hams, until some entrepreneur saw a buck to be made filling a
commercial need. Now it's nearly all commercial, with hams hanging on by
the skin of their chins.

>
> Do you believe that if ham radio had been created deliberately to function
> entirely differently than the radio services of its day, that it would have
> attained the level of respect and value that helped preserve it through
> decades?
>

Why not just ask a pointless question?

> >Our mission is almost infinitely multifaceted, as compared to
> >the narrowly focused objectives of commercial and governmental entities.
>
> I agree; our diversity is our strength. Having a test that emphasizes one mode
> over all others is not "infinitely multifaceted" and cannot be expected to
> foster that diversity in the Amateur Radio Service.

Total nonsense, and I know that you know better than that, so how can I
NOT believe you are exerecising an Agenda? You know as well as I that it
is simply impossible to operate CW without a minimum level of training
and practice. Those who want to operate CW must undergo that training.
Anyone who just hooks up a key or a paddle to his rig with the builtin
keyer will fail right out of the gate and you know it as well as I. How
can you at ARRL NOT to be merely trying to grease the skids for the
demise of the mode?

>
> >Just because they have abandoned
> >radiotelegraphy in favor of more cost efficient means, and do not hold
> >any radiotelegraphy assets in reserve doesn't mean that such a plan is
> >appropriate for the amateur radio service, where a large portion of
> >participants use it extensively,

>
> Do you think the same thing was said about the use of spark in the Amateur
> Radio Service?

No I do not. Spark covered a wide area of spectrum with a single
signal, and spectral efficiency alone mandated its abandonbment once
better technology was widely available. Now you'regoint to tell me we
have that sort of spectrum crowding problem today. And I'll send you to
scan the 70 cm band and report back.

> Do you think the Amateur Radio Service would have survived had
> it not evolved past that?
>
> > and some use no other mode, nor wish
> to.
>

So you've joined all the anti CW goons in slamming CW supportgers as
Luddites then? No one has EVER said anything about the ARS not evolving
and updating.
This entire squabble has been and continues to be really simple although
you and many others who really want CW totally dropped from testing
continually make it something it is not and never was. It is NOT an
anti-technology fight, as you seem intent on insisting. It IS
anti-laziness campaign. I believe that any worthwhile ham will agree to
learn CW so at to be able to use it, and I also believe that it should
be required of him/her to do so. A duty. Aw, that nasty word again. The
advance of technology and the evolution of the ARS has not a thing to do
with it.

> > To ignore their interests just because other later modes are in
> >existance is about as logical as ignoring your left hand just because
> >you are right handed and really don't need that unused left. Hey, just
> >cut it off, the right hand is all I need.
>
> Some use no other mode that RTTY. Do you believe they should be allowed to
> require that hams demonstrate that they possess the ability to decode RTTY
> before they are given a license to use CW?

Your reserve supply of arguments is clearly gone when you have to
resort to the assinine. You know what is being advocated here and it
isn't stupidity.

> >> Some commercial users have valid claims to places in the radio spectrum.
> >> They have paid the people to use those places. The places occupied by
> >> amateurs are still owned by the people, in the sense that public lands
> >> are owned by the people.
>
> > So try claiming your personal portion of Yellowstone or Yosemite and
> >see where it gets you.
>
> Try claiming 7040 kHz and see where it gets you.

You might have noted that it wasn't I that made ANY claim.

394. Re: Buy a ham ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 01:17:52 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <9407fp$h4a$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 648

In article <93v243eed1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
K0HB <k0hb@my-deja.com> wrote:
> In article <93r2gigfh1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
> Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com> wrote:
>
> > Been hanging on 3950 a little too long?
>
> 3950? That's way up there in the General voice sub-band, isn't it?
> I'm not sure my radio would tune that frequency!

As badly as you maintain your gear that doesn't suprise me. Maybe you
can find one of them web sites that has a SW radio. Good luck on that
one now.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

395. Re: The KENWOOD BOYCOTT is on!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 01:19:43 UTC
From: qrm2000@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010115201943.11203.00001609@ng-bj1.aol.com>
Source record: 642

A few years ago, Kenwood announced its intention to sell amateur radio equipment in truck stops.

Kenwood backed away from this plan after an outcry from Amateurs.

QRM

396. Re: Buy a ham ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 01:20:25 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A63A1D9.990285E5@IEEE.org>
Source record: 649

Dick Carroll wrote:
> You and Cecil deserve each other.

Nope, don't think so. Brian's serial port is incompatible with my I/O.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

397. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 01:21:31 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9407mrqlq0@208.206.142.85>
Source record: 643

Cecil wrote:
>
> W1RFI wrote:
> >
> > >From: Cecil Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
> >
> > >> Your answer does not consitute any kind of proof, just an
> > >> assumption on your part.
> >
> > >It's getting light outside. I have no proof but I assume that
> > >that light is coming from the sun.
> >
> > Do you believe that all assmuptions are equally valid?
>
> I'm not sure what an assmuption is. A donkey with mumps? :-)
>
> If it quacks like a duck ... Ed, do you agree with Jim that dits
> or dahs sent for the purpose of jamming are not sent with Morse
> code equipment?

If it quacks like a quack (false duck) it must be Cecil.

Who in the world is dumb enough to actually believe he can jam anyone with dits and dahs? You're just arguing to hear the wind blow, still. The jammers who actually jam use noise generators or steady carriers wobbulated to defeat your notch filter. They're not dummies, just idiots.

Jim is right,of couorse. You just don't hear that nonsense on CW. And you don't read about CW operators getting NAL's.

398. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 01:26:53 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <eo776tsaut54edh7vsq2emvudm5g3l42go@4ax.com>
Source record: 647

w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:
>I will introduce you to a lot of CW ops
>younger than 40.

What do you think the ratio of 50/75 year old active CW ops compared to say 15/40 year old active CW ops? I'd guess 20 or 30 to 1 (or worse)...

399. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 01:26:54 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <5p776t4ma99f3aq0rk8ojf9tmtameuiqmb@4ax.com>
Source record: 646

"Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net> wrote:
>Do you believe that it should be illegal for people to talk about the
>content of the tests after they have taken them?

Do you think it was morally correct for Bash to circumvent the FCC
tests by publishing the exact questions and answers, thus allowing
hams to pass the test by cheating?

>Do you believe it should be illegal to print information about the
>content of the tests after they have been taken?

Do you believe it would be OK for me to lawfully but clandestinely
obtain a copy of an ARRL employment exam, say from an employee who
owes me a favor, and print and sell it to those seeking employment at
ARRL?

>Do explain how the Bill of Rights fits in with your answer.

How does the Bill of Rights fit into *your* answer... :-)

400. Re: Buy a ham ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 01:37:26 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <9408km$i4g$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 651

In article <akM86.848$e5.2162878@news.ntplx.net>,
"Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net> wrote:
> Len Over 21 <lenover21@aol.com> wrote:
>
> > Do you REALLY think that a full explanation of the program
> > along with flow charts would be "acceptible" to a member-
> > ship that prizes manual code skill over nearly anything else
> > in amateur radio?!? I don't think so based on input from
> > others concerning their expertise and "necessity" of manual
> > code skill...'others' include those not in this newsgroup.
>
> Although I am sure that some of our members prize manual code speed
over
> nearly anything else, but let's take a little poll right here. Of
those
> that are ARRL members, how many of you would like to see an article
that
> describes how to use software to reliably read Morse code in the
presence
> of noise and poor timing?
>
> Count me as vote #1 for yes. I pony up my dues every few years.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

Sure. Use K0HB for the noise, and W0EX for poor timing or just use him for both the noise and the bad timing. That ought to be a real test for any software.

Seriously, it would be nice to see some side by sides of software/hardware performance competitions from the pk, kam, universal, etc., as well as the cheapie baypac type.

QST has been doing well with the nec antenna modeling software, and I think it was World Radio that did the VOA Prop software. Both are outstanding directions for the future of the ARS. Keep up the good work.

While I'm dreaming, how about a how-to article for an ionospheric pinger that measures the critical frequency? A network of these might be as useful as the 20M beacon network. Too bad we would be out of band about 90% of the time.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

401. Re: W4JLE Welefare Extra?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 01:41:39 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A63A6D3.561E3381@IEEE.org>
Source record: 652

Richard McCollum wrote:
> Admirable! Now who in Sam Hill is Gerald Schmitt?

Mobile antenna shootout organizer extraordanaire.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

402. Re: W4JLE Welefare Extra?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 01:43:30 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A63A742.688ED17B@IEEE.org>
Source record: 654

"Ed Hare, W1RFI" wrote:
> If anyone has doubts about my qualifications wrt CW, they can meet me on 40
> M and judge for themselves.

Hey Ed, do you ever do 10wpm or should I turn on my SCS PTC2e?
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

403. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 01:45:57 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <94094l$1jk$0@208.206.142.85>
Source record: 650

W1RFI wrote:
>
> >From: "W4JLE" Fred@w4jle.com
>
> >A man needs to know his limitations, and the sooner all the CW challenged
> >people admit it the better.
>
> All of us are "challenged" in something, Fred. What modes do you not operate?
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

Ed, how long are you going to keep up this charade? I knows it's not politically correct these days to reveal the fact that working CW does indeed require a bit more personal involvement than any of the other- read 'easy'- modes, the ones for which one needs basically only to RTFM. But it is no less true. Does you sense of what is true and proper not get just a little uncomfortable as time goes by and you find yourself deeply involved in propping up a total charade? For that's what it is. You'd have just as much success taking off and landing an airplane without prior training and practice as you would successfully making a CW contact on the air without the necessary training and practice. And I'm sure that you know it.

404. Re: W4JLE Welefare Extra?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 01:45:59 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A63A7D7.D8CBA8D2@IEEE.org>
Source record: 656

Richard McCollum wrote:
> Not that it makes a lot of difference but one Gerald G. Schmitt, KK5YY of
> Los Alamos seems to have gotten his Extra 30 May presumably as a Welfare
> Extra. Pot, Kettle, Black?

Ten years from now, how are you going to tell welfare extras from
anyone else? Won't renewal time be a great equalizer?
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

405. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 01:52:42 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9409ha$1jk$1@208.206.142.85>
Source record: 653

Well that's sure no shortcoming you couldn't overcome in short order.
Just RTFM, plug all the black boxes together look at the screen and GET
BORED.

W4JLE wrote:
>
> I have never operated spread spectrum or psk31.
>
> "W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20010114205126.19385.00002001@ng-fy1.aol.com...
> > >From: "W4JLE" Fred@w4jle.com
> >
> > >A man needs to know his limitations, and the sooner all the CW challenged
> > >people admit it the better.
> >
> > All of us are "challenged" in something, Fred. What modes do you not
> operate?
> >
> > 73,
> > Ed Hare, W1RFI

406. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 01:54:43 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9409l3$1jk$2@208.206.142.85>
Source record: 655

W1RFI wrote:
>
> >From: "W4JLE" Fred@w4jle.com
>
> >I have never operated spread spectrum or psk31.
>
> Then those that do are better than you -- at operating spread spectrum or
> psk31.
>

Don't overlook the big point-again. Fred can easily operate those
modes. Nocoders cannot easily operate CW. It takes a little personal
involvement and dedication to skillhuilding.

407. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 02:02:13 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <940a35$1jk$3@208.206.142.85>
Source record: 657
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.policy

```
Cecil wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > Cecil wrote:
> > >
> > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > > To attempt to work code without any training and practical
> > > > experience is akin to attempting to fly an airplane without any prior
> > > > flight training.
> > >
> > > Please explain how working CW is a life and death proposition akin
> > > to flying an airplane.
> >
> > There you go again, making phantom linkages. No such assertation was
> > made. The comparison stands.
>
> You are the one who made the phantom linkage. Working CW is NOT
> akin to flying an airplane.
>

It certainly is. Neither activity can be accomplished without
sufficient training and practice such that one can properly perform the
necessary functions to successfully complete the task. Some things
cannot be accomplished by "winging" it.
```

408. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 02:04:38 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <940a7m$1jk$4@208.206.142.85>
Source record: 658

```
Cecil wrote:
>
> W1RFI wrote:
> >
> > >From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
> >
> > >And Cecil says his slips are never Fruedian.
> >
> > Do you believe they always are?
>
> Who the heck was Frued anyway?

OOps...should have been Fruitian
```

409. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 02:05:37 UTC
From: A knight of knee <dxssb@ieee.org>
Message-ID: <MPG.14cd767d17fdafa7989692@nntp.mindspring.com>
Source record: 660

In article <3A63A0B6.3612071F@IEEE.org>, Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org says...
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Bet you a lobster that the same thing occurs when the do dropthe code
> > test entirely.
>
> Last year you were betting that hoards of CBers and freebanders were
> about to invade the ARS. Which is it?

try listening to all the dx types working d68bt. she's asking for the
lima delta and all you hear is people howling and yowling like some doof
from Ohio or Michigan during a dull big 10 game or worse during the
excitingly dull fiesta bowl

must be the tech plus upgrades from April 15

410. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 02:05:58 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <940aa6$1jk$5@208.206.142.85>
Source record: 659

Cecil wrote:
>
> W1RFI wrote:
> > I have no basis on which to even speculate as to the percentage. Do you?
>
> Nope, Jim and I are not arguing percentages. All it takes is one jammer
> using Morse code equipment and I win the argument.
>

Not so. Jim said USING MORSE CODE, not equipment that can be used for Morse code. In that case any radio capable of being keyed as a CW transmitter would qualify.

411. Re: Buy a ham ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 02:05:59 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <92O86.856$e5.2172422@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 661

Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com> wrote:

> Seriously, it would be nice to see some side by sides of
> software/hardware performance competitions from the pk, kam, universal,
> etc., as well as the cheapie baypac type.

I will take that as a "yes" vote. :-)

> QST has been doing well with the nec antenna modeling software, and I
> think it was World Radio that did the VOA Prop software. Both are
> outstanding directions for the future of the ARS. Keep up the good
> work.

If you like propagation, go to http://elbert.its.bldrdoc.gov/hf.html and download the HFWIN software. This is about the coolest freeware I think I have ever used! It will give IONCAP predictions, from city to city, complete with either frequency vs time graphs or world maps of signal contours. I promise it is worth the price!

> While I'm dreaming, how about a how-to article for an ionospheric pinger
> that measures the critical frequency? A network of these might be as
> useful as the 20M beacon network. Too bad we would be out of band about
> 90% of the time.

Well, I hear enough of these pingers in band, so somebody is doing it! :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

>
>
> Sent via Deja.com
> http://www.deja.com/

412. Re: W4JLE Welefare Extra?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 02:07:47 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <R3O86.857$e5.2172501@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 662

Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:

> "Ed Hare, W1RFI" wrote:

> > If anyone has doubts about my qualifications wrt CW, they can meet me on
40
> > M and judge for themselves.

> Hey Ed, do you ever do 10wpm or should I turn on my SCS PTC2e?

10 wpm or 30 wpm is fine by me. I can handle a bit faster, but I don't
enjoy it as much.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

413. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 02:12:57 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <H8O86.858$e5.2172842@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 664

Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

> You'd have just as much success taking off and landing an airplane
> without prior training and practice as you would successfully making a
> CW contact on the air without the necessary training and practice. And
> I'm sure that you know it.

Dick, you forgot the smiley.

I learned CW in 1963, from a chart and by saying dit-dah in my head a lot. W1BNB sent code at 5 wpm and I copied it. I got my Novice. When I made that first shaky CQ, I do not believe that I had anything more than this self training, and absolutely zero practice.

Do you really believe that if W1BNB had not checked my code speed at 5 wpm, that I would not have been able to get on the air and do my first shaky QSO? I would not have done so until I knew the code.

Would you ever sing a song in front of a large group of people unless you knew the words?

Do you really equate my learning code at a shaky 5 wpm and making a QSO that I wasn't really ready for with flying a plane?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

414. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 02:13:55 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <B9O86.859$e5.2172824@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 665

Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

> > I have never operated spread spectrum or psk31.

> Well that's sure no shortcoming you couldn't overcome in short order.
> Just RTFM, plug all the black boxes together look at the screen and GET
> BORED.

Can you tell me where I can buy the manual and black box to operate spread spectrum?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

415. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 02:15:09 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <940ard$60i$0@208.206.142.85>
Source record: 663

W1RFI wrote:
>

> That is exactly what is needed to influence ARRL policy. Hams should also make
> their views known to the FCC when such matters are on the regulatory plate.
> They should also support organizations that represent their views, such as
> FISTS or NCI.
>

Next you'll try to tell us that their minds aren't already made up.

416. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 02:15:22 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A63AEBA.C4DC46A4@IEEE.org>
Source record: 672
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Dick Carroll wrote:
> It certainly is. Neither activity can be accomplished without
> sufficient training and practice such that one can properly perform the
> necessary functions to successfully complete the task. Some things
> cannot be accomplished by "winging" it.

Of course, learning CW can be accomplished by "winging" it since there is no punishment for doing so. The reason that one cannot "wing" learning to fly an airplane is because one winds up dead. The only thing that happens to a poor CW operator is that the other operator pulls out or the QSO cannot be finished. It's no big deal if a QSO cannot be completed. It happens all the time because of fading MUFs.

The only CW-only bands in the entire amateur radio spectrum don't require Morse code for the license. That proves that the FCC thinks CW can be learned and accomplished by "winging" it. Why should HF have any different requirement from the CW-only bands?????

If one applied your desired rules to speech, babies would never be allowed to try to speak until they were fluent. Is that really what you want?
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

417. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 02:16:22 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <_bO86.860$e5.2173135@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 666

Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

> Don't overlook the big point-again. Fred can easily operate those
> modes. Nocoders cannot easily operate CW. It takes a little personal
> involvement and dedication to skillhuilding.

Now, if all of these new hams can memorize over 1,100 questions in the question pool in a weekend of studying, I am sure they can memorize 26 characters and a few punctuations "easily."

I do agree, though, those who don't know Morse code can't easily use the mode. They would have to buy a TNC and read the manual. :-)

I am curious, what can Fred to easily operate spread spectrum?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

418. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 02:17:51 UTC
From: W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com>
Message-ID: <940b3q$an3$1@iac5.navix.net>
Source record: 667

And many are like the message I am enclosing copied from Rec.Radio.CB, I forward sans comments:

I have to agree with you there ken. I am a Ham operator with a tech no code license. I like DX, that is the main reason I use radio. Right now I can talk useless (to me) Vhf now but no HF unless I use 11 meters. So about the only DX IM doing is freebanding until I suffer through these tapes and learn this stupid code. I can already pass the General exam and I'm studying for the Extra, but all my DX is on 11 meters.

Plus when I go out 4wheel driving and want to keep in touch with my XYL (wife)if I use regular CB it is to crowded, and she dosn't have a ham license so what freqs do I use??? You guessed it, I go above channel 40 on 11 meters. I don't bother anyone and I have safe comm with the XYL.

The main thing about freebanding is to use courteous operating procedures, good equipment, a Low-pass filter, grounded gear and not to much power.

73
Jim
2DK3

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote > What happened to all those hoards of CBers and
> > freebanders that you predicted would invade the ARS?
>
>
> They arrived early. In the form of lots of no coders and slow coders.
> No real surprise, lots of them have came through the VE system. And many
> have gone on to other more productive "freeband" activities where they
> find conditions and 'services' better than 27 mhz and they don't have to
> put up with dodging ham radio regulations and renewed enforcement.
> Things do evolve. Ham radio is evolving -mutating would be a better
> choice of words,like a cancer- into something unrecognizable. Ah well,
> no good thing lasts forever. Ham radio is no different in that respect.

419. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 02:18:09 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A63AF61.62C601F0@IEEE.org>
Source record: 674

ehsjr@bellatlantic.net wrote:
> Both you and Cecil elect to dismiss anything that does not fit
> into your preconceived ideas.

That's not true. I dismiss anything that is irrelevant to the
argument. Music is not listed in the list of languages in the
encyclopedia. Neither is Morse code. Just because you want to
confound the language is no good reason to allow you to get
away with it.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

420. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 02:18:25 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <QdO86.861$e5.2173328@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 668

Vincent Biancomano <103520.355@CompuServe.COM> wrote:

> >It was definately prominently featured in the study guide for
> >the Novice exam I took.

> Either way, NOT the actual exam.

I'll post the study guide and let folks decide for themselves.

> >I really don't remember much about the Novice exam, but I am
> >sure it appeared on at least one version of the Novice test.

> I'm sure it didn't. Through wasting my, and your time yet, Ed?

I am sorry that you feel the discussion is a waste of your time. If you wish, the last word is yours.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

421. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 02:20:31 UTC
From: W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com>
Message-ID: <940b8sarh1@iac5.navix.net>
Source record: 669

Let alone the fact that on/off keying is not Morse. A string of dots or dashes at 60 WPM from a built in keyer does not a Morse operator make.

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:940aa6$1jk$5@208.206.142.85...
>
>
> Cecil wrote:
> >
> > W1RFI wrote:
> > > I have no basis on which to even speculate as to the percentage. Do you?
> >
> > Nope, Jim and I are not arguing percentages. All it takes is one jammer
> > using Morse code equipment and I win the argument.
> >
>
> Not so. Jim said USING MORSE CODE, not equipment that can be used for
> Morse code. In that case any radio capable of being keyed as a CW
> transmitter would qualify.

422. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 02:20:51 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <6gO86.862$e5.2173409@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 670

Larry Roll K3LT <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote:

> >That would be a valid reason IF there was a government
> >need for amateurs to attain that skill. You can argue that
> >as you choose, but I fully believe that you'd never convince
> >the administrations of the world that the skill is needed
> >today.

> No, I guess I couldn't, because the slouching whiners are very
> effectively drowning me out. At least I can grasp reality.

Do you really believe that the FCC went against what it felt was best
because a few people "whined?"

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

423. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 02:23:19 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <940ban$726$0@208.206.142.85>
Source record: 671

W1RFI wrote:
>
> >From: "W4JLE" Fred@w4jle.com
>
> >Yep, they sure are. Now would you care to place a wager if there were me and
> >a nocoder, which could get on the air using the mode they were not
> >proficient in the quickest.
>
> Here are the terms. Let's select someone with a no-code license and you. He
> or she will be asked to construct a Morse-code transmitter and make a Morse
> code QSO. You will be asked to construct a spread-spectrum transmitter and
> make a Morse code QSO. Winner gets an ARRL Handbook from the "bent-cover" bin.

Fred I'll loan you my cordless telephone and you can make a
call.....that'll pretty well take care of it.

424. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 02:25:04 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <3kO86.863$e5.2173794@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 673

Larry Roll K3LT <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote:

> >I cannot answer the second because I do not believe that we should have a
> >one-class license system.

> Please consider that what you believe we should have, and what we
> end up with, are likely to be two different things. I can easily see
> all ham radio privileges given away with a single multiple-choice
> "written" test. It would be the ARRL's last desperate attempt to
> entice people to join up, considering the abject failure of Restructuring
> so far.

Can you point to anything that the ARRL has said that makes you believe that it favors a single multiple choice "written" test?

> >I also do not believe that our licensing system
> >should contain no Morse code testing. I believe that Morse code
proficiency
> >should be tested the same way we test for proficiency in other modes.

> I see. So asking multiple-guess questions *about* Morse code
> operation is now the equivalent of actually testing people on the
> skill of sending/receiving Morse code texts?

No. I believe that the test should contain a sent Morse code transmission and that the applicant should be asked questions about it. The way it would be tested the same as other modes is by including the answers as part of the overall score. 75% passes.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

425. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 02:26:07 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A63B13F.F6FAA4AB@IEEE.org>
Source record: 678

```
Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> Cecil wrote:
> >
> > W1RFI wrote:
> > > I have no basis on which to even speculate as to the percentage. Do you?
> >
> > Nope, Jim and I are not arguing percentages. All it takes is one jammer
> > using Morse code equipment and I win the argument.
>
> Not so. Jim said USING MORSE CODE, not equipment that can be used for
> Morse code. In that case any radio capable of being keyed as a CW
> transmitter would qualify.

That's what he said at first. He later changed it.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca
```

426. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 02:27:52 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A63B1A8.36571127@IEEE.org>
Source record: 679

W4JLE wrote:
> Let alone the fact that on/off keying is not Morse. A string of dots or
> dashes at 60 WPM from a built in keyer does not a Morse operator make.

Nobody said anything about Morse operators. The accusation is that
Morse equipment is being used by code-tested hams for the purpose
of jamming. The answer is obvious.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

427. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 02:30:25 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A63B241.EDC10850@IEEE.org>
Source record: 680

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Who in the world is dumb enough to actually believe he can jam anyone
> with dits and dahs?

The same dumb $hits who listen to 3950. Try it. You will hear CW
equipment being used for the jamming by code-tested hams - guaranteed.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

428. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 02:30:57 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <ApO86.864$e5.2174207@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 676

Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com> wrote:

> w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:

> >I will introduce you to a lot of CW ops
> >younger than 40.

> What do you think the ratio of 50/75 year old active CW ops compared
> to say 15/40 year old active CW ops? I'd guess 20 or 30 to 1 (or
> worse)...

I will take that bet. Let's take the first 100 CW QSOs from the 2001 W1AW logs from those operators whose age can be identified from the birth dates at the QRZ site or ARRL membership records as being either between 50 and 75 years of age or between 15 and 40 (inclusive). At 20:1, that would mean that 95 of the operators on the other end are 50-75 5 15-40.

Steak or lobster? :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

429. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 02:31:48 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <940bqk$9bl$0@208.206.142.85>
Source record: 675

W1RFI wrote:
>
> >From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
>
> >The most destructive act the FCC has ever taken was to make the Novice
> >license renewable and give it 10 meter phone. For far too many that
> >removed most of the incentive to upgrade. That was the difference. It
> >instantly took most Novices off learning and practicing on the CW bands
> >and instantly handed them a microphone.
>
> Most of those Novices either upgraded or failed to renew.

Yeah - to Tech Plus so they could get on 2 meters. Basic problem
remained.

>
> Do you believe they would have renewed if they had been limited only to Morse
> code operation?

Oh, probably not Ed. They would've probably just sat on their tails
and hands and whined and bitched for 12 or 13 years like a certain fella
who posts here a lot.

430. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 02:32:51 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <mrO86.865$e5.2174282@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 677

Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com> wrote:

> "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net> wrote:

> >Do you believe that it should be illegal for people to talk about the
> >content of the tests after they have taken them?

> Do you think it was morally correct for Bash to circumvent the FCC
> tests by publishing the exact questions and answers, thus allowing
> hams to pass the test by cheating?

You didn't answer the question.

> >Do you believe it should be illegal to print information about the
> >content of the tests after they have been taken?

> Do you believe it would be OK for me to lawfully but clandestinely
> obtain a copy of an ARRL employment exam, say from an employee who
> owes me a favor, and print and sell it to those seeking employment at
> ARRL?

You didn't answer that question, either.

Could you do me a favor and at least read the things you didn't say between
your lines.
73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

431. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 02:41:45 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <PzO86.866$e5.2175213@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 682

Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

> > Do you believe that if ham radio had been created deliberately to function
> > entirely differently than the radio services of its day, that it would have
> > attained the level of respect and value that helped preserve it through
> > decades?

> Why not just ask a pointless question?

Why do you thinkk that question is pointless?

> > I agree; our diversity is our strength. Having a test that emphasizes one mode
> > over all others is not "infinitely multifaceted" and cannot be expected to
> > foster that diversity in the Amateur Radio Service.

> Total nonsense, and I know that you know better than that, so how can I
> NOT believe you are exerecising an Agenda?

Do you believe that having a test that emphasizes one more over all others IS infinitely multfaceted? Do you believe that emphasizing one mode will foster diversity in the Amateur Radio Service?

>You know as well as I that it is simply impossible to operate CW without a minimum
> level of training and practice.

Of course it takes training, but for most hams, it is self training. As to practice, I got all of mine after I got my license.

> Those who want to operate CW must undergo that training.

Those who want to operate CW must either learn the code or buy a TNC and read the manual.

> Anyone who just hooks up a key or a paddle to his rig with the builtin
> keyer will fail right out of the gate and you know it as well as I. How
> can you at ARRL NOT to be merely trying to grease the skids for the
> demise of the mode?

Why would I want to end the mode that I use 99% of the time? Do you really believe that I am not posting what I personally believe?

> Now you'regoint to tell me we have that sort of spectrum crowding problem today. And I'll send you to

> scan the 70 cm band and report back.

Why would I want to tell you that, Dick. I have said a number of times that our occupancy of the higher bands is low. Did you miss the posts?

> So you've joined all the anti CW goons in slamming CW supportgers as
> Luddites then? No one has EVER said anything about the ARS not evolving
> and updating.

> It IS an anti-laziness campaign.

The difficulty of the present entry-level tests are already much much harder than they were when I studied those 4 pages to be a Novice. How can you say it is a laziness issue?

> The advance of technology and the evolution of the ARS has not a thing to
do
> with it.

We agree.

> Your reserve supply of arguments is clearly gone when you have to
> resort to the assinine. You know what is being advocated here and it
> isn't stupidity.

Well, I tried all the logical ones... :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

432. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 02:41:57 UTC
From: W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com>
Message-ID: <940ch3$bo3$1@iac5.navix.net>
Source record: 681

All BS aside, I can appreciate SS for military or commercial communications. As a ham mode, one would first have to make a standard contact, then agree on the spreading code and then switch to the mode. I admit ignorance as to how SS is being used on the ham bands, is there a standard spreading code and base frequency? While I may be in a self imposed minority, I can't see the utility of the mode for normal Amateur operations.

If one were setting up a traffic circuit or internet via amateur radio it would start to make more sense. That would raise another point as to how one could use the internet over amateur radio, given the bent towards the profane, and posting by people from countries without a third party agreement. What am I missing? Given a reasonable use, I would be glad to dig into it and at least learn on a rudimentary level.

PSK31 is a mode I might find tempting if I didn't live on 30 acres with no antenna restriction, and my nearest neighbor almost 1/2 mile away.

"Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:_bO86.860$e5.2173135@news.ntplx.net...
> Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>
> > Don't overlook the big point-again. Fred can easily operate those
> > modes. Nocoders cannot easily operate CW. It takes a little personal
> > involvement and dedication to skillhuilding.
>
> Now, if all of these new hams can memorize over 1,100 questions in the
> question pool in a weekend of studying, I am sure they can memorize 26
> characters and a few punctuations "easily."
>
> I do agree, though, those who don't know Morse code can't easily use the
> mode. They would have to buy a TNC and read the manual. :-)
>
> I am curious, what can Fred to easily operate spread spectrum?
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
>
>

433. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 02:44:14 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A63B57E.E1EF3889@IEEE.org>
Source record: 683

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Now it's nearly all commercial, with hams hanging on by
> the skin of their chins.

Dang Dick, you are the next Yogi Berra. Talk about mixed metaphores.

> You know as well as I that it
> is simply impossible to operate CW without a minimum level of training
> and practice.

But the question is: Why can't that training and practice take place
on the air? One wonders why you want to keep the airways all to yourself.
Did you refuse to allow your children to talk until they had mastered
the English language?

> So you've joined all the anti CW goons in slamming CW supportgers as
> Luddites then?

You are NOT a CW supporter, Dick. You have discouraged more potential
hams from ever trying CW than anyone else I know.

> It IS anti-laziness campaign.

It is an "I had to do it so you have to too" campaign. What is wrong with
live and let live? Why should everyone be forced to learn your personal
favorite mode?
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

434. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 02:47:46 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A63B652.E389214C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 685

A knight of knee wrote:
> try listening to all the dx types working d68bt. she's asking for the
> lima delta and all you hear is people howling and yowling like some doof
> from Ohio or Michigan during a dull big 10 game or worse during the
> excitingly dull fiesta bowl. must be the tech plus upgrades from April 15

Sorry to disillusion you, but that was happening long before April 15.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

435. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 02:53:58 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A63B7C6.A135F41A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 689

Dick Carroll wrote:
> It takes a little personal
> involvement and dedication to skillhuilding.

Uhhhhhhh Dick, last time I checked, "skillhuilding" was illegal,
immoral, and banned by the Catholic Church since the 7th century.
Such a pervert, tsk, tsk.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

436. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 02:54:59 UTC
From: Vincent Biancomano <103520.355@CompuServe.COM>
Message-ID: <940d63nol1@sshuraaa-i-1.production.compuserve.com>
Source record: 684

VB> Either way, NOT the actual exam.

>I'll post the study guide and let folks decide for themselves.

Let's get this straight, so I don't misunderstand: If you can post the STUDY GUIDE re: your Novice and show that a question was asked about the unit of resistance in the ACTUAL FCC TEST you took for Novice, I'll nominate you for the Nobel Prize in Literature.

Regards,
Vince, WB2EZG

437. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 02:58:31 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <940dcn$c9b$0@208.206.142.85>
Source record: 686

"Ed Hare, W1RFI" wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>
> > And many have gone on to other more productive "freeband" activities where
> they
> > find conditions and 'services' better than 27 mhz and they don't have to
> > put up with dodging ham radio regulations and renewed enforcement.
>
> The nerve of them, actually following the rules!

Yeah, they followed the rules right out of the ARS into the Freeband
where there's no one like me to tweak their tails. some of you seem more
than willing to welcome whatever shows up at the door with a free
license, and then lament the nonsense they bring with them.

438. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 02:58:58 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A63B8F2.A34FA38B@IEEE.org>
Source record: 692

Dick Carroll wrote:
> You'd have just as much success taking off and landing an airplane
> without prior training and practice as you would successfully making a
> CW contact on the air without the necessary training and practice.

Absolutely false, Dick. One way you would be dead. The other way you
would just continue learning Morse code. Do you advocate killing all
the babies who are not fluent when they utter their first words?
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

439. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 03:00:34 UTC
From: W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com>
Message-ID: <940djucdb1@iac5.navix.net>
Source record: 688

Given the premise as you have stated, one could not disagree.

"Cecil" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3A63B1A8.36571127@IEEE.org...
> W4JLE wrote:
> > Let alone the fact that on/off keying is not Morse. A string of dots or
> > dashes at 60 WPM from a built in keyer does not a Morse operator make.
>
> Nobody said anything about Morse operators. The accusation is that
> Morse equipment is being used by code-tested hams for the purpose
> of jamming. The answer is obvious.
> --
> http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

440. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 03:01:07 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A63B973.E08BAF78@IEEE.org>
Source record: 693

"Ed Hare, W1RFI" wrote:
> Do you really equate my learning code at a shaky 5 wpm and making a QSO that
> I wasn't really ready for with flying a plane?

Unfortunately, he does. There are many crazy people out there, Ed.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

441. No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 03:02:09 UTC
From: Vincent Biancomano <103520.355@CompuServe.COM>
Message-ID: <940djhnol2@sshuraaa-i-1.production.compuserve.com>
Source record: 687

VB>I'll make it easy for you to find, Paul: Among my letters to ARRL include
VB>my newsletters sent to the division membership during all my runs for director
VB>(that's an ARRL rule). Easy to locate, all in public forum. One of them
VB>especially went into detailed discussion about what to do to protect/improve
VB>the Service re: deregulation. They will also have my 300-word statements (as
VB>part of the ARRL mailouts) on file. They will also have on file two letters
VB>concerning my proposal to initiate the (first) Spectrum Protection Act (which
VB>they allowed me credit for on at least one of my 300-word statements).

>Are you saying that all of these important documents only have copies at
>League HQ, that is, if they were retained by them at all? Since the
>League is an organization you have much disagreement with, I'd expect
>that you'd keep personal copies of this important correspondence about
>examination reform, spectrum protection, ARRL electoral politics
>including "dirty pool" by other participants/supporters, etc., in case
>there is any disagreement about content.

First, the documents are not important at all. What I am saying is get your
proof of their existence from ARRL, since you could always say I've just
generated any letters I might give you and what I say is not true (which
is what you've long attempted to show in any case). Arguments with
the League aside, ARRL would not be so foolish as to doctor a public
record.

>By asking the TIS for everything, I was inquiring if there were letters
>to the editor, or other small items not in the public indexes (their
>internal indexes, or even institutional memory such as experienced
>staffers, might be more detailed than the indexes at www.arrl.org, or in
>the December QST's each year).

There was one letter to the editor c. 1969 regarding the Extra Class exam.
A lot of correspondence to ARRL staffers such as Doug DeMaw, Lew
McCoy. Mostly technical exchanges, some political ones.

VB>If ARRL has none of these, a summary of all those suggestions to improve
VB>the exam process per se was filed with FCC in their restructuring proposal.
VB>On the FCC site, in public forum. In only 4 pages, as I remember.

>Be assured that that was read by me very shortly after it was made.

Make sure then that ARRL gives you a copy of that document. I sent
them one.

There have been other letters sent to HQ hierarchy over the years,
starting c. 1964 with George Grammer, then various presidents
in office, and Dave Sumner. The vast bulk of them, tho, are political,
starting in the mid 80s, then picking up again in the mid 90s with the

ARRL poll written by ARRL's First VP and I believe the GM and possibly ARRL president. A poll so badly done it drew slashing criticism from even one ham who was a social scientist (K4JAP) in the business of designing polls. The response was so incendiary, Dave Sumner initially denied even receiving some of those letters. All the ARRL had to do was hire a professional polling firm to construct the survey. But no, they had to do it their way.

They received a letter from me on that, warning of the consequences of doing a poll written by amateurs. AND they received a letter from me afterwards, but by that time K4JAP had actually beaten me to the punch; instead of providing his own professional critique on the poll, he referenced my letter! (Still ARRL couldn't get its no-code/slow-code thing through.)

But I digress. One of my exchanges with the Pres, in speaking about the poll, also went through in detail what was happening to the theory exam process, and what specifically needed to be done to fix it.

SO MAKE VERY SURE you receive a copy of THAT letter from the ARRL archives. If you don't get it, they've either trashed all that correspondence, or they're not giving you all they have. Time to get down to the nitty-gritty on this one. But ARRL will do the proving for me, just to demonstrate I've been involved in this thing for 18 years in no-nonsense fashion.

Regards,
Vince, WB2EZG

442. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 03:02:33 UTC
From: W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com>
Message-ID: <940dnlcfu1@iac5.navix.net>
Source record: 690

Hey I forgot all about the cordless phone...

Ed scratch SS off the list and I am downloading PSK 31 as I type this.

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:940ban$726$0@208.206.142.85...
>
>
> W1RFI wrote:
> >
> > >From: "W4JLE" Fred@w4jle.com
> >
> > >Yep, they sure are. Now would you care to place a wager if there were
me and
> > >a nocoder, which could get on the air using the mode they were not
> > >proficient in the quickest.
> >
> > Here are the terms. Let's select someone with a no-code license and
you. He
> > or she will be asked to construct a Morse-code transmitter and make a
Morse
> > code QSO. You will be asked to construct a spread-spectrum transmitter
and
> > make a Morse code QSO. Winner gets an ARRL Handbook from the
"bent-cover" bin.
>
>
> Fred I'll loan you my cordless telephone and you can make a
> call.....that'll pretty well take care of it.

443. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 03:02:56 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A63B9E0.8E502207@IEEE.org>
Source record: 694

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Next you'll try to tell us that their minds aren't already made up.

If their minds are made up, why are you wasting your time?
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

444. Re: W4JLE Welefare Extra?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 03:05:12 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A63BA68.7453B09F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 696

"Ed Hare, W1RFI" wrote:
> 10 wpm or 30 wpm is fine by me. I can handle a bit faster, but I don't
> enjoy it as much.

Hmmmmmm, does that mean you don't enjoy 13wpm? :-)
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

445. Re: Despicable 14.313 behavior (?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 03:07:08 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <940dss$c9b$1@208.206.142.85>
Source record: 691
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Phil Kane wrote:
>
> On 15 Jan 2001 04:59:48 GMT, Jeffrey Herman wrote:
>
> >>Listened on 12.350 after their 14.313 ham "phone patch" was concluded.
> >>They used the callsigns "sasperella" and "shooting star".
> >
> >Those would probably be the names of their boats. Boat names in
> >lieu of callsigns are permitted on the VHF marine channels --
> >perhaps the FCC now permits that also on the HF marine frequencies
> >now.
>
> Not according to the Rules. What happens in real life is
> something else.....
>
> >Coordinating two boats to meet up on a marine band frequency
> >is perfectly acceptable.
>
> The authorized carrier frequency is 12.353 kHz...

Phil I think you and I might as well toss in the towel. The Huns have
arrived and they won. The FCC capitulated without so much as a whimper.

446. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 03:12:02 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A63BC02.B6639B6B@IEEE.org>
Source record: 697

Dick Carroll wrote:
> He'll never understand, even when being a ham radio operator is fully
> the equal with being a CB operator or a Freebander. He thinks all are
> the same.

That's patently false, Dick, so you need to explain what delusional
thinking patterns lead you to that conclusion.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

447. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 03:13:43 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A63BC67.A9A02124@IEEE.org>
Source record: 698

W4JLE wrote:
> Given the premise as you have stated, one could not disagree.

It's good to see that you have finally come to your senses.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

448. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 03:14:22 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <940eae$c9b$2@208.206.142.85>
Source record: 695

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> In article <3A628A3C.56FFED75@IEEE.org>, Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>
> >Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> >> How about the reason that testing for code knowledge, at
> >> progressively higher speeds, and for progressively increasing
> >> HF privileges, causes radio amateurs to attain a practical
> >> communications skill?
> >
> >If it's not fun, it's not practical, Larry. Everybody does not
> >share your likes and dislikes. What is wrong with live and let
> >live?
>
> Cecil:
>
> Don't look now, but a person can live a perfectly normal, healthy,
> and happy life without ever becoming an amateur radio operator.
> I am the only licensed ham in my immediate family, and I assure
> you, my parents, brothers, sisters, girlfriend, nieces, nephews,
> and scores of friends are all very happy, indeed, without a ham
> license in their possession. You really need to come up with
> a better argument than that!

He'll never understand, even when being a ham radio operator is fully
the equal with being a CB operator or a Freebander. He thinks all are
the same.

449. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 03:19:37 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A63BDC9.A24E6305@IEEE.org>
Source record: 702

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Yeah, they followed the rules right out of the ARS into the Freeband
> where there's no one like me to tweak their tails. some of you seem more
> than willing to welcome whatever shows up at the door with a free
> license, and then lament the nonsense they bring with them.

If they obey the rules within the ham bands, who cares where they
came from? If they are operating legally as hams within the ham bands,
they aren't freebanders anymore, are they? Seems ham radio has saved
them from a life of crime. Seems that is a good thing to me. Do you
disagree? Do you condemn anyone who has not lead a perfect life like
you have?
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

450. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 03:23:22 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <NaP86.869$e5.2177712@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 699

Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:940ard$60i$0@208.206.142.85...

> W1RFI wrote:

> > That is exactly what is needed to influence ARRL policy. Hams should
also make
> > their views known to the FCC when such matters are on the regulatory
plate.
> > They should also support organizations that represent their views, such
as
> > FISTS or NCI.

> Next you'll try to tell us that their minds aren't already made up.

Whose mind, NCI, FISTS or ARRL. I am sure that the basic agenda of NCI and FISTS is pretty well set, but just how both organizations will undertake their basic missions will, IMHO, be influenced by member input.

I will also tell you that I don't believe that ARRL's mind is made up on this issue. If it were, the Board would not have seen any need to publicize the agenda item well in advance. Frankly, I wish the Board would do more of that, whenever they can.

I know that the last time I talked to Tom, he had not received very many member inputs on the topic to be discussed and possibly voted on at the January meeting. I am sure your Director is in the same boat.

See http://www.arrl.org/divisions.

73, Ed Hare, W1RFI

451. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 03:27:28 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <FeP86.872$e5.2177933@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 701

W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com> wrote:

> All BS aside, I can appreciate SS for military or commercial
communications.
> As a ham mode, one would first have to make a standard contact, then agree
> on the spreading code and then switch to the mode. I admit ignorance as to
> how SS is being used on the ham bands, is there a standard spreading code
> and base frequency? While I may be in a self imposed minority, I can't see
> the utility of the mode for normal Amateur operations.

SS is probably not well suited to "random" QSOs, as are the narrowband
modes, although an SS repeater is very much a possibility. In that case, the
spreading code or hop sequency would be used the same as frequency.

Unfortunately, SS is not at all in significant use in the ham bands. For a
rundown of the current useage, see http://www.tapr.org.

73, Ed Hare, W1RFI

452. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 03:28:48 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <UfP86.873$e5.2178012@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 703

W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com> wrote:

> Ed scratch SS off the list and I am downloading PSK 31 as I type this.

Have fun with it. It is a popular mode. Some hams have reported decoding signals they could not hear by ear. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

453. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 03:29:23 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <940f6j$g11$0@208.206.142.85>
Source record: 700

"Ed Hare, W1RFI" wrote:
>
> Vincent Biancomano <103520.355@CompuServe.COM> wrote:
>
> > Yes, fully. Personally, I truly believe it was timed with
> > "Amateur" restructuring to move hams down from VHF to HF,
> > and geared to show newbies to the HF bands that HF was a
> > hospitable place to live. That's my opinion, and I'll stay by it.
> > Knowing the history of the deregulation issue, I believe it's a
> > fully logical conclusion.
>
> In this logical conclusion, are there now fewer VHF-only licencees than
> there were before the FCC took the sneaky back door approach you believe
> they did? If so, cite the source. If not, explain why it backfired.
>

There are certainly fewer VHF> *users*, and that is more revealing than
numbers of licensees, many of whom are clearly inactive

454. Re: W4JLE Welefare Extra?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 03:29:58 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <%gP86.874$e5.2177885@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 704

Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:

> "Ed Hare, W1RFI" wrote:

> > 10 wpm or 30 wpm is fine by me. I can handle a bit faster, but I don't
> > enjoy it as much.

> Hmmmmmm, does that mean you don't enjoy 13wpm? :-)

Cecil, everyone loves a wise man . . .

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

455. Re: Despicable 14.313 behavior (?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 03:30:27 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A63C053.6B0BC0B4@IEEE.org>
Source record: 710
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Dick Carroll wrote:
> The Huns have arrived and they won.

Yep, just like the last time tyranny thought they were fixed.
When will you Royalists ever learn your lesson? The Bastille
will always be stormed, sooner or later.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

456. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 03:32:43 UTC
From: W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com>
Message-ID: <940fg5$dl7$1@iac5.navix.net>
Source record: 706

I don't think he is comparing the severity of the failure to accomplish the task, simply that the two compare in ability to complete the task.

"Cecil" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:3A63B8F2.A34FA38B@IEEE.org...
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > You'd have just as much success taking off and landing an airplane
> > without prior training and practice as you would successfully making a
> > CW contact on the air without the necessary training and practice.
>
> Absolutely false, Dick. One way you would be dead. The other way you
> would just continue learning Morse code. Do you advocate killing all
> the babies who are not fluent when they utter their first words?
> --
> http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

457. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 03:32:52 UTC
From: billsohl@mindspring.com
Message-ID: <3a63c0ab.2080697@news.mindspring.com>
Source record: 707

On 16 Jan 2001 03:29:23 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

>"Ed Hare, W1RFI" wrote:
>>
>> Vincent Biancomano <103520.355@CompuServe.COM> wrote:
>>
>> > Yes, fully. Personally, I truly believe it was timed with
>> > "Amateur" restructuring to move hams down from VHF to HF,
>> > and geared to show newbies to the HF bands that HF was a
>> > hospitable place to live. That's my opinion, and I'll stay by it.
>> > Knowing the history of the deregulation issue, I believe it's a
>> > fully logical conclusion.
>>
>> In this logical conclusion, are there now fewer VHF-only licencees than
>> there were before the FCC took the sneaky back door approach you believe
>> they did? If so, cite the source. If not, explain why it backfired.
>
> There are certainly fewer VHF> *users*, and that is more revealing than
>numbers of licensees, many of whom are clearly inactive

And just how have you made that determination.
I've seen no lessening of VHF use here in NJ.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

458. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 03:34:08 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <940ffg$g11$1@208.206.142.85>
Source record: 705

"Ed Hare, W1RFI" wrote:
>
> Larry Roll K3LT <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote:
>
> > >That would be a valid reason IF there was a government
> > >need for amateurs to attain that skill. You can argue that
> > >as you choose, but I fully believe that you'd never convince
> > >the administrations of the world that the skill is needed
> > >today.
>
> > No, I guess I couldn't, because the slouching whiners are very
> > effectively drowning me out. At least I can grasp reality.
>
> Do you really believe that the FCC went against what it felt was best
> because a few people "whined?"

That's petty well how it happened, along with the caveat that it gave
FCC a
very easy out of the problematical Medical Code Waiver dilemna. Riley
himself made the comment on how a "few people can change the world-they
just did" WRT the restructuring.

459. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 03:34:49 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A63C159.50484547@IEEE.org>
Source record: 711

Dick Carroll wrote:
> That's petty well how it happened, ...

I'm glad you are finally seeing the light and admitting it was a petty issue.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

460. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 03:35:14 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <XIP86.875$e5.2178437@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 708

Vincent Biancomano <103520.355@CompuServe.COM> wrote:

> VB> Either way, NOT the actual exam.

> >I'll post the study guide and let folks decide for themselves.

> Let's get this straight, so I don't misunderstand: If you can
> post the STUDY GUIDE re: your Novice and show that a question was
> asked about the unit of resistance in the ACTUAL FCC TEST you
> took for Novice, I'll nominate you for the Nobel Prize in
> Literature.

I think the study guide will let people decide for themselves, Vince. It was, after all, derived from the FCC-published syllabus. For the Novice exam, things were kept pretty simple, so they stuck to the syllabus pretty closely.

If you feel the best way to persuade people to make up their minds your way is to remind them that I don't deserve a Nobel prize in Literature, I won't mind.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

461. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 03:38:31 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A63C237.927F3D91@IEEE.org>
Source record: 712

W4JLE wrote:
> I don't think he is comparing the severity of the failure to accomplish the
> task, simply that the two compare in ability to complete the task.

But a comparison of those tasks is like me comparing my ability to blow
my nose to the task of landing a man on the moon.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

462. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 03:40:47 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <940frviof0@208.207.71.175>
Source record: 709

Cecil wrote:
>
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > >If it's not fun, it's not practical, Larry.
> >
> > Don't look now, but a person can live a perfectly normal, healthy,
> > and happy life without ever becoming an amateur radio operator.
> > I am the only licensed ham in my immediate family, and I assure
> > you, my parents, brothers, sisters, girlfriend, nieces, nephews,
> > and scores of friends are all very happy, indeed, without a ham
> > license in their possession. You really need to come up with
> > a better argument than that!
>
> You seemed to have missed the point entirely, Larry. I was talking
> about CW. In the present amateur radio environment, if it's not
> fun, it's not practical. There is no other incentive for a ham
> to know Morse code anymore except for the fun involved. If you
> want to recruit new hams to Morse code, I would suggest you stop
> telling everyone what a pain in the arse it was for you.

For almost everyone it IS a real pain in the arse! Why are so many
easy accessers so opposed to it? Not just because "we never plan on
using it".
No one planned onusing it beyond the time the phonelicnese arrived. Most
of us found the benefits and value of it only after putting up with the
pain until we passed that point. When one approaches it from a "I don't
want to and I shouldn't have to" angle it makes it much harder to to
than if one takes it on as a task to be accomplished.

463. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 03:43:15 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A63C353.501C80F8@IEEE.org>
Source record: 716

Dick Carroll wrote:
> For almost everyone it (CW) IS a real pain in the arse!

Dick, if you keep that up nobody in the world will want to learn it.
For me, Morse code was fun. My cousin and I learned it without any
rewards. It was trivially easy to learn. It is so trivially easy
to learn that a Morse code requirement just doesn't make any sense.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

464. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 03:46:05 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A63C3FD.B03185CC@IEEE.org>
Source record: 717

Dick Carroll wrote:
> The one jammer case that I
> personally know of was not a licensed ham at all, but he jammed with a
> carrier and audio.

So you, who admittedly knows of only ONE case of jamming, are presenting
yourself as an expert on jamming. Why am I not surprised?
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

465. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 03:48:39 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A63C497.B74527A7@IEEE.org>
Source record: 718

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Who in the world is dumb enough to want to listen to 3950???

Anyone who wants to present himself as an expert on jamming.
Obviously, not you, since you only ever heard ONE jammer.

Hey, Dick, I'm an expert on birds. I saw one, one time.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

466. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 03:49:38 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <940gcijud0@208.207.71.175>
Source record: 713

Cecil wrote:
>
> W4JLE wrote:
> > Let alone the fact that on/off keying is not Morse. A string of dots or
> > dashes at 60 WPM from a built in keyer does not a Morse operator make.
>
> Nobody said anything about Morse operators. The accusation is that
> Morse equipment is being used by code-tested hams for the purpose
> of jamming. The answer is obvious.

Again,Cecil has twisted the subject to fit his own Agenda. What Jim said was that NO NAL's were ever issued to any operator for operation using Morse code.
Then Cecil not so subtly changed the entire situation to a "using Morse code equipment" theme, contrary to the original. He ignores of course that any ham radio transciever is capable of Morse code. And as Fred says, keying a key or keyer to cause an RF carrier doesn't make Morse code. Any Freebander who has no ham license but does have a ham tranceiver for his bootlegging operations can have all the CW sending gear he wants,and many are said to have it. The one jammer case that I personally know of was not a licensed ham at all, but he jammed with a carrier and audio.

467. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 03:50:53 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A63C51D.603B3C79@IEEE.org>
Source record: 719

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> Cecil wrote:
> > Dick, I don't often think of you in church but this Sunday I did.
> > The preacher said, "To belittle is to be little." I instantly
> > thought of you.
>
> That remark is inconsistant with reality and you know it.

Nope, it is the gospel truth. I don't know anyone who belittles
people more than you do.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

468. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 03:51:30 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <940gg2jud1@208.207.71.175>
Source record: 714

```
Cecil wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Who in the world is dumb enough to actually believe he can jam anyone
> > with dits and dahs?
>
> The same dumb $hits who listen to 3950. Try it. You will hear CW
> equipment being used for the jamming by code-tested hams - guaranteed.

Who in the world is dumb enough to want to listen to 3950???
```

469. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 03:52:25 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <940ghpjud2@208.207.71.175>
Source record: 715

```
Cecil wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > That remark is inconsistant with reality and you know it.
>
> Dick, I don't often think of you in church but this Sunday I did.
> The preacher said, "To belittle is to be little." I instantly
> thought of you.

That remark is inconsistant with reality and you know it.
```

470. Re: W4JLE Welefare Extra?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 04:06:03 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3A63C8AB.F63ED2F6@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 720

W4JLE wrote:

>
>
> You never did answer the question if anyone actually operates SS Morse?
>
>
> I think it was called "spark".

471. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 04:08:15 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <940hff$mm7$0@208.207.71.175>
Source record: 721

"Ed Hare, W1RFI" wrote:
>

> Do you believe that having a test that emphasizes one more over all others
> IS infinitely multfaceted? Do you believe that emphasizing one mode will
> foster diversity in the Amateur Radio Service?
>

It is simply NOT TRUE that the tests emphasize one mode over all
others. Morse code is simply not subject to testing that does not
include the ability to function as an operator using that mode.That is
no different than it has been for a hundred years. All assertions
otherwise are smoke and chaff.

> >You know as well as I that it is simply impossible to operate CW without a
> minimum
> > level of training and practice.
>
> Of course it takes training, but for most hams, it is self training. As to
> practice, I got all of mine after I got my license.
>

Great! Would that some of the wannabees would do the same today.

> > Those who want to operate CW must undergo that training.
>
> Those who want to operate CW must either learn the code or buy a TNC and
> read the manual.

And then act like BrianBurkeyTurkey and scream "Poor amateur practice"
when some handsent signal comes along they can't copy.

>
> > Anyone who just hooks up a key or a paddle to his rig with the builtin
> > keyer will fail right out of the gate and you know it as well as I. How
> > can you at ARRL NOT to be merely trying to grease the skids for the
> > demise of the mode?
>
> Why would I want to end the mode that I use 99% of the time? Do you really
> believe that I am not posting what I personally believe?

What I can't believe is that you really truly believe that any
significant number of todays hams will ever learn it if they don't do it
for a test. It just doesn't compute based on history.

> > Now you'regoing to tell me we have that sort of spectrum crowding problem
> today. And I'll send you to

> > scan the 70 cm band and report back.
>
> Why would I want to tell you that, Dick. I have said a number of times that
> our occupancy of the higher bands is low. Did you miss the posts?
>
> > So you've joined all the anti CW goons in slamming CW supportgers as
> > Luddites then? No one has EVER said anything about the ARS not evolving
> > and updating.
>
> > It IS an anti-laziness campaign.
>
> The difficulty of the present entry-level tests are already much much harder
> than they were when I studied those 4 pages to be a Novice. How can you say
> it is a laziness issue?
>

You really don't want to read all that again, factual as it is.

It is very easy to believe that the wheels at ARRL are resigned to an
ARS of any kind, at whatever level FCC decides to drop it to, in the
desperate hope that it will be able to remain in existance at all.

472. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 04:11:39 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <940hlr$mm7$1@208.207.71.175>
Source record: 722

Cecil wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Bet you a lobster that the same thing occurs when the do dropthe code
> > test entirely.
>
> Last year you were betting that hoards of CBers and freebanders were
> about to invade the ARS. Which is it?

You read when I said it- they're already here, they came early.

473. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 04:16:05 UTC
From: Vincent Biancomano <103520.355@CompuServe.COM>
Message-ID: <940hu5qit1@sshuraaa-i-1.production.compuserve.com>
Source record: 723

>I think the study guide will let people decide for themselves,
>Vince. It was, after all, derived from the FCC-published
>syllabus. For the Novice exam, things were kept pretty simple,
>so they stuck to the syllabus pretty closely.

Ed, having just admitted you don't remember what was on your Novice exam, you know not of what you speak (in my opinion; no offense). On the other hand, I for a fact remember that question wasn't there. And the reason I remember it is that I specifically remember saying to myself "even the Novice exam wouldn't be so trivial as for them to ask me what the unit of resistance is. The test is a giveaway as it is!" The only break I could possibly cut you is that some exams had that question, by chance. But I've yet to run into one that specifically remembers it. Just too easy. Ridiculous, in fact.

Regards,
Vince, WB2EZG

474. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 04:16:07 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A63CB07.E8F61E06@IEEE.org>
Source record: 725

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> "Ed Hare, W1RFI" wrote:
> It is simply NOT TRUE that the tests emphasize one mode over all
> others.

How you can delude yourself and attempt to delude others is beyond belief. One exam is for Morse code. One exam is for everything else in ham radio combined. If one flunks either exam, one doesn't pass. Therefore, the Morse code test is EQUAL to everything else in amateur radio combined. Each exam is pass/fail. Exactly what is it about this situation that you don't understand?

> What I can't believe is that you really truly believe that any
> significant number of todays hams will ever learn it if they don't do it
> for a test.

What I cannot believe is that you believe in a tyranny of testing where one mode is considered as important as everything else in ham radio combined. Where is your sense of justice and fairness?
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

475. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 04:20:27 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A63CC0B.ECE64DA8@IEEE.org>
Source record: 726

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> Cecil wrote:
> > Last year you were betting that hoards of CBers and freebanders were
> > about to invade the ARS. Which is it?
>
> You read when I said it- they're already here, they came early.

So exactly what is wrong with CBers and freebanders who enter the
ARS and obey the rules? Aren't you, in essence, advocating a sort
of racism? Black = 0wpm. White = 20wpm. Hispanic = 5wpm. Asian = 13wpm.
Blacks don't deserve equal rights.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

476. Re: W4JLE Welefare Extra?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 04:24:24 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <940idoons0@208.207.71.175>
Source record: 724

Cecil wrote:
>
> Richard McCollum wrote:
> > Not that it makes a lot of difference but one Gerald G. Schmitt, KK5YY of
> > Los Alamos seems to have gotten his Extra 30 May presumably as a Welfare
> > Extra. Pot, Kettle, Black?
>
> Ten years from now, how are you going to tell welfare extras from
> anyone else? Won't renewal time be a great equalizer?
>

Ten years from now, if there is still an ARS, the only class in existance will be Extra. When FCC drops all the other classes they won't dare off end or insult anyone by renaming their license, so they'll have to make every licensee an Extra. Whatta concept- the no code, no theory Extra!
That's what they started on April 15. I doubt it'll take ten years to complete the job.

477. Re: W4JLE Welefare Extra?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 04:26:08 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A63CD60.2A9D1486@IEEE.org>
Source record: 727

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Ten years from now, if there is still an ARS, the only class in
> existance will be Extra. When FCC drops all the other classes they won't
> dare off end or insult anyone by renaming their license, so they'll have
> to make every licensee an Extra. Whatta concept- the no code, no theory
> Extra! That's what they started on April 15. I doubt it'll take ten years
> to complete the job.

"So let it be written - so let it be done." Dicken Little, Jan. 15, 2001
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

478. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 04:46:03 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <940jmbrri0@208.207.71.175>
Source record: 728

"Ed Hare, W1RFI" wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>
> > Don't overlook the big point-again. Fred can easily operate those
> > modes. Nocoders cannot easily operate CW. It takes a little personal
> > involvement and dedication to skillhuilding.
>
> Now, if all of these new hams can memorize over 1,100 questions in the
> question pool in a weekend of studying, I am sure they can memorize 26
> characters and a few punctuations "easily."

Replay #976.... They don't memorize the questions and answers, they
make word associations so that when they read a question they look for
the familiar choice among the possibles, and can pick it out often
enough to pass. That's after studying only a single test element, not
the whole question pool. Vast difference, but you already knew that.

> I do agree, though, those who don't know Morse code can't easily use the
> mode. They would have to buy a TNC and read the manual. :-)
>
> I am curious, what can Fred to easily operate spread spectrum?

Borrow my cordless telephone to make a call.

479. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 05:07:53 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <940kv9$1po$0@208.207.71.175>
Source record: 729

"Ed Hare, W1RFI" wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>
> > You'd have just as much success taking off and landing an airplane
> > without prior training and practice as you would successfully making a
> > CW contact on the air without the necessary training and practice. And
> > I'm sure that you know it.
>
> Dick, you forgot the smiley.

Ok, :-)

>
> I learned CW in 1963, from a chart and by saying dit-dah in my head a lot.
> W1BNB sent code at 5 wpm and I copied it. I got my Novice. When I made
> that first shaky CQ, I do not believe that I had anything more than this
> self training, and absolutely zero practice.

Ah,but you DID have training and W1BNB sent you some code practice.
Enough to get you started. Do you equate all that to a couple written
questions on a written exam?

> Do you really believe that if W1BNB had not checked my code speed at 5 wpm,
> that I would not have been able to get on the air and do my first shaky QSO?
> I would not have done so until I knew the code.

Do you really believe that no ham who had never had that Novice style
training and bit of practice would get on the air and give it a go
anyway, with a lookup chart, at .00001 WPM?

> Would you ever sing a song in front of a large group of people unless you
> knew the words?

I can't carry one (tune) in bushel basket.

>
> Do you really equate my learning code at a shaky 5 wpm and making a QSO that
> I wasn't really ready for with flying a plane?

Well, my first solo was no masterpiece either, but I did make it back.
The second time around was better. On the third, full of newfound
confidence, I let it get a little slow just before touchdown and the
Cessna 150 stalled -quit flying- at about three feet off the ground. It
fell the rest of the way with a thud, bounced and bucked like a wild
bronco, and I got the world record for a short rollout, no more than 50
to 75 feet. I didn't know it, but the stall warning indicator wasn't

working.
My instructor, who was watching the whole affair from a runwasy marker nearby, made me get back in and take it around again, just for grins and to regain my aplomb. I never again let one get too slow on final.
That lesson was worth a lot of hours of ordinary flying. The lesson was that you never "have it made" till the machine is parked and tied down, and you never assume anything.

480. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 05:10:32 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <940l48$1po$1@208.207.71.175>
Source record: 730

```
Cecil wrote:
>
> "Ed Hare, W1RFI" wrote:
> > Do you really equate my learning code at a shaky 5 wpm and making a QSO that
> > I wasn't really ready for with flying a plane?
>
> Unfortunately, he does. There are many crazy people out there, Ed.
>

Cecil speaks from experience again, we see. He's about as looney as
they come. No one "equated" any such thing. Equating is not at all the
same as making a comparison. They DO compare. Neither can be done with
no training or practice.
```

481. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 05:24:21 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <940lu5$34p$0@208.207.71.175>
Source record: 731

Cecil wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > The one jammer case that I
> > personally know of was not a licensed ham at all, but he jammed with a
> > carrier and audio.
>
> So you, who admittedly knows of only ONE case of jamming, are presenting
> yourself as an expert on jamming. Why am I not surprised?
>

You're too dense to be surprised. Just because I've known personally
only one jamming case that comes immediately to mind, that means I have
no knowledge of any other? I can't read my monthly QST like you do? I
guess you've been "personally involved" in dozens of jammng cases and
that makes you an expert?

482. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 05:26:17 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <940m1p$34p$1@208.207.71.175>
Source record: 732

Cecil wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Who in the world is dumb enough to want to listen to 3950???
>
> Anyone who wants to present himself as an expert on jamming.
> Obviously, not you, since you only ever heard ONE jammer.
>
> Hey, Dick, I'm an expert on birds. I saw one, one time.

Oh,I hear jamming on a weekend net every week. But we just ignore the idiot and he takes his No Code arse somewhere else to try to gain his "revenge".

483. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 05:27:01 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <940m35$34p$2@208.207.71.175>
Source record: 733

```
Cecil wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > Cecil wrote:
> > > Dick, I don't often think of you in church but this Sunday I did.
> > > The preacher said, "To belittle is to be little." I instantly
> > > thought of you.
> >
> > That remark is inconsistant with reality and you know it.
>
> Nope, it is the gospel truth. I don't know anyone who belittles
> people more than you do.
>
To find one you only have to look in the mirror.
```

484. Re: W4JLE Welefare Extra?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 05:32:03 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <940mcj$34p$3@208.207.71.175>
Source record: 734

"Ed Hare, W1RFI" wrote:
>
> Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
>
> > "Ed Hare, W1RFI" wrote:
>
> > > 10 wpm or 30 wpm is fine by me. I can handle a bit faster, but I don't
> > > enjoy it as much.
>
> > Hmmmmmm, does that mean you don't enjoy 13wpm? :-)
>
> Cecil, everyone loves a wise man . . .

But none a smartass!

485. Re: Will you let them take away your guns?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 06:09:54 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <940oi9$l1g$1@news.service.uci.edu>
Source record: 735

Larry Roll K3LT <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20010114125938.00714.00001781@nso-md.aol.com...
> In article <3A55190B.C60FA4AB@uci.edu>, Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
writes:
>
> >
> >You still haven't given me an example of one in which it would be
> >appropriate to arm ourselves against our own government. I can't think
> >of one, and I certainly can't think of one that we could win.

> An example of a citizen militia rising up against tyranny would be a
> coordinated, mass demonstration by armed citizens on the steps of
> the Capital, demanding redress of specific grievances.

Weapons are not permitted on the steps of the Capitol. You could get
arrested! An even better place to take the guns would be to Andrews Air
Force base. Lots of things to shoot at there, and a great opportunity to
size up the opposition.

> Naturally,
> the D.C. Police and the military would be called out, but it would
> be up to them to fire the first shots on citizens who were simply
> taking advantage of one of their Constitutional rights. When the
> "lawful authorities" did fire on such citizens, then they would then
> be responsible for the beginning of Civil War II. At that point, the
> police and military, composed of the sons, fathers, daughters, and
> mothers of the revolutionaries, would then be required to fight
> against potentially tens of millions of armed citizens who wish to
> live in freedom from government oppression and tyranny.

You certainly do have a vivid imagination there, young man.

73, ac6xg

486. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 06:33:30 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <940pvc$ls1$1@news.service.uci.edu>
Source record: 736

Larry Roll K3LT <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message > I learned Morse code at speeds greater than 5 WPM because
> it was the current requirement to obtain an Extra-class license!
> If the requirement hadn't existed, neither would my achievement --
> and I would not have benefited from the enjoyment of reasonable
> proficiency in this practical communications skill. It's as simple
> as that.

And if the requirement for Extra had been 1B, you would never have been able to work any faster than 13 WPM? I'm sorry, but I don't believe you.

73, Jim AC6XG

487. Re: W4JLE Welefare Extra?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 06:47:23 UTC
From: kk5yy@arrl.net
Message-ID: <3a64eaaa.17524947@nntp.mindspring.com>
Source record: 737

On Mon, 15 Jan 2001 17:05:55 -0500, "W4JLE" <Fred@w4jle.com> wrote:

>OK, Gerald you have it all figured out. Now as Ed suggested would you care
>to set a skid?
>
>"Gerald Schmitt" <kk5yy@arrl.net> wrote in message
>news:3a646aa2.360000040@nntp.mindspring.com...
>> On Mon, 15 Jan 2001 15:20:27 -0500, "W4JLE" <Fred@w4jle.com> wrote:
>>

First you'll have to tell me what a "skid" is. Isn't that a wooden
thing something like a pallet. Tell you what better than a sked
why not have a little discussion of Physics.

Jupiter has a magnetic field, why?

Under what circumstances might a noble gas be conductive?

When you're finished with these questions I give you some more.

I think I've wasted enough time on foolish arguments and
foolish people. Take a lesson from Chip don't be so nasty
and superior and folks won't make fun of you.

BTW I still don't believe you, sorry I don't find bravado compelling.

488. Re: Despicable 14.313 behavior resumes

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 06:52:16 UTC
From: DX405 <lightnin9@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <940rkqgjc1@dagobah.blueriver.net>
Source record: 744
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

No, actually I do have some nice equipment. Would you call a FRG 100 a piece
of trash. How about a 909 not to mention others. Riley been talking to you
lately. Actually as far as a job goes, I have one not to mention other means
of producing income. Something that would not apply to a bum like yourself.
"KC8JBO" <roger_kc8jbo@my-deja.com> wrote in message
news:93vog4$3gi$1@nnrp1.deja.com...
> In article <93tmh7$9g6$1@dagobah.blueriver.net>,
> "DX405" <lightnin9@hotmail.com> wrote:
> > Hopefully KC8JBO will be getting a notice for his on air behavior. He
> needs
> > to be off the air like WB2OTK and some of the others.
>
> Hopefully, "DX405" will get a better job so he can afford something
> other than CHEAP-ASS RADIO SHACK RADIOS.
> But cheap is as cheap does......
>
> > "Joe Black" <jbla88@houston.net> wrote in message
> > news:3A623756.33C94D8B@houston.net...
> > > Fortunately, Riley Hollingsworth got an earful. Time for more
> official
> > > notices?
> >
> >
>
> --
> 73 de Roger, KC8JBO
> EM99 |ARRL|VE [ARRL & W5YI]|ARES |RACES
> Yaesu FT-920 |Inverted Vee @ 40 ft.
> Yaesu FT-90R
>
>
> Sent via Deja.com
> http://www.deja.com/

489. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 07:10:46 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <60t76tc6077s78b7385fiu9chr7oibr2r0@4ax.com>
Source record: 739

"Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net> wrote:
>Let's take the first 100 CW QSOs from the 2001 W1AW logs

If you have the time, do it. It will be interesting to see the result.

>from those operators whose age can be identified

I have a 3000+ QSO CW (only) log that stretches over the last ten
years. Most of the entries have the age identified. That's where I
made my estimate from...

490. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 07:10:47 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <hvs76tougkhmnoti3vp6pqb3qsqr32h3it@4ax.com>
Source record: 738

"Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net> wrote:

>Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com> wrote:
>
>> "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net> wrote:
>
>> >Do you believe that it should be illegal for people to talk about the
>> >content of the tests after they have taken them?
>
>> Do you think it was morally correct for Bash to circumvent the FCC
>> tests by publishing the exact questions and answers, thus allowing
>> hams to pass the test by cheating?
>
>You didn't answer the question.
>
>> >Do you believe it should be illegal to print information about the
>> >content of the tests after they have been taken?
>
>> Do you believe it would be OK for me to lawfully but clandestinely
>> obtain a copy of an ARRL employment exam, say from an employee who
>> owes me a favor, and print and sell it to those seeking employment at
>> ARRL?
>
>You didn't answer that question, either.
>
>Could you do me a favor and at least read the things you didn't say between
>your lines.

You have a habit of making comments by asking questions. I was just
commenting on your questions with my questions. Don't you like your
own debating style?? :-)

BTW, you didn't answer my questions either...

491. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 07:10:48 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <0vs76tod4d14b908ngqn0lbqv5qvpul9fl@4ax.com>
Source record: 740

Vincent Biancomano <103520.355@CompuServe.COM> wrote:
>I for a fact remember that question
>wasn't there. And the reason I remember it is that I specifically
>remember saying to myself "even the Novice exam wouldn't be so
>trivial as for them to ask me what the unit of resistance is.

In my 1949 ARRL license manual the first line of question #1 for the class B and class C license is: "Name the basic unit of electrical resistance" and the first line in the answer block is "The unit of electrical resistance is the ohm"...

492. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 07:17:05 UTC
From: W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com>
Message-ID: <940skt$lc8$1@iac5.navix.net>
Source record: 741

Not a case of coming to any senses, as you stated your premise, any ham on the air is assumed to be licensed and if on HF has passed a code test. Out of this universe you select a group of jammers, out of that group some non-Morse operator uses a keyer to Jam.

The original premise was that of the people issued citations, those that operate CW were not among that subset.

Just as I agree with your premise as stated, the fact is that I have not been able to find a case of jamming by Morse operators that resulted in a citation in the CW portions of the bands.

I am aware that a number of disgruntled hams have operated over W1AW code practice, while one may find this reprehensible, I don't think you can interfere with a broadcast. At least I can find no citations issued.

You were being hypertechnical, and I am now suspicious that you may be the advisor that told Clinton to argue the meaning of "is".

"Cecil" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3A63BC67.A9A02124@IEEE.org...
> W4JLE wrote:
> > Given the premise as you have stated, one could not disagree.
>
> It's good to see that you have finally come to your senses.
> --
> http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

493. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 07:20:16 UTC
From: W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com>
Message-ID: <940sqtlgs1@iac5.navix.net>
Source record: 742

So we are to assume from your derisive tone, you are aware of all jammers?

Or is your knowledge limited to those using Morse capable equipment?

"Cecil" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3A63C3FD.B03185CC@IEEE.org...
>
> So you, who admittedly knows of only ONE case of jamming, are presenting
> yourself as an expert on jamming. Why am I not surprised?
> --
> http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

494. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 07:22:02 UTC
From: W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com>
Message-ID: <940su6lhb1@iac5.navix.net>
Source record: 743

That remark is inconsistent with reality as you know it.

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:940ghpjud2@208.207.71.175...
>
>
> Cecil wrote:
> >
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > That remark is inconsistant with reality and you know it.
> >
> > Dick, I don't often think of you in church but this Sunday I did.
> > The preacher said, "To belittle is to be little." I instantly
> > thought of you.
>
>
> That remark is inconsistant with reality and you know it.

495. Re: Will you let them take away your guns?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 10:52:13 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <94194sbld1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 745

In article <940oi9$l1g$1@news.service.uci.edu>,
"Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote:
> An even better place to take the guns would be to Andrews Air
> Force base. Lots of things to shoot at there, and a great opportunity
> to size up the opposition.

Not really. Andy is probably the lamest AFB around. Quantico is in the
same neighborhood. Try that one.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

496. No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 12:41:57 UTC
From: Vincent Biancomano <103520.355@CompuServe.COM>
Message-ID: <941fil$qi4$1@sshuraac-i-1.production.compuserve.com>
Source record: 746

>Uh huh, well, how about sending me copies of your file copies,
>anyway? I'll even give you a quarter a page to cover your costs.

As I said Paul, get your info from ARRL. While you're at it, ask them of the details of what's gone down the past 10 years internally. I wouldn't want to skew the information unintentionally, or just in case I've missed the fine details, i.e., some nuances.

>Posting to news is such a bother, and sending E-mail is so easy.
>What say I just E-mail you my postings, and you can pass them on
>to rec.radio.amateur.policy for me from now on?

Better to post up right on this newsgroup, so there's no misunderstanding of misquotes, etc. Everything right in the open.

Regards,
Vince, WB2EZG

497. Re: Despicable 14.313 behavior resumes

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 12:45:28 UTC
From: KC8JBO <roger_kc8jbo@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <941fp7gct1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 747
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <940rkqgjc1@dagobah.blueriver.net>,
"DX405" <lightnin9@hotmail.com> wrote:
> No, actually I do have some nice equipment. Would you call a FRG 100
a piece
> of trash. How about a 909 not to mention others. Riley been talking
to you
> lately. Actually as far as a job goes, I have one not to mention
other means
> of producing income. Something that would not apply to a bum like
yourself.

Yeah, but being a GAY male prostitute must be difficult to list as a
job title on yout IRS tax forms.

> "KC8JBO" <roger_kc8jbo@my-deja.com> wrote in message
> news:93vog4$3gi$1@nnrp1.deja.com...
> > In article <93tmh7$9g6$1@dagobah.blueriver.net>,
> > "DX405" <lightnin9@hotmail.com> wrote:
> > > Hopefully KC8JBO will be getting a notice for his on air
behavior. He
> > needs
> > > to be off the air like WB2OTK and some of the others.
> >
> > Hopefully, "DX405" will get a better job so he can afford something
> > other than CHEAP-ASS RADIO SHACK RADIOS.
> > But cheap is as cheap does......
> >
> > > "Joe Black" <jbla88@houston.net> wrote in message
> > > news:3A623756.33C94D8B@houston.net...
> > > > Fortunately, Riley Hollingsworth got an earful. Time for more
> > official
> > > > notices?
> > >
> > >
> >
> > --
> > 73 de Roger, KC8JBO
> > EM99 |ARRL|VE [ARRL & W5YI]|ARES |RACES
> > Yaesu FT-920 |Inverted Vee @ 40 ft.
> > Yaesu FT-90R
> >
> >
> > Sent via Deja.com
> > http://www.deja.com/

>
>

--
73 de Roger, KC8JBO
EM99 |ARRL|VE [ARRL & W5YI]|ARES |RACES
Yaesu FT-920 |Inverted Vee @ 40 ft.
Yaesu FT-90R

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

498. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 13:06:54 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010116080654.05657.00001657@ng-cl1.aol.com>
Source record: 748

>From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

>Well that's sure no shortcoming you couldn't overcome in short order.
>Just RTFM, plug all the black boxes together look at the screen and GET
>BORED.

Most SS communication is for voice operation, not computer-to-computer.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

499. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 13:08:27 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010116080827.05657.00001658@ng-cl1.aol.com>
Source record: 749

>From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

>> I am curious, what can Fred to easily operate spread spectrum?

> Borrow my cordless telephone to make a call.

Are you advocating that he take the lazy way out?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

500. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 13:10:45 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010116081045.05657.00001659@ng-cl1.aol.com>
Source record: 750

>From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

> Does you sense of what is true and proper not
>get just a little uncomfortable as time goes by and you find yourself
>deeply involved in propping up a total charade?

Do you think that I don't believe the things I post?

What makes me uncomfortable is reading some of the posts to which I have commented. That is why I offer my views or ask questions.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

501. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 13:13:57 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010116081357.05657.00001661@ng-cl1.aol.com>
Source record: 751

>From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

>They DO compare. Neither can be done with
>no training or practice.

Dick is correct; one must learn the code before using it. One must learn how to fly a plane before flying it. The difference is that one teaches one's self Morse code. They can do so successfully in virtually all cases with or without any formal demonstration of that ability. People would not get on the air and try Morse code unless they had learned it first. For that reason, the plane analogy is technically correct, but not very useful to the discussion at hand.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

502. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 13:14:02 UTC
From: Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com>
Message-ID: <3A644919.6594B8CC@dvol.com>
Source record: 752

"Ed Hare, W1RFI" wrote:

> Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com> wrote:
>
> > Just DO it, it's your lab right? Oh, never mind . . !
>
> The Lab testing is under my control and I try to make sure that equipment is
> tested within a few days of its arrival. Usually, a rig like that will
> spend about 5-8 days in the screen room, being tested thoroughly from DC to
> daylight.

>
By who? Wilson?
>

> From there, the radios go to a reviewer, or, more
> likely, several reviewers. That is the part that is NOT under my control,
> even if the reviewer happens to be a Lab guy.

>
Who does control who does what when as far as what radios get reviewed and
scheduled for review publication?
>

>The reviewers are contract

> authors, paid the standard page rates. (Policy is that staff, officers or
> Technical Advisors can do reviews.)

>
A bit of moonlighting on the company dime, eh? Heh.
>

> The test results, btw, are summarized in the test-result table in the
> review, and for most rigs into an expanded test-result report. I put a
> sample up at http://www.arrl.org/tis/info/pdf/k2.pdf, if you want a quick
> link. (This is on the public site.)

>
The detailed K2 report, tnx. Can't complain about leaving many rocks unturned!
>

>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

>
w3rv

503. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 13:19:13 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010116081913.05657.00001662@ng-cl1.aol.com>
Source record: 753

>From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

>Ah,but you DID have training and W1BNB sent you some code practice.
>Enough to get you started.

No, he did not. I learned the Morse code from a table, saying "Q dah-dah-di-dah" a lot. He then sent about a minute of text and looked at my copy, asked me to send a few seconds and signed the form that indicated that I knew Morse code. If he had not signed the form, I still would have known Morse code. At that point, with or without the form, I was as ready as I was going to be to operate on the air. The only thing the form gave me was the regulatory authority to do so.

I know you know this.

>Do you really believe that no ham who had never had that Novice style
>training and bit of practice would get on the air and give it a go
>anyway, with a lookup chart, at .00001 WPM?

Sure they might. It is legal for any ham to do so on the only two CW-only sub-bands. If you believe that on-the-air operation should have a minimum speed, it would be more efficient to handle that with a rule about a minimum code speed. Did you recommend that in your comments to the FCC?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

>Do you really believe that no ham who had never had that Novice style
>training and bit of practice would get on the air and give it a go
>anyway, with a lookup chart, at .00001 WPM?

504. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 13:20:52 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010116082052.05657.00001663@ng-cl1.aol.com>
Source record: 754

>From: "W4JLE" Fred@w4jle.com

>I don't think he is comparing the severity of the failure to accomplish the
>task, simply that the two compare in ability to complete the task.

Which do you believe to be orders of magnitude easier -- teaching one's self
Morse code or teaching one's self how to fly?

Equating an analogy that is orders of magnitude different than the subject
being discussed is not logical.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

505. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 13:28:29 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010116082829.05657.00001664@ng-cl1.aol.com>
Source record: 755

>From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

>What if a situation arose where people's lives depended on
>communicating with the outside world, and the only mode that
>would work was some form of Morse/CW? Ever hear of a
>fractured larynx?

How many hams do you think have operated Morse code in an emergency because
they had fracturered their larynx?

I miss the list of reasons to keep the code. "You might fracture your larynx
someday in an emergency" could be the #1 answer.

>What if the only HF transceiver available
had a choice between SSB or CW, and there was only a single
>gel cell battery to power it? How long could it transmit on QRP
>CW as opposed to SSB at 100 watts?

I would use the drive or microphone control to reduce power to 10 W PEP SSB;
that would consume less power than 5 W CW.

Reason #2, "You might only have a gel cell and not know how to use your drive
or microphone gain controls to reduce power on SSB."

>The problem with the Morse/CW mode is that in order to
>effectively exploit its practical advantages, one needs to know
>the Morse code! Can you at least agree to that?

Pretty much. You have said it is child's play to learn at 5 wpm, so I am sure
if someone chooses to exploit its practical advantages, they will do so.
Perhaps you would serve the cause more effectively if you expounded on the
practical advantages instead of the parade of demeaning statements you have
made to those who are not presently choosing to use the mode...

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

506. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 13:31:28 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010116083128.05657.00001666@ng-cl1.aol.com>
Source record: 756

>From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

>No one planned on using it beyond the time the phone licnese arrived.

Your "no one" does not include me. I developed my love of the code as a Novice and when I upgraded to General, I didn't like phone.

I find it odd that you are "promoting" the mode by telling everyone how horrible it is. It seems to me that you are trashing the mode just so you can be right in this "debate."

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

507. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 13:33:07 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010116083307.05657.00001667@ng-cl1.aol.com>
Source record: 757

>From: Cecil Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>It was trivially easy to learn.

I don't know if "trivial" is the right word for everyone, Cecil. It took me about 2 weeks, as I recall, and that was after having learned it in the Scouts a few years earlier.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

508. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 13:34:56 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010116083456.05657.00001668@ng-cl1.aol.com>
Source record: 758

>From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

>> Do you really believe that the FCC went against what it felt was best
>> because a few people "whined?"

>That's petty well how it happened,

Do you believe that the reasons the FCC gave in its R&O were a coverup for what you have told us is the real, albeit secret, reason?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

509. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 13:36:13 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010116083613.05657.00001669@ng-cl1.aol.com>
Source record: 759

>From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

>I now regret the 14 years of fun I missed while I spent
>that time loudly objecting to code testing requirements.

And think of all the fun you are talking others out of having by being bitter
and negative about the present code testing requirements.

I think you are managing not to have fun on both ends of this one. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

510. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 13:40:14 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010116084014.05657.00001671@ng-cl1.aol.com>
Source record: 760

>From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

> There are certainly fewer VHF> *users*, and that is more revealing than
>numbers of licensees, many of whom are clearly inactive.

I have not noticed any significant change in VHF useage since 4/15. Is it
different in your area? By what percentage has VHF use declined? What licence
class shows that decline? Can you point to any data?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

511. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 13:43:12 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010116084312.05657.00001673@ng-cl1.aol.com>
Source record: 761

>From: Cecil Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>Last year you were betting that hoards of CBers and freebanders were
>about to invade the ARS. Which is it?

They all arrived early so they could pass a high-speed code test before
restructuring. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

512. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 13:46:41 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010116084641.05657.00001674@ng-cl1.aol.com>
Source record: 762

>From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

>> Do you believe that having a test that emphasizes one more over all others
>> IS infinitely multfaceted?

>It is simply NOT TRUE that the tests emphasize one mode over all
>others.

Do you believe that having one mode and one mode only have a pass/fail test is not emphasis? If I don't pass the code test, I don't get my license. If I don't answer the SSB questions correcty, I can still be a ham.

What does the word "emphasis" mean to you?

I know you know what it means.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

513. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 13:50:58 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010116085058.05657.00001675@ng-cl1.aol.com>
Source record: 763

>From: Aaron Jones nomail@nomail.com

>>Let's take the first 100 CW QSOs from the 2001 W1AW logs

>If you have the time, do it. It will be interesting to see the result.

So, is there a lobster dinner in it, or what? :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

514. Re: 10 bucks buys a ham license.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 13:54:12 UTC
From: "D. S. Platt" <jeepp@erols.com>
Message-ID: <3A645284.B34C8E3C@erols.com>
Source record: 765
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"D. S. Platt" wrote:

> jamesrhampton@my-deja.com wrote:
>
> > Neat. Someone actually thought of not charging. Of course, my first
> > licenses cost nothing - it was just the 60 mile (one way) drive to
> > Buffalo that cost a bit of time and money (gas, thruway tolls, parking,
> > etc.). The cost is actually minimal anywhere. I think I paid $5.90
> > when I decided to get back into amateur radio and tested out in 1993
> > (after letting my tickets expire over 10 years earlier). Whats the
> > cost today?
> >
> > 73 from Rochester, NY
> > Jim (AA2QA)
> >
> > In article <93airr$1js$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
> > BamBam <kl0an@my-deja.com> wrote:
> > > Now why would I go and PAY for a license when I got my license, AND
> > > upgrades for free.. Oh, sorry, I did have to earn them with a little
> > > studying and such.. My club offers testing free.. No money exchanges
> > > hands.. And I can now talk world-wide on the Extra bands..
> > >
> > > Just quit tryin to cheat the system, sit down with the manuals and get
> > > studying.. And if you want to take a test for free.. First Saturday of
> > > the month, Geo-Physics Institute, UAF, Fairbanks, Alaska.
> > >
> > > 73
> > > Paul Jordan
> > > kl0an
> > >
> > > In article <no.skill@arrl.crappy.org>,
> > > Buyone@arrl.crap (peddler) wrote:
> > > > Thanks to the organization called the ARRL, you don't have to earn a
> > > license
> > > > anymore. You can go to your local VE group and buy one for $10.
> > > > Get one today and join in the Fun!
> > > >
> > > > AOHF ~ assholes on H.F.
> > > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > > --
> > > Don't Sweat the Petty Things.

> > > Don't Pet the Sweaty Things.
> > >
> > > Sent via Deja.com
> > > http://www.deja.com/
> > >
> >
> > Sent via Deja.com
> > http://www.deja.com/
>
> The Laurel (MD) VEC (MD) has had a fee!

Sorry about that... left a word out... should have read: Laurel (MD) VEC has NEVER had a fee. Nice folks... fast and competent, too!!

515. Re: Despicable 14.313 behavior resumes

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 13:54:33 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010116085433.05657.00001679@ng-cl1.aol.com>
Source record: 764

>From: Brian brianburke@my-deja.com

>> >Was it more "Battle of the Pre-99 Extras?"
>>
>> I don't know. What percentage of the pre-99 Extras participated?

>Hey Ed, I'm asking the questions around here. ;)

>OK, what percentage of the pre-99 Extras participated?

What part of "I don't know" did you not understand? I would wager that the percentage of pre-1999 Extras that participated in that particular battle was less than 0.01% of the total number of pre-1999 Extras. For that reason. I don't believe that naming a battle after a group of people that had such a miniscule percentage of them actually participate is appropriate.

>Or better yet, of the participants, what percentage did the pre-99
>Extras make?

I don't know that, either. Are you willing to share the answer?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

516. Re: Despicable 14.313 behavior resumes

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 13:55:59 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010116085559.05657.00001681@ng-cl1.aol.com>
Source record: 766

>From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

>What is the significance of 1999?

I didn't have a clue, but it apparently had some significance to Brian, so I asked him a few questions about it.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

517. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 14:02:46 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A645486.96673C03@IEEE.org>
Source record: 770

W1RFI wrote:
>
> >From: Cecil Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
> >It was trivially easy to learn.
>
> I don't know if "trivial" is the right word for everyone, Cecil. It took me
> about 2 weeks, as I recall, and that was after having learned it in the Scouts
> a few years earlier.

I wasn't talking about everyone, Ed, just about myself. Learning Morse
code was one of the easiest things I have ever done. Two hours for
two nights was all it took for about 4wpm. However, my cousin had to
use cheat sheets and later flunked his first 5wpm exam.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

518. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 14:03:38 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010116090338.29826.00000630@ng-cl1.aol.com>
Source record: 767

>From: Brian Kelly kelly@dvol.com

>> Usually, a rig like that will spend about 5-8 days in the screen room,
>> being tested thoroughly from DC to daylight.

>By who? Wilson?

Mike Tracy, KC1SX, is our test engineer. Mark was promoted long ago; he is my boss. :-)

>> From there, the radios go to a reviewer, or, more
>> likely, several reviewers. That is the part that is NOT under my control,
>> even if the reviewer happens to be a Lab guy.

>Who does control who does what when as far as what radios get reviewed and
>scheduled for review publication?

The Product Review editor is Joe Bottiglieri, AA1GW. ARRL tries to review every major piece of amateur equipment, although it certainly doesn't get all the accessories.

>>The reviewers are contract
>> authors, paid the standard page rates. (Policy is that staff, officers or
>> Technical Advisors can do reviews.)

>A bit of moonlighting on the company dime, eh? Heh.

Yes.

>> The test results, btw, are summarized in the test-result table in the
>> review, and for most rigs into an expanded test-result report. I put a
>> sample up at http://www.arrl.org/tis/info/pdf/k2.pdf, if you want a quick
>> link. (This is on the public site.)

>The detailed K2 report, tnx. Can't complain about leaving many rocks
>unturned!

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

519. Re: Dealer Of Illegal 10 meter CB's

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 14:04:34 UTC
From: "Leland C. Scott" <no-spam@junk-mail.net>
Message-ID: <t68l7u975h627c@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 768

"Mr. Aaron Voobner" <voobner-no-spam@cotse.com> wrote in message
news:979592222.3a63641e0a424@webmail.cotse.com...
> A business called "Express Electronics" has recently surfaced on the web
as the
> result of demand for "CB Radios and Export Radio Equipment". Their stated
goal
> is to be the largest dealer of 2-way radio equipment in the US.

"Express Electronics" has been around for a while.

The problem with "export" radios is they are perfectly legal for Hams to buy, and use, so long as it's not on 11m. The only way to reduce the flow of equipment like this from getting into the hands of un-licensed people requires one to provide proof of license before the sale. As of right now there is no such requirement by law. Some Hams believe there should NOT be one either so that those who want a rig can get one, before getting their license, so they can monitor the bands, for example. One solution would be banding the importation, or sale, of any kind of "export" radio. Short of this I don't see much more the FCC can do except chase down the hundreds of large, and small, dealers selling these rigs. I see them for sale, by local CB Radio shops, at many Ham Radio flea markets I go to, and the next table over is somebody else selling "10m" amplifiers.

> However, products they focus exclusively on are illegal CB linears

This is one area where the FCC could make a big difference. There are well known 10m/11m linear amplifier dealers that do business on the Internet. You would figure it would be simple for the FCC to set them up for a "buy", like the DEA does with drug dealers, then bust them. An Internet search engine can track these dealers down at little to no cost to the FCC. There is no question about if the amplifiers are legal to sell or not. The FCC has that area well covered in Part 97. The Detroit FCC office got after the people selling H.F. amplifiers, kits no less, in the tent area at the Dayton Hamvention, so the real question is why don't they bust these guys on the Internet too.

--
Leland C. Scott
KC8LDO

520. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 14:07:02 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A645586.91FCBA64@IEEE.org>
Source record: 771

W4JLE wrote:
> Just as I agree with your premise as stated, the fact is that I have not
> been able to find a case of jamming by Morse operators that resulted in a
> citation in the CW portions of the bands.

Of course not, just as you won't find anyone dunking a basketball
while wearing a straight jacket.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

521. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 14:09:33 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010116090933.29826.00000645@ng-cl1.aol.com>
Source record: 769

>From: Vincent Biancomano 103520.355@CompuServe.COM

>Ed, having just admitted you don't remember what was on your
>Novice exam, you know not of what you speak (in my opinion; no
>offense).

You are correct; I don't remember the question specifically from my Novice exam. I am quite willing to assume that the material that was published in the 4-page study guide was going to appear on the tests. Can you think of any reason that the FCC would have put that material in its syllabus and not asked questions about it? Can you think of any reason that the FCC would ask questions about ohms without asking a question about what an ohm is?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

522. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 14:09:39 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A645622.F4EA125F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 772

Dick Carroll wrote:
> I guess you've been "personally involved" in dozens of jammng cases and
> that makes you an expert?

I have personally heard dozens of cases of jamming. A number of
those were indistinguishable from electronic keyers.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

523. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 14:11:18 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A645686.9939AE7F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 773

W4JLE wrote:
> So we are to assume from your derisive tone, you are aware of all jammers?

I have heard dozens of jammers.

> Or is your knowledge limited to those using Morse capable equipment?

Some jamming is indistinguishable from electronic keyers.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

524. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 14:12:34 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A6456D2.123711CB@IEEE.org>
Source record: 774

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Oh,I hear jamming on a weekend net every week.

VHF?
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

525. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 14:13:52 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A645720.F9B10ED3@IEEE.org>
Source record: 775

```
Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> Cecil wrote:
> >
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > That remark is inconsistant with reality and you know it.
> >
> > Nope, it is the gospel truth. I don't know anyone who belittles
> > people more than you do.
> >
> To find one you only have to look in the mirror.

I really love to bully bullies and belittle belittlers.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca
```

526. Re: 10 bucks buys a ham license.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 14:19:18 UTC
From: Ilan Rabinovitch <ilan@fonz.net>
Message-ID: <t6aeb6gt672mc3@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 851
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

I paid $6 when I took my Technician test in Decmeber.

Ilan
KG6ERM

In article <93bh3v$p32$1@nnrp1.deja.com>, jamesrhampton@my-deja.com wrote:

> The cost is actually minimal anywhere. I think I paid $5.90
> when I decided to get back into amateur radio and tested out in 1993
> (after letting my tickets expire over 10 years earlier). Whats the
> cost today?
>
> 73 from Rochester, NY
> Jim (AA2QA)

527. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 14:21:21 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A6458E1.748381F8@IEEE.org>
Source record: 776

Dick Carroll wrote:
> No one "equated" any such thing. Equating is not at all the
> same as making a comparison. They DO compare. Neither can be done with
> no training or practice.

One cannot play a game of checkers with no training or practice
either but there is no governmental requirement for training
because checkers is not a life and death situation. Learning
checkers is like learning Morse code. Learning anything where
one can be physically injured is unlike learning Morse code.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

528. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 14:27:03 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A645A37.22AB2B45@IEEE.org>
Source record: 777

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Do you really believe that no ham who had never had that Novice style
> training and bit of practice would get on the air and give it a go
> anyway, with a lookup chart, at .00001 WPM?

My cousin could send and receive Morse code with lookup charts at
approximately 4wpm. For receiving, he had the chart entries arranged
in a logical manner so he could just follow a flow chart and write
down the character.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

529. "They oughta require a license....blah, blah, blah"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 14:42:45 UTC
From: K0HB <k0hb@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <941ml3$mb4$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 779

In article <t68l7u975h627c@corp.supernews.com>,
"Leland C. Scott" <no-spam@junk-mail.net> wrote:

> The only way to reduce the flow of equipment like this
> from getting into the hands of un-licensed people
> requires one to provide proof of license before the sale.

Every so often a new guy like Leland comes up with the mistaken idea of placing restrictions on the wide availability of amateur radio equipment and supplies. These are the folks who suggest it be a crime to own amateur equipment without a license, and who are not thrilled about the fact that Radio Shack sells a line of UHF/VHF amateur equipment right out under the nose of the impressionable public. I suspect they don't like the idea that soldering guns and schematics are openly sold to those without the proper credentials also.

. . .While it is easy, on the surface, to agree with their goal (keeping amateur equipment out of the hands of bootleggers), I feel the attitude that amateur equipment should be treated as some sort of controlled substance is short-sighted and in fact damaging to our service.

. . .I live in a large metropolitan area. We have one full line amateur store in town. There are no other similar stores in the whole state. In the four states which border us, there are 2 more amateur radio stores. THAT'S IT! In 5 states, there are only 3 stores! In the whole country, my guess is that there are less than four dozen stores selling amateur radio equipment, antennas, and supplies! It is as though we were some secret society, bent on concealing our presence from the world.

. . .Not all that many years ago, there were at least 6 electronic stores here in town which sold amateur equipment (not exclusively, but they all had a good selection). Add to that two Heathkit stores, and even the Sears stores sold amateur transceivers for awhile. (Yes, Virginia, right there along with the Craftsman sockets and Silvertone TV sets.) In the same era, Radio Row in NYC was blocks of wall-to-wall storefronts catering to electronics experimenters. Popular Science magazine had a regular column about amateur radio, and occasional construction articles. Every second little town had an amateur radio club. Amateur Radio was a populist, Joe SixPack kind of hobby.

. . .During those years it was easy for a person to get interested in being an amateur, to shop around for the best

deal on equipment, and to meet an Elmer. We were visible to the public, and well regarded.

. . .Then somewhere along the line came the magic of 1-800 shopping, amateur radio marketing became streamlined, and radio stores disappeared from Hometown America. With the demise of the local radio store, all the Elmers disappeared into their shacks and newcomers flounder around in fancy four-color ads in back of CQ and QST magazine, trying to decide how to be a ham. Clubs floundered, in part due to the loss of hams around the coffee pot in the back of the local electronics part store.

. . .Rather than continuing to restrict the availability of amateur equipment, as though we were selling assault weapons or recreational pharmaceuticals, I vote for opening up the market. Let's have radios for sale in the strip malls alongside the video games, Lionel trains, and mountain bikes. And it won't hurt if a few of us put on our Elmer-suits and lurk around to spot the likely recruits.

When they outlaw ham gear, only outlaws will be hams.

73, de Hans, K0HB/4ID

--
> >Frisbeetarianism: The belief that when you die,
> >your soul goes up the on roof and gets stuck.

> What roof would this be?

The Roof of the Universe. And in the Last Days, when the Great Frisbee that shineth in the sky hath gone out, then shalt the Almighty Thrower ascend the Ladder of Life and collect the souls of those who have flown free, and take them The Eternal Park, where we shall sail upon the Spring Breezes for ever and ever, and be Fetched by the Holy Dog. Amen.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

530. Re: W4JLE Welefare Extra?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 14:43:58 UTC
From: kk5yy@arrl.net
Message-ID: <3a6457e3.420745977@nntp.mindspring.com>
Source record: 778

On Mon, 15 Jan 2001 11:16:48 -0600, "Richard McCollum"
<rmccoll@radiks.net> wrote:

>
>"Gerald Schmitt" <kk5yy@arrl.net> wrote in message
>news:3a630e92.336428289@nntp.mindspring.com...
>>
>> Well Folks,
>>
>> With all the sound and fury signifying nothing I just had to look into
>> Fred's bona fides, very interesting reading.
>>
>
>Admirable! Now who in Sam Hill is Gerald Schmitt?
>
>Dick, Nï¿½BK, Aging Boy Wonder
>
>
Well Dick first let me tell you who I am not. I'm not
someone who judges other hams by their code speed.
I'm not someone who requires that everyone share my
interests or have my skill set.

I am someone who goes well out of his way to teach and
demonstrate amateur radio in order to promote the hobby
and help other hams enjoy it more. This to me seems a better
course of action than berating other hams that don't share
my interests or skills. Last year I attended 16 hamfests in
12 different states from Florida to Alaska doing demos,
forums, teaching and speaking about amateur radio.
What did you and your hero do?

It seems to me that poor Fred has his entire self worth tied
up in his code. What a shame to have done so little in ones
life that all you have to be proud of is an arcane skill,
be that ability real or imagined,

I have a question I think you might be able to help me with.
Why does someone become a sock puppet for an internet
jerk? Is it sort of like those Bozos who hung out with those
schoolyard bullies basking in reflected "glory"?

531. Re: HA HA HA: Bush won popular vote!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 15:04:30 UTC
From: ~Steve~ <mcsp@usa.net>
Message-ID: <3A6462FD.FE75701B@usa.net>
Source record: 780
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Shhhhhhhhhhh - can't let things like that out in the regular news stream. How could the Black Caucus or any other left wing extremist group have any right to complain if facts like those are brought out? This reality must be hidden and counter attacked immediately or otherwise the truth might be a popular belief, Sharpton, Jackson, and all the others will be out of a job for the next 8 years if it is revealed Bush got the popular vote... and you wouldn't want to see them on welfare would you?

Kerry King wrote:

> Despite the widely accepted claim that Al Gore won the popular
> vote by some 300,000 votes, a new count of state totals
> appears to show George Bush was the real winner by nearly 2
> million votes.
>

532. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 15:28:52 UTC
From: Carl Zager <kb9rvb@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <941pb8$oo6$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 781

From _The Development of Modern English_ by Stuart Robertson, rev. Frederic G. Cassidy, Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1934, 1938, 1954, Eleventh printing, 1965. [Not exactly "modern" dumbing down.], pp 1-2.

Chapter One -- Introduction: The Nature and Origin of Language.

"Like most words that are often used, the word _language_ has many senses.... The English _language_, the _language_ of mathematics, deaf-mutes' _language_, 'the subtle _language_ of a women's eyes' -- all these legitimate senses differ so much that some of them, at least, must represent special uses, extensions, or generalizations that have grown up in the course of time, presumably from some basic core of meaning..... we may yet note that _language_ is derived from _lingua_, the Latin word for tongue, which in this case correctly emphasizes speech as the basic thing in language.... _Language is the vocal and audible medium of human communication_....

"To say that language is _vocal_ and _audible_ immediately puts aside everything written--.... For writing is a _record_ of language...[the second level]....

"The dots and dashes of the Morse Code are still on a third level, since they are substititutes for the letters with which we spell out our _records_ of speech; and with them are the gestures of the deaf-mute...."

One of my favorite comments about language involves the difference between a _dialect_ and a _language_. "A _dialect_ is a _language_ without a navy," illustrating the _political_ nature of defining what _lingua_ is "language" and what _lingua_ is "dialect."

And you want to argue whether Morse is a language?

--
Carl Zager
http://www.mccsc.edu/~czager
kb9rvb@my-deja.com

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

533. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 16:28:04 UTC
From: Carl Zager <kb9rvb@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <941sq9$s17$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 782

On Fri, 12 Jan 2001, Cecil wrote:
> Vincent Biancomano wrote:
> > First, it doesn't take anything near a miracle to make Q&A
> > secret again, ...
>
> There's a more logical approach. Simply make the Q&A a computer
> program which generates random parameters for the questions. The
> entire program could be published and the random number generator
> could be reseeded from the computer clock. The parameters in the
> actual printed multiple choice exam would be unpredictable. An
> answer key could be printed out along with the exam.

Let me get this straight...random parameters? If there were ever a solution that would drive test takers to memorize the correct answers, this is it.

The problem is, we don't understand the concept of tests and measurement. Yet we think we can design tests. We know that short answer or essay tests place too much demand on the test administers, so we settle for multiple choice -- easy to administer, quick to grade. And then we get bent out of shape when takers know the correct answer -- either because they memorized or because they could figure it out from the distractors or because they knew the answer.

Right now the only way we know folks are memorizing the question and answer pool is because that's what they are saying. We can surmise that's happening for two additional reasons: 1. the Q&A pool is public information and available (therefore people will take the shortcut), and 2. a great many of the questions and distractors are so convoluted and so specific that the logical method is to memorize.

The only thing most multiple choice tests measure to any great degree of certainty is not the subject matter but rather the ability to take a test.

--
Carl Zager
http://www.mccsc.edu/~czager
kb9rvb@my-deja.com

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

534. It's like this....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 16:32:10 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <941t2a$s62$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 784

http://www.callingcq.org/desoto/chap1.html

Enjoy!

73, de Hans, K0HB

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

535. Re: HA HA HA: Bush won popular vote!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 16:32:52 UTC
From: "Dr. Conrad Connie" <coontail@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <941t3lsdm1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 783
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <3A6462FD.FE75701B@usa.net>,
~Steve~ <mcsp@usa.net> wrote:
> Shhhhhhhhhhh - can't let things like that out in the regular news
> stream. How could the Black Caucus or any other left wing extremist
> group have any right to complain if facts like those are brought out?
> This reality must be hidden and counter attacked immediately or
> otherwise the truth might be a popular belief, Sharpton, Jackson, and
> all the others will be out of a job for the next 8 years if it is
> revealed Bush got the popular vote... and you wouldn't want to see
them
> on welfare would you?

Good one! So true.. when the cabal can't prove anything they insinuate
a liberal conspiracy.. because God knows the liberals have all the
power.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

536. Vince Documentation Wild Goose Chase (was Re: No-code kills)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 16:42:09 UTC
From: pschleck@novia.net
Message-ID: <3a647948$0$82369$45beb828@newscene.com>
Source record: 785

In <941fil$qi4$1@sshuraac-i-1.production.compuserve.com> Vincent Biancomano <103520.355@CompuServe.COM> writes:

>>Uh huh, well, how about sending me copies of your file copies,
>>anyway? I'll even give you a quarter a page to cover your costs.

>As I said Paul, get your info from ARRL. While you're at it, ask
>them of the details of what's gone down the past 10 years
>internally. I wouldn't want to skew the information
>unintentionally, or just in case I've missed the fine details,
>i.e., some nuances.

Dave Sumner, Executive VP at the ARRL, says the following:

Hello Paul,

We have lots of material in lots of file cabinets, but staff time is very limited and we're not in a position either to conduct or to permit searches of files for private purposes.

73,
David Sumner, K1ZZ
Executive Vice President, ARRL

So, to recap, we have the following situation:

Vince points to an 18-year correspondence trail, including letters to the League and newsletters to Hudson Division members during his campaigns for Director, that support his positions. Vince says that reading all of this would give a detailed exposition of his views.

Vince is asked for copies of all of this documentation, even offered 25 cents a page for reproduction. Vince refuses, stating (paradoxically) that his revealing such evidence would made it LESS CREDIBLE (as if it's more credible unrevealed?) because he could be accused of doctoring it. This is reminiscent of Vince's refusing to prove Fred Maia's "women and children" quote unless Fred denies it in writing (Fred says that he doesn't recall).

To paraphrase Dave Sumner, because of practical staff time and other understandable constraints, the League cannot retrieve arbitrary internal documents from years in the past on demand for private purposes (I, of course, suspected that, but did want to get a definitive answer for the purpose of this discussion).

So, Vince says get the documents from the ARRL. The ARRL says (in effect) get them from Vince. If you can falsify an 18 year correspondence trail (properly forging it in detail, including adding

all of the realistic touches, such as historical accuracy and document aging), you *deserve* to have it accepted as authentic (just as if you can memorize a 500-question VE exam pool, you *deserve* to have a license). I suspect that if it existed, it would be a recap of all of the points that you've offered, and we've disagreed with over the years. I also suspect that much of it does not exist in either Vince's or the League's hands (and for no other reason than such documentation either gets lost or is routinely disposed of after some period of time).

Oh, and by the way, which of your opponents for Hudson Division Director made that quote which you paraphrased as:

"you know, there's no reason for Amateur Radio to be a technical hobby today, simply because there's no jobs for engineers. You know, my father was a plumber, and advised me to do the same. Looking back on it, you know, he was right."

?

The individual who defeated you four times says that his father was not a plumber, and nothing resembling such a statement was made by him..

Perhaps exchanges with you in the past along these lines had motivated Gary Coffman, KE4ZV, to say the following:

"Vince, you have provided essentially no documentation, merely a couple of one-liner out of context quotes that you repeat over and over, and a few paraphrased references to obscure documents you *claim* exist but refuse to properly identify or furnish. You are indeed not engaged in debate. You are simply spewing the same old propaganda, depending on repetition in classic Big Lie fashion, in an attempt to win your point. We aren't fooled."

Jerry Altzman, KE3ML, put it a bit more succinctly (and amusingly);

"I have the names of KNOWN TOUGHER-TEST-SUPPORTERS infiltrating our highest levels of government, academia, industry..."

More good quotes like this can be seen at:

http://www.novia.net/~pschleck/vince/quotes.html

But I should let you get back to your work on the Un-Amateur Activities Committee.

--
Paul W. Schleck, K3FU
pschleck@novia.net
http://www.novia.net/~pschleck/ ICQ# 44218003
Finger pschleck@novia.net for PGP Public Key

537. Re: Buy a ham ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 16:46:56 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <3A647B00.F9D53145@arrl.org>
Source record: 786

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> I used the word 'membership' in my sentence. I have no doubt
> that FISTS members are also members of the ARRL. However,
> I was not referring to just FISTS members but rather the general
> ARRL membership...and the general editorial policies of QST in
> regard to selection of material to publish.

Which, clearly, you misunderstand.

> >ARRL members liked:
> >A PIC16F84-Based CW Decoder, Morgantini, Francesco, IK3OIL, QST, Aug
> >1999, pp 37-40.
>
> All the members liked that? Some members liked that? A few
> members liked that? With 170 thousand or so members in the
> ARRL, was there also a Poll done to ascertain who liked what?
> How does the ARRL decide on what is liked or disliked?

By listening to what our members tell us. When we get many compliments
and few complaints on an article, it's not hard to infer that the
membership liked it! (Actually, every PIC-based article we've published
has been well received.)

> >Maybe you need a new set of "others" from which to solicit input. The
> >one you've got now seems to be misleading you.
>
> Jon, from what you've written, I daresy you are rather
> uncomfortable with my opinion. :-)

It's not something that affects my comfort. I'm merely pointing out the
errors that you are being led into by the others on whom you are
relying. If you choose to continue to get your information from sources
that are demonstrably uninformed, it's no skin off me.

> As a non-subscriber to QST, I cannot hope to compete with an
> ARRL staffer who has ready access to the full line of ARRL
> publications.

Yet lacking access to the publications you still draw conclusions about
the editorial policies of the publisher.

> I am not critiquing individual QST articles but
> rather expressing an opinion on the attitude in general of the
> ARRL relative to morse code...over the last few decades...and
> the attitude of the general membership of the ARRL relative to
> morse code proficiency being the paramount achievement in

> US amateur radio.

Your opinion of the membership's attitude led you to the conclusion that the ARRL membership would not accept (your word) publication of an article about a computer-based Morse reader. I've shown you that such an article was published (as others have been, BTW) and the membership did not rise up in outrage. Now, if you approach the topic objectively you might consider that if a premise (ARRL members prize manual code skill over nearly anything else) leads to a conclusion (ARRL members wouldn't accept publication of such an article) that is incorrect, it just may be that the premise is flawed. Which it is.

> I readily admit to not knowing the entire scope of amateur
> radio activity as practiced by over a half million licensed US
> radio amateurs.

Yet you are willing to state with certainty what attitudes and opinions are held by that half-million-plus.

> To be fair, you should admit the very same
> thing. Being an ARRL staff member does not give you some
> magic powers to know the entire scope of amateur radio
> activity...or radio activity that is possibly related to amateur
> activity.

Nope, it doesn't. What it does, however, is expose me to many amateurs holding a broad range of opinions about Amateur Radio, the ARRL and related matters. I don't claim to know all of their opinions, but when there is evidence that suggests that a particular view is widely held, I'm willing to go by it. When someone expresses the opinion that a view IS widely held, I simply want to know what evidence led them to that opinion. And when the available evidence shows that conclusions that follow from that opinion are incorrect, I consider the opinion to be unjustified.

Jon

538. Re: HA HA HA: Bush won popular vote!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 17:01:25 UTC
From: ~Steve~ <mcsp@usa.net>
Message-ID: <3A647E65.EFFF0B52@usa.net>
Source record: 787
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

I guess the sarcastic nature did not come through as I had hoped.
If God were such a boon to the liberal agenda, why are 99% of them trying to remove Him from of everything? No prayer in schools, no 10 commandments, abortion runs rampant, etc. I really don't think God wants His name attached to such blasphemous activity!

~Steve~

"Dr. Conrad Connie" wrote:

> Good one! So true.. when the cabal can't prove anything they insinuate
> a liberal conspiracy.. because God knows the liberals have all the
> power.

539. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 17:08:05 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <mrv86tko43g0dieqn2j953qte46k8ho12l@4ax.com>
Source record: 788

w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:
> People would not get on the air and
>try Morse code unless they had learned it first.

I've talked to a few people on CW who didn't know the Morse code...

540. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 17:08:05 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <6sv86tshq3v7hegasp21eab907cn1n375h@4ax.com>
Source record: 789

Vincent Biancomano <103520.355@CompuServe.COM> wrote:
>Better to post up right on this newsgroup, so there's no
>misunderstanding of misquotes, etc.

Your quotes are easy to misunderstand.
You fail to post the author of the quotes...

541. Re: "They oughta require a license....blah, blah, blah"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 17:20:38 UTC
From: "Leland C. Scott" <no-spam@junk-mail.net>
Message-ID: <t690nfrg1u26da@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 790

"K0HB" <k0hb@my-deja.com> wrote in message
news:941ml3$mb4$1@nnrp1.deja.com...

> Every so often a new guy like Leland comes up with the mistaken
> idea of placing restrictions on the wide availability of
> amateur radio equipment and supplies.

And why should that be a mistake? You have to provide proof of insurance to get plates for a vehicle, provide a prescription from your doctor at the drug store for powerful drugs, a photo ID (normally a driver's license) to pass a check, same thing with trying to buy booze, or get a drink at a bar, cops wants to see your driver's license when you get pulled over etc. The list goes on and on. There are many things we are required to provide proof that we are who we say we are, and that we can do something, or we are authorized to be where we are. Normally we just don't think about all the cases. Asking to see your FCC license is not a big deal.

So when you get pulled over by a cop, and he notices you are getting public service calls over your mobile rig, and tells you that you can't have a scanner in your vehicle. You going to tell him you are a Ham, then refuse to show you license when he asks to see it, and then tell him to go bugger off because you don't have to?

> These are the folks who
> suggest it be a crime to own amateur equipment without a
> license, and who are not thrilled about the fact that
> Radio Shack sells a line of UHF/VHF amateur equipment right out
> under the nose of the impressionable public.

I have been to plenty of Hamfests where the policy is NOT to give a winner of the door prizes a Ham Radio TX of any kind UNLESS they have a license. Instead they give them cash in the case they are unlicensed. So in a way it's already being done. I bet you never even thought about it, even bothered to notice.

--
Leland C. Scott
KC8LDO

542. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 17:30:19 UTC
From: W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com>
Message-ID: <9420fj$8e5$1@iac5.navix.net>
Source record: 791

While I normally agree with you once you have tortured the language sufficiently. In this case both your logic and analogy really lack your normally well thought out, intellectually superior, worthy of eternal archiving - Heck let me just say it, it sucked!

"Cecil" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:3A63C237.927F3D91@IEEE.org...
> W4JLE wrote:
> > I don't think he is comparing the severity of the failure to accomplish the
> > task, simply that the two compare in ability to complete the task.
>
> But a comparison of those tasks is like me comparing my ability to blow
> my nose to the task of landing a man on the moon.
> --
> http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

543. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 17:47:49 UTC
From: Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com>
Message-ID: <3A648945.32D38CFD@dvol.com>
Source record: 792

W1RFI wrote:

>
> The Product Review editor is Joe Bottiglieri, AA1GW.

>
He's running one of if not the main atttraction in QST. I usually won't buy a
major piece of gear new or used until I cruise the report first.
>

> ARRL tries to review
> every major piece of amateur equipment, although it certainly doesn't get all
> the accessories.

>
Tell the distributor or manufacturer you won't run the review until you have
all the goodies to play with.
>

> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

>
w3rv

544. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 18:01:07 UTC
From: W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com>
Message-ID: <9422n4$9hh$1@iac5.navix.net>
Source record: 793

If you are of average skills I can teach you to take off and land an airplane safely, as the sole occupant in about 10 hours.

I suspect I would spend more time teaching you Morse code to the level I could "solo" you on the band. This assumes 5 WPM as the solo level.

How long it would take to teach yourself is another matter. However I once worked with a guy who was an avid simulator pilot that could probably have soloed in 4 hours. he claimed several thousand hours on his Microsoft flight simulator.

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message news:20010116082052.05657.00001663@ng-cl1.aol.com...
> >From: "W4JLE" Fred@w4jle.com
>
> >I don't think he is comparing the severity of the failure to accomplish the
> >task, simply that the two compare in ability to complete the task.
>
> Which do you believe to be orders of magnitude easier -- teaching one's self
> Morse code or teaching one's self how to fly?
>
> Equating an analogy that is orders of magnitude different than the subject
> being discussed is not logical.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

545. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 18:23:26 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A64919E.9360C68C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 795

Carl Zager wrote:
> Let me get this straight...random parameters? If there were ever a
> solution that would drive test takers to memorize the correct answers,
> this is it.

How could that be? The answers would not be available until the
exam was generated. The examinee would see the answers for the
first time when he/she takes the exam under the watchful eyes
of the VEs. Every exam would be different.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

546. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 18:29:59 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A649327.EC15870@IEEE.org>
Source record: 797

W4JLE wrote:
> While I normally agree with you once you have tortured the language
> sufficiently. In this case both your logic and analogy really lack your
> normally well thought out, intellectually superior, worthy of eternal
> archiving - Heck let me just say it, it sucked!

Too much spoiled grape juice.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

547. Re: "They oughta require a license....blah, blah, blah"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 18:31:59 UTC
From: Jake Brodsky <frussle@erols.com>
Message-ID: <fh496t4af7l94gv4vnep9npbjhb5v6tn62@4ax.com>
Source record: 794

On Tue, 16 Jan 2001 12:20:38 -0500, "Leland C. Scott"
<no-spam@junk-mail.net> wrote:

>
>"K0HB" <k0hb@my-deja.com> wrote in message
>news:941ml3$mb4$1@nnrp1.deja.com...
>
>> Every so often a new guy like Leland comes up with the mistaken
>> idea of placing restrictions on the wide availability of
>> amateur radio equipment and supplies.
>
>And why should that be a mistake? You have to provide proof of insurance to
>get plates for a vehicle, provide a prescription from your doctor at the
>drug store for powerful drugs, a photo ID (normally a driver's license) to
>pass a check, same thing with trying to buy booze, or get a drink at a bar,
>cops wants to see your driver's license when you get pulled over etc. The
>list goes on and on. There are many things we are required to provide proof
>that we are who we say we are, and that we can do something, or we are
>authorized to be where we are. Normally we just don't think about all the
>cases. Asking to see your FCC license is not a big deal.
>
>So when you get pulled over by a cop, and he notices you are getting public
>service calls over your mobile rig, and tells you that you can't have a
>scanner in your vehicle. You going to tell him you are a Ham, then refuse
>to show you license when he asks to see it, and then tell him to go bugger
>off because you don't have to?

Sigh. The question is really "Is there a problem which is bad enough
that we would insist on the expense and the enforcement of checking
for a license before the sale?"

That's a judgement call.

>> These are the folks who
>> suggest it be a crime to own amateur equipment without a
>> license, and who are not thrilled about the fact that
>> Radio Shack sells a line of UHF/VHF amateur equipment right out
>> under the nose of the impressionable public.
>
>I have been to plenty of Hamfests where the policy is NOT to give a winner
>of the door prizes a Ham Radio TX of any kind UNLESS they have a license.
>Instead they give them cash in the case they are unlicensed. So in a way
>it's already being done. I bet you never even thought about it, even
>bothered to notice.

Personally, I don't think it's that big a problem.

The real problem is that the FCC isn't enforcing its own laws very well. Laws against unlicensed operation exist. Maybe the FCC would consider licensing something like an Official Radio Monitor (Kind of like the ARRL OO, but with some sort of legal standing in a court of law) who could be called at a moment's notice to DF a signal they can't afford to track down.

Then the real problem would disappear.

Leland, I respect your position, but I can't help thinking that you're fighting the symptom, not the disease.

73,

Jake Brodsky, AB3A mailto:frussle@erols.com
"Beware of the massive impossible!"

548. Re: It's like this....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 18:38:09 UTC
From: Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com>
Message-ID: <3A649511.766D510D@dvol.com>
Source record: 796

K0HB wrote:

> http://www.callingcq.org/desoto/chap1.html
>
> Enjoy!

>
Right on the money.
>

> 73, de Hans, K0HB

>
w3rv

549. Re: "They oughta require a license....blah, blah, blah"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 18:43:31 UTC
From: "Leland C. Scott" <no-spam@junk-mail.net>
Message-ID: <t695j69u9fl07e@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 798

"Jake Brodsky" <frussle@erols.com> wrote in message
news:fh496t4af7l94gv4vnep9npbjhb5v6tn62@4ax.com...
> Leland, I respect your position, but I can't help thinking that you're
> fighting the symptom, not the disease.

Properly true. So the other option(s) are....?

--
Leland C. Scott
KC8LDO

550. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 18:51:16 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010116135116.09475.00000735@nso-fj.aol.com>
Source record: 799

In article <93vo6mqvf1@iac5.navix.net>, "W4JLE" <Fred@w4jle.com> writes:

>Of course it does, same as it makes me better at that skill than one who has
>never figured an exposure problem.

"Better?!?" I thought the Jelly Jermiad bespoke of "superiority"?!?

Figuring exposure: I did that as an teenager, could F-stop and
shutter speed under stated ASA film ratings as good as pros.
I did radiation exposure problems in late twenties, am still
alive. I did field strengths for SID antennas in my forties and
was able to measure them accurately...compared standard
antennas to new development antennas on a range at the
same age. All of them without needing CW skill. All of them
without having to attend formal classes having grades and
neat little certificates of "graduation."

>Ed, the demonization of someone being superior is a product of the feel good
>generation. Soccer games for kids that do not keep score ,so no one feels
>bad. Gradeless classes for the same reason.

Heh heh heh...the ultra-conservative wanting SCORES,
brag-rights indicators of "superiority" to others. No one
allowed to "play" just for the love of playing?!?

Heh, my cousin Leif in Sweden played soccer (with scores
and international football rules) until he was 55. Did he
do that for showing his "superiority" or did he just like to
play the game, win or lose?

>One could go on forever listing the esteem building exercises.

Tell everyone more about your wonderfulness, Jelly. I think it
would be an interesting display of encouraging newcomers
to take on a hobby, to show "incentive" in order to be as good
as you.

>The reason you see such vitriolic response, is for many this is the first
>time in their life they have been told they don't measure up.

"Measure up" to WHAT, old-timer? :-)

Standards and practices of the 1930s?!? WHY?!? :-)

Just who, or which divinity, has decreed that morse code skill is
the epitome of amateur radio excellence...that all "must" have
that skill to be "accepted" by the Superior Beings?

This newsgroup was created primarily to be a forum to discuss
the code test for amateur radio license examinations. From
day one it was obvious that the self-styled "superior" ones were
personally attacking those that did not want the code test.

>Do you not
>sense the "it's my God given right to be equal in all respects regardless of
>effort" attitude in the responses?

I sense, detect, and almost blinded by Day-Glo letters of "CW skill
is superior to all other forms of endeavor in anything and therefore
[Jelly] is superior to others who cannot be as godlike as [Jelly]."

The FCC determines what constitutes essential requirements for
a US amateur radio license. Not the "amateur community." Not
the ARRL. Not what is currently done in amateur radio. Not the
traditions and urban myths of now-ancient history in amateur radio.
Licensing is part of the FCC's task of regulating US civil radio. The
license test isn't an academic test of any kind. Never was.

The FCC has stated in 1990 and in 1999 that it does not consider
a morse code test as relevant to amateur radio licensing in order
to regulate amateur radio. It stated that the FCC must continue to
do so because of existing treaty-cooperative ITU-R standards.

As far as I've been able to see over a three year period, none of
the no-code-test advocates has proposed an outright banning of
morse code USE in amateur radio. The only advocacy is the
elimination of the morse code test itself.

If that morse code test is considered necessary to prove some
kind of moral-ethical-mental superiority...as often stated by
those who have passed such tests...then the only conclusion
to be drawn is that their moral-ethical-mental standards are
questionable. It seems to fall to the obvious -

"We had to take the test so all the newcomers have to take it."

Selfish emotionalism is not a good reason for regulations.

didit

551. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 18:51:18 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010116135118.09475.00000736@nso-fj.aol.com>
Source record: 800

In article <94057p$f31$1@nnrp1.deja.com>, Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
writes:

>In article <93vn1g$q6e$1@iac5.navix.net>,
> "W4JLE" <Fred@w4jle.com> wrote:
>
>> Why the construction requirement?
>
>> Back when my eyes were good and my hands were steady the smallest
>active
>> element I had to deal with was a 6AQ5, now I can barely see a surface
>> mounted component, let alone solder the dam thing.
>
>Fred, oops. You were supposed to be better than everyone else.

Brian, a correction...Jelly is superior, not just better.

I find his admission of a "failure" to be shocking. The era of 7-pin
glass base beam power pentodes ended over two decades ago
with components growing steadily smaller...while the egos of
those who said they "dealt" with tubes grew steadily larger. :-)

My wife is older than Jelly and she does excellent fine-detail
cross-stitching. Her headband magnifier helps. I've been
under treatment for glaucoma for a quarter century and can
still see very well close-up. No problem with unsteady hands
here...but that may be due to constantly working with
electronics, adjusting and improvising. No amount of ego can
move electrons or generate RF, it takes application and
learning-with-the-components, learning about components.

The pin-to-pin spacing of dual-inline IC packages is about the
same as the pin-to-pin spacing of a 7-pin miniature glass
tube. The 1949-operational AN/PRC-6 military handy-talky
had 12 subminiature glass tubes whose pin-to-pin spacing
was half that of the single 7-pin tube of the PRC-6's PA.
That is 52 years ago. I wonder where all these "superior"
hams have been that whine and complain about not being
able to "deal" with 6AQ5s?

Maybe all of those whining, crybaby "superior" oldsters can
only "deal" with power triodes like the 833 having only four
large cap-contacts and no base, grid and plate caps being
around 3 to 4 inches apart? Gonzo sizes to fit gonzo egos?
:-)

didit

552. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 19:04:40 UTC
From: W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com>
Message-ID: <94260d$b7m$1@iac5.navix.net>
Source record: 801

How about a 5 question test for General.

1. State in 300 words or more why you want to be a ham.

2. Describe the procedure for calculating, adjusting, and connecting a 15 meter dipole cut for the center of the phone band.

3. Explain the difference, if any, between an AC ground and a RF ground. Elaborate as to how each contributes or degrades operator and property safety.

4. Explain the procedures to make a contact on a non voice mode of your choosing.

5. Your neighbor calls and says you are interfering with his television, you are at a loss as to how to solve it. What do you do next?

Now even if they memorize the answers they at least have some practical knowledge.

"Cecil" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:3A64919E.9360C68C@IEEE.org...
> Carl Zager wrote:
> > Let me get this straight...random parameters? If there were ever a
> > solution that would drive test takers to memorize the correct answers,
> > this is it.
>
> How could that be? The answers would not be available until the
> exam was generated. The examinee would see the answers for the
> first time when he/she takes the exam under the watchful eyes
> of the VEs. Every exam would be different.
> --
> http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

553. Re: It's like this....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 19:20:33 UTC
From: W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com>
Message-ID: <9426u6bjp1@iac5.navix.net>
Source record: 802

Really enjoyed it!

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:3A649511.766D510D@dvol.com...
>
> K0HB wrote:
>
> > http://www.callingcq.org/desoto/chap1.html
> >
> > Enjoy!
>
> >
> Right on the money.
> >
>
> > 73, de Hans, K0HB
>
> >
> w3rv
>

554. Re: The Pope now rules the U.S.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 19:32:30 UTC
From: jediffor <jediffor@ticon.net>
Message-ID: <9427jfaah1@galileo.ticon.net>
Source record: 803
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.conspiracy

"Bill Hammack" <bhamack@my-deja.com> wrote in message
news:93f7j8$5kh$0@pita.alt.net...
>
> How is it that after seeing the CNN report that a large majority of
> people in congress is Roman Catholic, no one has worried that we have
> 150 congress people who place the Pope above their own President.
>
> Is the Pope the de facto ruler of America?

Yes, he is. That is why this country outlaws all abortions and all contraception. That is why we have forgiven our debtors. That is why there are so many new Catholic schools and churches. That is why prayer in public schools is not only allowed but encouraged. That is why education is taught from a high moral perspective and history is interpreted as the fight between good and evil. That is why we have our ultimate political example of Catholic morality, Senator Kennedy.

Got it?

555. Re: Left wingers getting ready

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 19:36:19 UTC
From: ~Steve~ <mcsp@usa.net>
Message-ID: <3A64A2B3.5C6A41EB@usa.net>
Source record: 804

If that isn't an advertisement to be car jacked, I don't know what is.

Dick Carroll wrote:
>All those nuts have is a bumper sticker that says
>"Gunfree and Proud of it".

556. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 19:39:39 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A64A37B.62113A13@IEEE.org>
Source record: 805

W4JLE wrote:
> How about a 5 question test for General.
> Now even if they memorize the answers they at least have some practical
> knowledge.

Good questions but there are a couple of problems - too subjective
and too time consuming.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

557. The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 19:42:09 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <94286f$7a9$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 806
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

For those who get their shorts all knotted up about CB lingo on the ham bands, here is an excerpt from a book written 60 years ago by Clinton DeSoto.

"Among radio amateurs there is a genuine brotherhood and informal camaraderie. Everyone is called by his "handle" -- his first name or nickname. The president of the Chicago Stock Exchange and the mechanic in a Birmingham garage are just "Paul" and "Joe" when they meet on the air."

73, de Hans, K0HB
--
> >Frisbeetarianism: The belief that when you die,
> >your soul goes up the on roof and gets stuck.

> What roof would this be?

The Roof of the Universe. And in the Last Days, when the Great Frisbee that shineth in the sky hath gone out, then shalt the Almighty Thrower ascend the Ladder of Life and collect the souls of those who have flown free, and take them The Eternal Park, where we shall sail upon the Spring Breezes for ever and ever, and be Fetched by the Holy Dog. Amen.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

558. Re: "They oughta require a license....blah, blah, blah"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 19:56:23 UTC
From: K0HB <k0hb@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <942912$88j$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 808

In article <fh496t4af7l94gv4vnep9npbjhb5v6tn62@4ax.com>,
frussle@erols.com wrote:

> The real problem is that the FCC isn't enforcing its own laws very
> well. Laws against unlicensed operation exist.

Exactly. We don't need more big-government rules! Enforce the
ones we have.

> Maybe the FCC would consider licensing something like an Official
> Radio Monitor (Kind of like the ARRL OO, but with some sort of
> legal standing in a court of law)......

Groan.....

We could have tin badges and blue jump-suits and all other sorts of
cop-wannabe paraphenalia.

On second though, fergit it! I don't think it is the function of
hams to be hall-monitors for CBers and freebanders.

73, Hans, K0HB
--
> >Frisbeetarianism: The belief that when you die,
> >your soul goes up the on roof and gets stuck.

> What roof would this be?

The Roof of the Universe. And in the Last Days,
when the Great Frisbee that shineth in the sky
hath gone out, then shalt the Almighty Thrower
ascend the Ladder of Life and collect the souls
of those who have flown free, and take them The
Eternal Park, where we shall sail upon the Spring
Breezes for ever and ever, and be Fetched by the
Holy Dog. Amen.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

559. Re: "They oughta require a license....blah, blah, blah"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 19:59:19 UTC
From: Jake Brodsky <frussle@erols.com>
Message-ID: <1r996toaqnk5q8jgqnilghsd9abk9flvuu@4ax.com>
Source record: 807

On Tue, 16 Jan 2001 13:43:31 -0500, "Leland C. Scott"
<no-spam@junk-mail.net> wrote:

>"Jake Brodsky" <frussle@erols.com> wrote in message
>news:fh496t4af7l94gv4vnep9npbjhb5v6tn62@4ax.com...
>> Leland, I respect your position, but I can't help thinking that you're
>> fighting the symptom, not the disease.
>
>Properly true. So the other option(s) are....?

As I alluded to in my previous message, If the FCC monitoring
facilities are taxed, why not certify certain amateur radio stations
as a legal observer who can give expert testimony? Then one would
only have to alert these observers to the problem, they'll track the
bugger down and the FCC would decide how to prosecute the offender.

This is certainly less costly than assuming the whole enforcement
burden, and hopefully this could enable the FCC to use its funding
more wisely.

73,

Jake Brodsky, AB3A mailto:frussle@erols.com
"Beware of the massive impossible!"

560. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 20:52:47 UTC
From: W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com>
Message-ID: <942cb4$f0a$1@iac5.navix.net>
Source record: 809

A lot less time consuming that having to learn code. My problem with the FCC exams is they do not test the practical aspect of ham radio.

If we are remove the CW requirement, we should at least insure the new amateur has a practical understanding of operations. We might instead make it a requirement that the new amateurs station be examined by a volunteer group similar to the VE groups and signed off for operation. I worry that some of the newbies can jump from zero to 1.5 KW with no practical knowledge of the consequences. I go back to the flying without lessons. In this case serious jeopardy awaits those that lack instruction in safety and what could happen when you reach inside that new linear with the pair of 3-500Z's.

Before you ask what CW has to do with safety, in the process of learning from an Elmer or a club these issues are brought up by an experienced amateur. With the ability to simply answer a few questions on a written, one could conceivably be an extra and have never even seen a radio. No one on one contact with a ham is necessary.
"Cecil" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3A64A37B.62113A13@IEEE.org...
> W4JLE wrote:
> > How about a 5 question test for General.
> > Now even if they memorize the answers they at least have some practical
> > knowledge.
>
> Good questions but there are a couple of problems - too subjective
> and too time consuming.
> --
> http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

561. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 21:15:47 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <xW296.896$e5.2250599@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 810

Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com> wrote:
in message news:3A648945.32D38CFD@dvol.com...

> > ARRL tries to review every major piece of amateur equipment, although it certainly doesn't get all
> > the accessories.

> Tell the distributor or manufacturer you won't run the review until you have
> *all* the goodies to play with.

I'm sorry; poor choice of words on my part. QST doesn't run the Review until we have all of the accessories we want to include. (Filters, tuners, etc.)

What doesn't always get reviewed is every station accessory available, ie wall clock, keyer, etc.

The QST column "Short Takes" does include a lot of the lower-end products, though; it was added sometime last year to let ARRL take a closer look at more equipment.

In case a few members missed it, the entire QST Product Reviews from 1980 onward are available at the ARRL members pages at http://www.arrl.org/members-only. The expanded test reports are available there also. As each issue is sent to the printer, the Product Reviews are put up there, giving members a faster look at them.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI
ARRL Lab

562. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 21:39:50 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <8h396.897$e5.2252310@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 811

Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

> > Now, if all of these new hams can memorize over 1,100 questions in the
> > question pool in a weekend of studying, I am sure they can memorize 26
> > characters and a few punctuations "easily."

> Replay #976.... They don't memorize the questions and answers, they
> make word associations so that when they read a question they look for
> the familiar choice among the possibles, and can pick it out often
> enough to pass. That's after studying only a single test element, not
> the whole question pool. Vast difference, but you already knew that.

Like these?

T6A02 @T6A12 (A)
Which symbol of Figure T6-1 represents a fixed resistor?
A. Symbol 2
B. Symbol 3
C. Symbol 4
D. Symbol 5

T6A04 @N6A10 (A)
In Figure N6-2, which symbol represents a single-pole, single-throw
switch?
A. Symbol 1
B. Symbol 2
C. Symbol 3
D. Symbol 4

T6A06 @N6A08 (A)
In Figure N6-1, which symbol represents a fuse?
A. Symbol 1
B. Symbol 3
C. Symbol 5
D. Symbol 7

T6A08 @N6A09 (D)
In Figure N6-1, which symbol represents a single-cell battery?
A. Symbol 7
B. Symbol 5
C. Symbol 1
D. Symbol 4

T6B03 @N6B04 (D)
In Figure N6-1, which symbol represents an earth ground?
A. Symbol 2
B. Symbol 5

C. Symbol 6
D. Symbol 8

T6B04 @N6B06 (D)
In Figure N6-1, which symbol represents an antenna?
A. Symbol 2
B. Symbol 3
C. Symbol 6
D. Symbol 7

T6B05 @N6B07 (D)
In Figure N6-3, which symbol represents an NPN transistor?
A. Symbol 1
B. Symbol 2
C. Symbol 3
D. Symbol 4

T6B06 @T6B01 (A)
Which symbol of Figure T6-2 represents a fixed-value capacitor?
A. Symbol 1
B. Symbol 2
C. Symbol 3
D. Symbol 4

T6B07 @T6B06 (C)
In Figure T6-2, which symbol represents a variable capacitor?
A. Symbol 1
B. Symbol 2
C. Symbol 3
D. Symbol 4

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

563. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 21:44:51 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <RI396.899$e5.2252689@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 812

W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com> wrote:

> How about a 5 question test for General.
> Now even if they memorize the answers they at least have some practical
> knowledge.

Do you believe that the following represent practical knowledge?

T4B07 @N4C06 (B)
If an SWR reading at the low frequency end of an amateur band is
2.5:1, increasing to 5:1 at the high frequency end of the same band,
what does this tell you about your 1/2-wavelength dipole antenna?
A. The antenna is broadbanded
B. The antenna is too long for operation on the band
C. The antenna is too short for operation on the band
D. The antenna is just right for operation on the band

T4B08 @N4C07 (C)
If an SWR reading at the low frequency end of an amateur band is 5:1,
decreasing to 2.5:1 at the high frequency end of the same band, what
does this tell you about your 1/2-wavelength dipole antenna?
A. The antenna is broadbanded
B. The antenna is too long for operation on the band
C. The antenna is too short for operation on the band
D. The antenna is just right for operation on the band

T4C01 @T4B01 (B)
How is a voltmeter usually connected to a circuit under test?
A. In series with the circuit
B. In parallel with the circuit
C. In quadrature with the circuit
D. In phase with the circuit

T4C02 @T4B02 (A)
How is an ammeter usually connected to a circuit under test?
A. In series with the circuit
B. In parallel with the circuit
C. In quadrature with the circuit
D. In phase with the circuit

T4D01 @N4D01 (C)
What is meant by receiver overload?
A. Too much voltage from the power supply
B. Too much current from the power supply
C. Interference caused by strong signals from a nearby source
D. Interference caused by turning the volume up too high

T4D02 @N4D02 (A)
What is meant by harmonic radiation?
A. Unwanted signals at frequencies that are multiples of the fundamental (chosen) frequency
B. Unwanted signals that are combined with a 60-Hz hum
C. Unwanted signals caused by sympathetic vibrations from a nearby transmitter
D. Signals that cause skip propagation to occur

T4D03 @N4D06 (B)
What type of filter might be connected to an amateur HF transmitter to cut down on harmonic radiation?
A. A key-click filter
B. A low-pass filter
C. A high-pass filter
D. A CW filter

T4D04 @N4D08 (C)
If your neighbor reports television interference whenever you are transmitting from your amateur station, no matter what frequency band you use, what is probably the cause of the interference?
A. Too little transmitter harmonic suppression
B. Receiver VR tube discharge
C. Receiver overload
D. Incorrect antenna length

T4D05 @N4D09 (D)
If your neighbor reports television interference on one or two channels only when you are transmitting on the 15-meter band, what is probably the cause of the interference?
A. Too much low-pass filtering on the transmitter
B. De-ionization of the ionosphere near your neighbor's TV antenna
C. TV receiver front-end overload
D. Harmonic radiation from your transmitter

T4D06 @N4D10 (B)
What type of filter should be connected to a TV receiver as the first step in trying to prevent RF overload from an amateur HF station transmission?
A. Low-pass
B. High-pass
C. Band pass
D. Notch

T4D07 @N4D11 (B)
What first step should be taken at a cable TV receiver when trying to prevent RF overload from an amateur HF station transmission?
A. Install a low-pass filter in the cable system transmission line
B. Tighten all connectors and inspect the cable system transmission line
C. Make sure the center conductor of the cable system transmission line is well grounded
D. Install a ceramic filter in the cable system transmission line

T4D08 @N4D12 (C)
What effect might a break in a cable television transmission line have on amateur communications?
A. Cable lines are shielded and a break cannot affect amateur communications
B. Harmonic radiation from the TV receiver may cause the amateur transmitter to transmit off-frequency
C. TV interference may result when the amateur station is transmitting, or interference may occur to the amateur receiver
D. The broken cable may pick up very high voltages when the amateur station is transmitting

T4D09 @N4D13 (A)
If you are told that your amateur station is causing television interference, what should you do?
A. First make sure that your station is operating properly, and that it does not cause interference to your own television
B. Immediately turn off your transmitter and contact the nearest FCC office for assistance
C. Connect a high-pass filter to the transmitter output and a low-pass filter to the antenna-input terminals of the television
D. Continue operating normally, because you have no reason to worry about the interference

T4D10 @N4D14 (C)
If harmonic radiation from your transmitter is causing interference to television receivers in your neighborhood, who is responsible for taking care of the interference?
A. The owners of the television receivers are responsible
B. Both you and the owners of the television receivers share the responsibility
C. You alone are responsible, since your transmitter is causing the problem
D. The FCC must decide if you or the owners of the television receivers are responsible

T4D11 @N4D15 (D)
If signals from your transmitter are causing front-end overload in your neighbor's television receiver, who is responsible for taking care of the interference?
A. You alone are responsible, since your transmitter is causing the problem
B. Both you and the owner of the television receiver share the responsibility
C. The FCC must decide if you or the owner of the television receiver are responsible
D. The owner of the television receiver is responsible

T5A01 @N5A03 (B)
*Modified Q,A-D
If a dial marked in kilohertz shows a reading of 28450 kHz, what would it show if it were marked in hertz?

A. 284,500 Hz
B. 28,450,000 Hz
C. 284,500,000 Hz
D. 284,500,000,000 Hz

T5A02 @N5A05 (C)
If an ammeter marked in amperes is used to measure a 3000-milliampere current, what reading would it show?
A. 0.003 amperes
B. 0.3 amperes
C. 3 amperes
D. 3,000,000 amperes

T5A03 @N5A09 (C)
How many hertz are in a kilohertz?
A. 10
B. 100
C. 1000
D. 1,000,000

T5A04 @N5B02 (C)
What is the basic unit of electric current?
A. The volt
B. The watt
C. The ampere
D. The ohm

T5A05 @N5B03 (D)
Which instrument would you use to measure electric current?
A. An ohmmeter
B. A wavemeter
C. A voltmeter
D. An ammeter

T5A06 @N5B08 (B)
Which instrument would you use to measure electric potential or electromotive force?
A. An ammeter
B. A voltmeter
C. A wavemeter
D. An ohmmeter

T5A07 @N5B05 (A)
What is the basic unit of electromotive force (EMF)?
A. The volt
B. The watt
C. The ampere
D. The ohm

T5A08 @N5B12 (C)
What are three good electrical conductors?
A. Copper, gold, mica

B. Gold, silver, wood
C. Gold, silver, aluminum
D. Copper, aluminum, paper

T5A09 @N5B13 (A)
What are four good electrical insulators?
A. Glass, air, plastic, porcelain
B. Glass, wood, copper, porcelain
C. Paper, glass, air, aluminum
D. Plastic, rubber, wood, carbon

T5A10 @N5C09 (C)
Which electrical circuit can have no current?
A. A closed circuit
B. A short circuit
C. An open circuit
D. A complete circuit

T5A11 @N5C11 (D)
Which electrical circuit draws too much current?
A. An open circuit
B. A dead circuit
C. A closed circuit
D. A short circuit

564. Re: "They oughta require a license....blah, blah, blah"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 21:52:50 UTC
From: "Leland C. Scott" <no-spam@junk-mail.net>
Message-ID: <t69glrek8fakea@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 813

"Jake Brodsky" <frussle@erols.com> wrote in message
news:1r996toaqnk5q8jgqnilghsd9abk9flvuu@4ax.com...
> On Tue, 16 Jan 2001 13:43:31 -0500, "Leland C. Scott"
> <no-spam@junk-mail.net> wrote:
>
> >"Jake Brodsky" <frussle@erols.com> wrote in message
> >news:fh496t4af7l94gv4vnep9npbjhb5v6tn62@4ax.com...
> >> Leland, I respect your position, but I can't help thinking that you're
> >> fighting the symptom, not the disease.
> >
> >Properly true. So the other option(s) are....?
>
> As I alluded to in my previous message, If the FCC monitoring
> facilities are taxed, why not certify certain amateur radio stations
> as a legal observer who can give expert testimony? Then one would
> only have to alert these observers to the problem, they'll track the
> bugger down and the FCC would decide how to prosecute the offender.
>
> This is certainly less costly than assuming the whole enforcement
> burden, and hopefully this could enable the FCC to use its funding
> more wisely.

This may work since the bill was passed allowing enforcement of the CB Radio
Part 95 rules by local LEOs. Hams could volunteer to help in that area as
part of our public service function. Now the question is, how many would
even bother to do so?

--
Leland C. Scott
KC8LDO

565. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 22:28:54 UTC
From: "Steven J Robeson", K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <942hurgho1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 814

In article <20010116135116.09475.00000735@nso-fj.aol.com>,
lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:

> Heh heh heh...the ultra-conservative wanting SCORES,
> brag-rights indicators of "superiority" to others. No one
> allowed to "play" just for the love of playing?!?

Sure you can...but you have to HAVE a license to play. So WHAT
would YOU know about it?

> Tell everyone more about your wonderfulness, Jelly.

Seems I don't remember Fred addressing you as anything but Len,
ergo why the name calling, Lennie?

Again, you prove me right. Thank you.

> "Measure up" to WHAT, old-timer?

Regardless of what the "WHAT" is, YOU don't make it anyway.

> This newsgroup was created primarily to be a forum to discuss
> the code test for amateur radio license examinations.

And like almost all things, it has evolved. You should try it.

> I sense, detect, and almost blinded by Day-Glo letters of "CW skill
> is superior to all other forms of endeavor in anything and therefore
> [Jelly] is superior to others who cannot be as godlike as [Jelly]."

More name calling which Lennie has repeatedly denied doing.

When will this lying creep realize he's an idiot who's number has
been had?

> The FCC has stated in 1990 and in 1999 that it does not consider
> a morse code test as relevant to amateur radio licensing in order
> to regulate amateur radio. It stated that the FCC must continue to
> do so because of existing treaty-cooperative ITU-R standards.

Yet YOU keep assailing AMATEURS for it's retention. Here you
state the FCC has clearly stated that international treaty is
to "blame". So which is it, Lennie?

>It seems to fall to the obvious -

What falls to the obvious is that you manipulate "facts" to
justify the rant of the hour.

> "We had to take the test so all the newcomers have to take it."

Not true, and you have been invited in. You spurn the offers
based on YOUR alleged moral superiority..."Why should >>I<< allow
myself to associate with such heathens...?!?!?"

> Selfish emotionalism is not a good reason for regulations.

Or a good reason for revoking regulations, either.

--
"If You're Not A Ham....You're SPAM!"

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

566. Re: It's like this....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 22:31:17 UTC
From: "Steven J Robeson", K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <942i3mgks1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 815

In article <941t2a$s62$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org> wrote:

> Enjoy!

Hurrah! Enjoyed it! Thanks!

73 de K4YZ

--
"If You're Not A Ham....You're SPAM!"

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

567. Re: "They oughta require a license....blah, blah, blah"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 22:51:58 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nospam.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.g79tps0.pminews@ca.news.verio.net>
Source record: 816

On Tue, 16 Jan 2001 13:31:59 -0500, Jake Brodsky wrote:

>The real problem is that the FCC isn't enforcing its own laws very
>well.

All it takes is money. The Commish' is stupid not to do it
while there are still agents left who have the capability and
the desire to do it. The old-timers like me are all gone (with
two notable exceptions nationwide) and our immediate proteges
who at least served a few years while we were around are
getting up to retirement time pretty soon.

There is no "new crop".

All it takes is money and a committment from above.

The new chairman-designate has ZIPPO understanding and support
of what the real mission of the agency should be. He proves it
in his public pronouncements.

>Laws against unlicensed operation exist. Maybe the FCC would
>consider licensing something like an Official Radio Monitor (Kind of
>like the ARRL OO, but with some sort of legal standing in a court of
>law) who could be called at a moment's notice to DF a signal they
>can't afford to track down.

We used to have them -- they were called "FCC engineers". I
got called out too many times to count in the "good old days".

The question came up about "volunteer agents" - similar to
police reserves - when the Amateur Auxiliary was formed. Both
the enforcement and the legal folks came to the same conclusion
that there are specific training and legal qualifiction problems
in that sort of arrangement on the Federal level, and that's why
the Amateur Auxiliary was crafted the way it is.

The problem is getting the legal folks both inside the agency
and outside (the Justice Department) to move on what we
amateurs consider a "major problem" but what, in the law
enforcement community, is really small potatoes - or so I've
been told by more than one U S Attorney.

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

568. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 23:01:02 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <942jra$i4j$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 817
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

In article <94286f$7a9$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org> wrote:
> For those who get their shorts all knotted up about CB lingo on the
ham
> bands, here is an excerpt from a book written 60 years ago by Clinton
> DeSoto.
>
> "Among radio amateurs there is a genuine brotherhood and informal
> camaraderie. Everyone is called by his "handle" -- his first name
> or nickname. The president of the Chicago Stock Exchange and the
> mechanic in a Birmingham garage are just "Paul" and "Joe" when
> they meet on the air."
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB

Hans, thats all very nice and good, but Cecil "keyed" us in on this
little bit of history a long time ago.

Good luck on finding another tidbit to troll with.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

569. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 23:12:15 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <3E496.908$e5.2258821@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 818
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com> wrote:

> > "Among radio amateurs there is a genuine brotherhood and informal
> > camaraderie. Everyone is called by his "handle" -- his first name
> > or nickname. The president of the Chicago Stock Exchange and the
> > mechanic in a Birmingham garage are just "Paul" and "Joe" when
> > they meet on the air."

> Good luck on finding another tidbit to troll with.

The term "troll" usually has some pretty negative implications. Do you believe that this post was intended only to goad people into arguing with each other for the amusement of the poster?

I believe that Hans posted it because it was a neat piece of information that has relevance that may just stop one tiny bit of the arguing we do here.

Hans, please find another tidbit to use to try to convince people not to argue over insignificant details like 11-meter ops using the term "handle" instead of name. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

570. Re: It's like this....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 23:30:58 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <942ljijll1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 819

In article <941t2a$s62$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org> wrote:
>
>
> http://www.callingcq.org/desoto/chap1.html
>
> Enjoy!
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB

Read it again, Hans. Key in on the phrases below. 73, Brian

He finds amateur radio "the means of communications with others on equal terms, of finding friendship, adventure and prestige while seated at one's own fireside," according to Dr Raymond V. Bowers. "In picking his human contacts out of the air, theamateur is not seen by them.... He is not known by the company he keeps nor by the clothes he wears, but by the signal he emits.

-ON EQUAL TERMS

-KNOWN BY THE SIGNAL HE EMITS

It stands for the maintenance of fraternalism and a high standard of conduct.

-HIGH STANDARD OF CONDUCT

In early days amateur stations used code alone in their transmissions. These days they use both voice, or 'phone, and code, or c.w. (continuous wave) telegraphy, theproportion being about one third 'phone and two thirds c.w. Actually, all amateurs mustbe able to understand the radio code. A 'phone transmitter, involving microphone, speech amplifier and modulator, is more complex and expensive than one for c.w. alone which needs only a telegraph key (no transmitter?). There is a traditional rivalry (not warfare) between confirmed addicts of the two methods, a rivalry comparable to that between sailing-boat and power-boat owners or between sailplane and airplane pilots.

To be considered a "good ham" is just about the highest mark of honor there is.

Among radio amateurs there is a genuine brotherhood and informal camaraderie

Fraternalism ... good fellowship ... ingenuity ... public service ...

That's what amateur radio is like.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

571. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 23:37:36 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <942lvv$k2a$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 821

In article <20010116081357.05657.00001661@ng-cl1.aol.com>,
w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:
> >From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
>
> >They DO compare. Neither can be done with
> >no training or practice.
>
> Dick is correct; one must learn the code before using it. One must
learn how
> to fly a plane before flying it. The difference is that one teaches
one's self
> Morse code. They can do so successfully in virtually all cases with
or without
> any formal demonstration of that ability. People would not get on the
air and
> try Morse code unless they had learned it first. For that reason, the
plane
> analogy is technically correct, but not very useful to the discussion
at hand.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

Ed, who tought Orville Wright to fly? Who taught Sammy Morse the code?

Either can be self-taught. Today it just depends on the gubmn't
regulations.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

572. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 23:40:26 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <942m59$k5g$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 820

In article <mrv86tko43g0dieqn2j953qte46k8ho12l@4ax.com>,
Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com> wrote:
> w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:
> > People would not get on the air and
> >try Morse code unless they had learned it first.
>
> I've talked to a few people on CW who didn't know the Morse code...
>
You wouldn't have if you sent crappy code.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

573. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-16 23:59:21 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <jk596.912$e5.2262464@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 822

Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com> wrote:

> Ed, who tought Orville Wright to fly? Who taught Sammy Morse the code?

> Either can be self-taught. Today it just depends on the gubmn't
> regulations.

True enough, but one caveat -- those self-taught hams might not send machine-perfect code. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

574. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 00:04:42 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <lp596.913$e5.2262790@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 823

> > I've talked to a few people on CW who didn't know the Morse code...

I have too, Aaron, on purpose. We set up a little cross-band QSO where I worked a bunch of new VHF only hams by transmitting Morse code on 40 meters and listening on 2 meters. A local op manually retransmitted my 40 meter signal, using a 40 meter receiver and an HT.

The hams, most of which were not code proficient, only had to learn how to recognize their call on CW and make the QSO with me. I sent them a signal report, which naturally was 59. :-) There was one old timer who just wanted in on the fun and one Tech+ who didn't have CW equipment who had never made a CW QSO.

It didn't change the world, mind you, but we all had a good time, tried something new and learned that CW is a real mode in ham radio.

Oh, and none of them complained about my timing. I had to use a J-38 to slow down to 5 wpm non-Farnsworth.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

575. Re: QCWA TELLS FCC TO END INCENTIVE LICENSING

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 00:13:34 UTC
From: Bob Wex w2ilp <w2ilp@juno.com>
Message-ID: <942o38lpj1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 824

In article <20001217170622.28371.00005391@ng-cr1.aol.com>,
w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:
> >From: Bob Wex w2ilp w2ilp@juno.com
>
> >They want to start an *Educational Program* for school kids...but
they
> >did away with the Novice class which was initially designed for kids.
>
> The Novice license had been superceded by the Technician or
Technician+ license
> as the defacto entry point a couple of decades ago, Bob. I am
suprised you
> hadn't noticed. :-)

The Novice License and the original Technician License both got their start at the same time on July 1951. The Tech Plus (5 wpm) and the No-Code Tech came later. The Novice and Tech Plus were eliminated recently in the dumb restructuring program. While the Novic License was not producing many new Novices, let us not discount it as an entry to youths who prefered to start becoming real HF Hams...Or haven't you noticed.

> It was the FCC that made the decision to eliminate the Novice,
although there
> was significant comment that the Novice class, due to significantly
declining
> interest, was no longer needed. Can you cite any figures that
support your
> contention that the present entry-level exams are so hard that less
people are
> entering ham radio than did before April 15, 2000?

The FCC makes its decisions based on the bragging and complaining of Hams and those who lobby for them (like the ARRL)...unfortunately not always on common sense or with an eye to the survival of ham radio or its educational benefits.

> >They informed us that there was
> >need for hams to understand how to comply with recent RF hazard
> >limitating regulations and this was supposed to add more questions to
> >all of the exams.....
>
> The FCC informed us that hams had to understand how to comply with the
> regulations. And the rules change the FCC put in place
wasn't "supposed" to

> add more questions, it did add more questions. I am surprised you
didn't know
> that.

It did add more questions to Novice and Tech Exams and was supposed to
add more questions to other exams as they came up for being
updated...but sadly the new restructured exams do not contain much RF
hazard content nor are the tables and graphs that are used as aides to
answering RF hazard questions given to applicants for the new exams.
I'm surprised that YOU didn't know THAT!

>
> >IMHO ham licensing was always meant to be an incentive
> >for learning. What the heck else can justify any licensing exams???
>
> Can you cite the section in Part 97 that says that exams are intended
to be an
> incentive for learning? I believe that the FCC sees exams as a way of
> determining that an applicant is qualified to use the priveleges
granted by the
> license properly.

The basis and purpose (as written in Part 97) of ham radio has often
been cited by me. It is a general goal for all hams. The exaqms are
used as incentives for the applicants to begion to prepare to generally
meet those goals.

> > I dunno what our Ham leaders motives are for sure. Can it be that
> >they just don't have any common sense that is consistant with the ham
> >policy makers of the past?
>
> Or could it be that they have enough common sense to avoid the
complex proposal
> you offer as a solution. Your idea of license classes heaped upon
license
> classes would, IMHO, drown amateur radio in a sea of red tape.

Not red tape...Just reality....It woyld add real value to Ham tickets
anmd make Ham Radio the worthwhile hobby that it once was.

> > They certainly don't seem to have a grasp of the present and
> > future technical challenges that hams need to coexist with and
comprehend.
>
> Sure they do; they just do not believe that FCC exams administered by
volunteer
> examiners is the way to meet those challenges.

Is it because they don't trust VEs?....or is it because they don't
trust themselves to propose any solutions that might make ham radio
compatible with modern computer science and technology???

> >At least some of the real expert hams
> >need to show that they have been given not just an incentive but an
> >education by being hams..
>
> Yes, they do, and the best way to do that is to do something with that
> expertise within ham radio, not by passing another FCC exam.

I disagree. What youy say can be true for individuals BUT it can
never apply to HAMS AS A GROUP unless it is part of the Ham licensing
structure.

> > I am the first to admit that all Hams are not Hams
> >for the same reasons or with the same motivations.
>
> You may admit it, but you are seeking to require that everyone in ham
radio
> follow the path and motivation that is right for you...

Nope...All Hams need not get to be Extra Class or to obtain specialist
technocal endorsements.
Lots of kids play baseball just for fun. Most sand lot players may
never get to be professional baseball players...BUT the dream is there
among ever kid when he or she starts to play...maybe I'll be good
enough to grow up to be a PRO. In the same manner Ham Radio no longer
offers a gateway to any real professionalism. This was not true in the
30s and 40s when a ham ticket was an early step toward getting a
commercial radio operator license. The commercial license could get
you a job as a broadcasting engineer or a ship board radio operator.
You had learned Mortse code as a ham...and you had learned how to
adjust and neutralize high power RF transmitting vacuum triodes. Both
of these skills mean nothing today as far as commercial values go...BUT
in order to attract new techies the FCC Ham licenses must replace these
practices and skills with the digital and networking skills now valued
commercially. If this does not happen...no self respecting techie can
be motivated to sopend any time as a ham.

> > Nor do all Hams care to get compulsively involved with education,
> > technology or science or even the technical details of ham radio
itself.\
>
> You are correct, not all hams will do what you are proposing they
do. If your
> grand and glorious exam scheme is not tied into priveleges, it is not
going to
> accomplish anything that other means would not accomplish better.
And if it is
> tied in to priveleges, you have created a structure where only a
handful of
> hams will have all of those priveleges.

I Disagree. The fact that the structiure is there would be just like
the fact that there is amateur, semi-pro and pro baseball. Without any
pro baseball, sand-lot baseball would cease to attract as many

youngsters as it does.

> >Viva la difference. IMHO this means that three classes of license
can
> > never fit all!
>
> 300 classes of license can never fit all, by your "logic."

Nope...I'll settle for 30 classes.

> >and most of those few are credited with their knowledge...not because
> >of what they learned preparing for any ham exams but because of what
> >they learned elsewhere.
>
> Exactly, and those are the ones who could take and pass your elite
exams, Bob,
> but they know they don't need to.

Those are not the only ones. We have seen many hams of the past and
present who could pass the higher level exams due to their own self-
study and practical experience.

> >BUT Ham Radio must also be a sequentially challenging hobby
> >for new young blooded people if it is to continue to survive in the
21st
> century.
>
> Ham radio IS a sequentially challenging hobby already, Bob; within
it, each ham
> is free to pursue whatever technical or operating challenges that he
or she
> sees fit.

You can lead a ham to Yaesu...but you can't make him think.
>
> >It must be able to introduce those who care to be introduced to an
> >understanding of modern electronic communications systems and methods
> >that can be applied by Hams to advance their state of the art.
>
> Yes, it should, and those >1000 questions in the question pool should
be
> changed to reflect just that.

What 1000 questions? 35+35+50= 120 multiple choice questions to make
Extra....from a fixed pool of 1000 or so and only 75% needed to
pass...less if you guess the rest by the laws of probability.
Heck a common hacker needs to be able to handle more knowledge than
that.

> >These widely different needs are in conflict and can only be solved
by
> >a more complex and divergent licensing structure.
>

> How can such needs be in conflict?

The conflict exists between those affluent people who seek Ham Radio as
a fun hobby...and the lesws affluent masses who will only become hams
if ham radio can offer a possible gateway to a vocation or profession.

> That statement is nothing more than emotive
> words strung together. If there is such a technical conflict, adding
a more
> complex licensing structure will not accomplish anything.

AND WHY NOT???

> >BASIS and PURPOSE that can be relied upon to maintain enough clout to
> >retain our governments' continous support.
>
> Your premise that amateur radio will have clout if hams pass more
tests is
> without merit. In all of the speeches the FCC has given to hams
lately, urging
> us to DO more technical things, not once has any FCC official asked
that we
> develop more, or even more difficult, amateur radio tests.

This is becauswe they are not thinking in the propper direction.

> >Hams need MORE license classes and/or technical endorsements.
>
> IMHO, your plans are not well thought out, and are proposing things
that not
> only will never happen, but would cause significant harm and hardship
to the
> Amateur Radio Service if they did.

I disagree.

> Perhaps it would be helpful if you directed your energy towards
something that
> the FCC will not shoot down in flames.

The Hams themselves and not the FCC may be burning their own britches
by not understanding the only real surviving purpose that ham radio can
offer.

> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

73,
I recently returned from vacationing in Southern California.
Bob Wex w2ilp (I Like Pasadena)

I invented the Internet.
--Al Gore--

I was born 35 years too soon. If I still
had the patents on my inventions, Bill Gates
would have to stand aside for me.
--Al Gross (inventor of the walkie-talkie, pager
and cordless telephone [silent key])--

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

576. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 00:30:02 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010116193002.13433.00002467@nso-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 825

In article <UUK86.838$e5.2154591@news.ntplx.net>, "Ed Hare, W1RFI"
<w1rfi@arrl.net> writes:

>
>> > Would you advocate that the VEs determine that a ham has working RTTY
>equipment
>> > before he or she is permitted to use RTTY on the digital portions of the
>bands?
>
>> That remark is inconsistant with reality and you know it.
>
>Yes, I do know it. But it is exactly analogous to the belief that an
>applicant must demonstrate proficiency in Morse code before being allowed to
>try the mode on HF. People would learn the mode, or write some really cool
>software, before trying it, would they not?

Ed:

You couldn't be wider of the mark. Morse/CW is the only mode which,
in order to be effectively employed, requires the user to learn and
master a physical skill which exceeds the learning curve and
committment level demanded of the other modes. Any person who can
read an instruction manual can get a multi-mode TNC up and running --
that's exactly how I did it. If they read a bit more, they will be able
to exploit it more fully, as I have. However, the Morse code is
different. If I hadn't put in a considerable amount of time and effort
to learn it properly, and had I not spent more time practicing it
regularly, I would not have achieved what I call "working proficiency"
in that mode. And, in spite of this working proficiency, I am still
far from what I'd call an "expert." I shall probably never attain that
status -- but I could hold my own handling traffic at what I consider
to be a reasonable speed, 18 - 22 WPM.

Your argument that the other modes require equal testing status
doesn't hold water, since using them doesn't require the user to be
able to employ the same kind of conditioned response to external
stimulation that is the essence of Morse/CW operation. All it
requires is that they be able to see or hear the output of their
transceiver through whatever interface is required (speaker, video
monitor, LCD display, etc.)

BTW that Kenwood IC-R3 comm receiver has me hot and bothered!
Thank Steve Ford for me, for an excellent review! It just may be
the basis for my purchase of that rig!

73 de Larry, K3LT

577. Re: "They oughta require a license....blah, blah, blah"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 00:40:11 UTC
From: Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com>
Message-ID: <3A64E9EB.9AD1A836@dvol.com>
Source record: 826

>
> > As I alluded to in my previous message, If the FCC monitoring
> > facilities are taxed, why not certify certain amateur radio stations
> > as a legal observer who can give expert testimony? Then one would
> > only have to alert these observers to the problem, they'll track the
> > bugger down and the FCC would decide how to prosecute the offender.

>
The monitoring stations and field units can tune and locate freebanders at will
any time they choose to do so. They seldom choose to do so.
>

> >
> > This is certainly less costly than assuming the whole enforcement
> > burden, and hopefully this could enable the FCC to use its funding
> > more wisely.
>
> This may work since the bill was passed allowing enforcement of the CB Radio
> Part 95 rules by local LEOs. Hams could volunteer to help in that area as
> part of our public service function. Now the question is, how many would
> even bother to do so?

>
Close to none, 'cept maybe some cop wannabes. The misbehavior of the CBers and
freebanders is an FCC enforcement issue which has no impact one way or another
on ham radio. Fact is they don't have any real impact on anything which is why
they're on the low end of the FCC's list of priorities.
>
How 'bout we just mind our own business and stick to ham radio?
>

> --
> Leland C. Scott
> KC8LDO

>
w3rv

578. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 00:51:19 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <942qa3nqd1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 827

In article <lp596.913$e5.2262790@news.ntplx.net>,
"Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net> wrote:

> Oh, and none of them complained about my timing. I had to use a J-38
> to slow down to 5 wpm non-Farnsworth.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

Why would they? I heard that you are the op behind W1AW's sterile code.

BTW, when you took the 13 and 20wpm exams in front of the FCC examiner,
did you dazzle him with your coconut boat swing?

Or did you send it by the book?

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

579. Re: It's like this....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 00:55:09 UTC
From: K0HB <k0hb@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <942qh9nus1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 828

In article <942ljijll1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com> wrote:
> In article <941t2a$s62$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
> K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org> wrote:
> >
> >
> > http://www.callingcq.org/desoto/chap1.html
> >
> > Enjoy!
> >
> > 73, de Hans, K0HB
>
> Read it again, Hans. Key in on the phrases below. 73, Brian
> --
-
> He finds amateur radio "the means of communications with others on
equal
> terms, of finding friendship, adventure and prestige while seated at
> one's own fireside," according to Dr Raymond V. Bowers. "In picking
his
> human contacts out of the air, theamateur is not seen by them.... He
is
> not known by the company he keeps nor by the clothes he wears, but by
> the signal he emits.
>
> -ON EQUAL TERMS
>
> -KNOWN BY THE SIGNAL HE EMITS
>
> It stands for the maintenance of fraternalism and a high standard of
> conduct.
>
> -HIGH STANDARD OF CONDUCT
>
> In early days amateur stations used code alone in their transmissions.
> These days they use both voice, or 'phone, and code, or c.w.
(continuous
> wave) telegraphy, theproportion being about one third 'phone and two
> thirds c.w. Actually, all amateurs mustbe able to understand the radio
> code. A 'phone transmitter, involving microphone, speech amplifier and
> modulator, is more complex and expensive than one for c.w. alone
> which needs only a telegraph key (no transmitter?). There is a
> traditional rivalry (not warfare) between confirmed addicts of the two
> methods, a rivalry comparable to that between sailing-boat and

> power-boat owners or between sailplane and airplane pilots.
>
> To be considered a "good ham" is just about the highest mark
> of honor there is.
>
> Among radio amateurs there is a genuine brotherhood and informal
> camaraderie
>
> Fraternalism ... good fellowship ... ingenuity ... public service ...
>
> That's what amateur radio is like.

Exactly!

73, de Hans, K0HB
--

PS: The internet newsgroups are not amateur radio.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

580. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 00:59:28 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <942qpc$o8u$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 829

In article <jk596.912$e5.2262464@news.ntplx.net>,
"Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net> wrote:
> Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com> wrote:
>
> > Ed, who tought Orville Wright to fly? Who taught Sammy Morse the
code?
>
> > Either can be self-taught. Today it just depends on the gubmn't
> > regulations.
>
> True enough, but one caveat -- those self-taught hams might not send
> machine-perfect code. :-)
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

Certainly they learned by listening to the ARRL "Now Your Talking" 5wpm
code tape and W1AW on the air.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

581. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 01:11:11 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <942rf8ori1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 830
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

In article <3E496.908$e5.2258821@news.ntplx.net>,
"Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net> wrote:
> Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com> wrote:
>
> > > "Among radio amateurs there is a genuine brotherhood and informal
> > > camaraderie. Everyone is called by his "handle" -- his first
name
> > > or nickname. The president of the Chicago Stock Exchange and the
> > > mechanic in a Birmingham garage are just "Paul" and "Joe" when
> > > they meet on the air."
>
> > Good luck on finding another tidbit to troll with.
>
> The term "troll" usually has some pretty negative implications. Do
you
> believe that this post was intended only to goad people into arguing
> with each other for the amusement of the poster?

Until a better explanation comes up, 10-4?

> I believe that Hans posted it because it was a neat piece of
information
> that has relevance that may just stop one tiny bit of the arguing we
> do here.

"Hans the Humanitarian." It just doesn't ring true.

> Hans, please find another tidbit to use to try to convince people not
to
> argue over insignificant details like 11-meter ops using the term
"handle"
> instead of name. :-)
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

582. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 01:23:56 UTC
From: vlfiscus@mcn.net
Message-ID: <t69t1c89uqur89@news.supernews.com>
Source record: 831

Ed, this wouldn't be a fair test. no-coders aren't smart enough to build things, least of all their code speed.

w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote in <20010115073413.09203.00001189@ng-cr1.aol.com>:

>Here are the terms. Let's select someone with a no-code license and
>you. He or she will be asked to construct a Morse-code transmitter and
>make a Morse code QSO. You will be asked to construct a
>spread-spectrum transmitter and make a Morse code QSO. Winner gets an
>ARRL Handbook from the "bent-cover" bin.
>
>73,
>Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
>

583. Re: HA HA HA: Bush won popular vote!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 01:35:03 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <942ss7pvk1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 832
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <941t3lsdm1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
Dr. Conrad Connie <coontail@my-deja.com> wrote:
> In article <3A6462FD.FE75701B@usa.net>,
> ~Steve~ <mcsp@usa.net> wrote:
> > Shhhhhhhhhhh - can't let things like that out in the regular news
> > stream. How could the Black Caucus or any other left wing extremist
> > group have any right to complain if facts like those are brought
out?
> > This reality must be hidden and counter attacked immediately or
> > otherwise the truth might be a popular belief, Sharpton, Jackson,
and
> > all the others will be out of a job for the next 8 years if it is
> > revealed Bush got the popular vote... and you wouldn't want to see
> them
> > on welfare would you?
>
> Good one! So true.. when the cabal can't prove anything they
insinuate
> a liberal conspiracy.. because God knows the liberals have all the
> power.

Dr Commie, when 3.5 out of 4 networks are liberal, it really is a
conspiracy. The silent conservative majority could really give a
damn and don't mind spending a little bit of tax money to keep you guys
quiet, but we're just tired of the incessant whining.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

584. Re: The Pope now rules the U.S.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 01:36:21 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <942suk$q7c$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 833
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.conspiracy

In article <3A5B2E9E.9A5583FC@oio.net>,
'Doc <w5lz@oio.net> wrote:
>
>
> Bill Hammack wrote:
> >
> > How is it that after seeing the CNN report that a large majority of
> > people in congress is Roman Catholic, no one has worried that we
have
> > 150 congress people who place the Pope above their own President.
> >
> > Is the Pope the de facto ruler of America?
>
> Bill,
> Stick to the conspiracy group, they'll believe anything...
> 'Doc
>
Yeah, this was tried back in 1960 against Kennedy. Was BS then, is BS
now.

Dan/W4NTI

--
"Just tellin the truth, and they cain't stand it."

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

585. Re: HA HA HA: Bush won popular vote!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 01:42:05 UTC
From: "Dr. Conrad Connie" <coontail@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <942t9bqcr1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 834
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <3A647E65.EFFF0B52@usa.net>,
~Steve~ <mcsp@usa.net> wrote:
> I guess the sarcastic nature did not come through as I had hoped.
> If God were such a boon to the liberal agenda, why are 99% of them
trying to
> remove Him from of everything? No prayer in schools, no 10
commandments,
> abortion runs rampant, etc. I really don't think God wants His name
attached
> to such blasphemous activity!
>
> ~Steve~
>
> "Dr. Conrad Connie" wrote:
>
> > Good one! So true.. when the cabal can't prove anything they
insinuate
> > a liberal conspiracy.. because God knows the liberals have all the
> > power.
>
>

Well, as A liberal, more a libertarian or independent, I think you've
got it wrong. All liberals do-not bow when Al Sharpton let's a fart or
were happy about Senor Clinton's little extra marital affair.
What the issue is and YOU conservatives distort it for your own agenda,
is Christain faith, i.e. the Bible is NOT the religion of all Americans.
We have the right of worship and the right NOT TO.
I haven't seen any church closings lately or the FCC putting any of
those fire and brimstone shortwave pocket picking preachers off the air.
Quite the contrary.
As for abortion.. I'm opposed to it, but not because of a religious
doctrine. Basically I say, why is it murder to strangle an infant after
birth, but perfectly OK to crush its skull, inside the womb?
Seems bizarre doesn't it?
And why do abortions take place? Because somebody wasn't being
reponsible with sex!!
Now, I'm a liberal ? Do I sound like one ?
Well, I think Bubba Bush will be the worst president we've had in 40
years.. but I could be wrong.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

586. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 01:46:22 UTC
From: "Dr. Conrad Connie" <coontail@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <942thcqng1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 837
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

In article <94286f$7a9$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org> wrote:
> For those who get their shorts all knotted up about CB lingo on the
ham
> bands, here is an excerpt from a book written 60 years ago by Clinton
> DeSoto.
>
> "Among radio amateurs there is a genuine brotherhood and informal
> camaraderie. Everyone is called by his "handle" -- his first name
> or nickname. The president of the Chicago Stock Exchange and the
> mechanic in a Birmingham garage are just "Paul" and "Joe" when
> they meet on the air."
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB
>

You're so right! I recall hams using handle before CB was popular.
In fact that term was stolen from ham lingo.
Apparently some of the non-old timers, who were not around in the 1960s,
aren't aware Handle was in common useage.

I did hear somebody say 10-4 the other day on 40, and quite frankly
thats not from CB either.. a stolen product. The COPS have this as a
part of their 10- code.. I am told.. and have had for decades.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

587. Re: W4JLE Welefare Extra?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 01:50:13 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <942tojqrd1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 836

In article <3a6457e3.420745977@nntp.mindspring.com>,
kk5yy@arrl.net wrote:
> On Mon, 15 Jan 2001 11:16:48 -0600, "Richard McCollum"
> <rmccoll@radiks.net> wrote:
>
> >
> > >"Gerald Schmitt" <kk5yy@arrl.net> wrote in message
> > >news:3a630e92.336428289@nntp.mindspring.com...
> > >>
> > >> Well Folks,
> > >>
> > >> With all the sound and fury signifying nothing I just had to look
into
> > >> Fred's bona fides, very interesting reading.
> > >>
> > >
> > >Admirable! Now who in Sam Hill is Gerald Schmitt?
> > >
> > >Dick, N BK, Aging Boy Wonder
> > >
> > >
> > Well Dick first let me tell you who I am not. I'm not
> > someone who judges other hams by their code speed.
> > I'm not someone who requires that everyone share my
> > interests or have my skill set.
>
> I am someone who goes well out of his way to teach and
> demonstrate amateur radio in order to promote the hobby
> and help other hams enjoy it more. This to me seems a better
> course of action than berating other hams that don't share
> my interests or skills. Last year I attended 16 hamfests in
> 12 different states from Florida to Alaska doing demos,
> forums, teaching and speaking about amateur radio.
> What did you and your hero do?
>
> It seems to me that poor Fred has his entire self worth tied
> up in his code. What a shame to have done so little in ones
> life that all you have to be proud of is an arcane skill,
> be that ability real or imagined,
>
> I have a question I think you might be able to help me with.
> Why does someone become a sock puppet for an internet
> jerk? Is it sort of like those Bozos who hung out with those

> schoolyard bullies basking in reflected "glory"?

This is why I am a proponent of one amateur radio license, simply called "Amateur Radio License." Do as much or as little with it as you like.

You can brag about an HPM 35wpm certificate on the wall if you want.

Or you can write code for the hottest new amateur digital mode.

Or you can help scouts get a radio merit badge...

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

588. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 01:54:54 UTC
From: vlfiscus@mcn.net
Message-ID: <t69urethiab696@news.supernews.com>
Source record: 835

w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote in <20010114175651.05250.00001615@ng-ff1.aol.com>:

>>From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
>
>>I learned Morse code at speeds greater than 5 WPM because
>>it was the current requirement to obtain an Extra-class license!
>>If the requirement hadn't existed, neither would my achievement --
>>and I would not have benefited from the enjoyment of reasonable
>>proficiency in this practical communications skill. It's as simple
>>as that.
>
>Did you learn Morse code faster than 20 wpm?
>
>73,
>Ed Hare, W1RFI
>

Ya know ED, I must've of read 60 of your posts tonight in various threads and you're a living example of the Leagues restructuring proposal. You won't promote anything that will improve ham radio and neither will your employer!

ARRL policy makes me want to vomit.

589. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 01:57:24 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <942u5v$r7t$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 840
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

In article <942thcqng1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
Dr. Conrad Connie <coontail@my-deja.com> wrote:
> In article <94286f$7a9$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
> K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org> wrote:
> > For those who get their shorts all knotted up about CB lingo on the
> ham
> > bands, here is an excerpt from a book written 60 years ago by
Clinton
> > DeSoto.
> >
> > "Among radio amateurs there is a genuine brotherhood and informal
> > camaraderie. Everyone is called by his "handle" -- his first name
> > or nickname. The president of the Chicago Stock Exchange and the
> > mechanic in a Birmingham garage are just "Paul" and "Joe" when
> > they meet on the air."
> >
> > 73, de Hans, K0HB
> >
>
> You're so right! I recall hams using handle before CB was popular.
> In fact that term was stolen from ham lingo.
> Apparently some of the non-old timers, who were not around in the
1960s,
> aren't aware Handle was in common useage.
>
> I did hear somebody say 10-4 the other day on 40, and quite frankly
> thats not from CB either.. a stolen product. The COPS have this as a
> part of their 10- code.. I am told.. and have had for decades.
>
> Sent via Deja.com
> http://www.deja.com/
>
You got it right. I'm sure your just trying to be nice. But the basic
fact is CB stole most, if not all, of their proceedures and pro-words
from either Ham, public service, or commercial service radio services.

Dan/W4NTI

--
"Just tellin the truth, and they cain't stand it."

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

590. Re: Left wingers getting ready

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 01:58:04 UTC
From: Chris Smolinski <cps@blackcatsystems.com>
Message-ID: <160120012058048723%cps@blackcatsystems.com>
Source record: 843
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.radio.pirate,alt.fan.art-bell,alt.politics.libertarian

In article <940149bhr1@nnrp1.deja.com>, <libertarian1@my-deja.com>
wrote:

> In article <93t2q0$619$1@iac5.navix.net>,
> "W4JLE" <Fred@w4jle.com> wrote:
> > Some of the left wing nonsense, this from Ramsey Clark former Attorney
> > General (D)
> > complete with neutral wording such as "Governor death"... January 20th
> > should be fun. A search of the internet shows all the cock roaches are
> > coming out of the woodwork.
> >
>
>
> It's not just a leftwing issue. Libertarians are opposed to the
> censorious policies of BOTH Republicans and Democrats locking Third
> Parties out.....
>
> The whole Left-Right congame is over!!!!!!!!!

No Howie, your game is over. Now take your medication and go to bed.

--
Chris Smolinski

591. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 02:03:02 UTC
From: vlfiscus@mcn.net
Message-ID: <t69vam5afmlncb@news.supernews.com>
Source record: 838
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Personal Hygiene tip:
Read your QST with gloves on so the bullshit doesn't run down your arms.
Especially the League policy section.

w1rfi@arrl.net (Ed Hare, W1RFI) wrote in
<xW296.896$e5.2250599@news.ntplx.net>:

>have
>> *all* the goodies to play with.
>
>I'm sorry; poor choice of words on my part. QST doesn't run the Review
>until we have all of the accessories we want to include. (Filters,
>tuners, etc.)
>
>What doesn't always get reviewed is every station accessory available,
>ie wall clock, keyer, etc.
>
>The QST column "Short Takes" does include a lot of the lower-end
>products, though; it was added sometime last year to let ARRL take a
>closer look at more equipment.
>
>In case a few members missed it, the entire QST Product Reviews from
>1980 onward are available at the ARRL members pages at
>http://www.arrl.org/members-only. The expanded test reports are
>available there also. As each issue is sent to the printer, the
>Product Reviews are put up there, giving members a faster look at them.
>
>73,
>Ed Hare, W1RFI
>ARRL Lab
>
>

592. Re: Despicable 14.313 behavior resumes

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 02:04:23 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <942uj2$rd6$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 841

In article <20010116085433.05657.00001679@ng-cl1.aol.com>,
w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:
> >From: Brian brianburke@my-deja.com
>
> >> >Was it more "Battle of the Pre-99 Extras?"
> >>
> >> I don't know. What percentage of the pre-99 Extras participated?
>
> >Hey Ed, I'm asking the questions around here. ;)
>
> >OK, what percentage of the pre-99 Extras participated?
>
> What part of "I don't know" did you not understand? I would wager
that the
> percentage of pre-1999 Extras that participated in that particular
battle was
> less than 0.01% of the total number of pre-1999 Extras. For that
reason. I
> don't believe that naming a battle after a group of people that had
such a
> miniscule percentage of them actually participate is appropriate.
>
> >Or better yet, of the participants, what percentage did the pre-99
> >Extras make?
>
> I don't know that, either. Are you willing to share the answer?
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

I'm willing to share that Riley has commented on the disproportionate
number of "advanced" hams that get in to regulatory trouble. I don't
know why thy're so unfamiliar with the rules, so don't ask me.

So when I hear of ham misbehavior, its not a stretch to imagine an Extra
doing it.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

593. Re: The Pope now rules the U.S.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 02:08:22 UTC
From: o-o-o <o-o-o@gmx.net>
Message-ID: <q8796.14288$7m.686231@news.chello.at>
Source record: 839
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.conspiracy

who do you think then rules over the pope?

or is that old man the illuminatus primus?

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@my-deja.com> schrieb im Newsbeitrag
news:942suk$q7c$1@nnrp1.deja.com...
> In article <3A5B2E9E.9A5583FC@oio.net>,
> 'Doc <w5lz@oio.net> wrote:
> >
> >
> > Bill Hammack wrote:
> > >
> > > How is it that after seeing the CNN report that a large majority of
> > > people in congress is Roman Catholic, no one has worried that we
> have
> > > 150 congress people who place the Pope above their own President.
> > >
> > > Is the Pope the de facto ruler of America?
> >
> > Bill,
> > Stick to the conspiracy group, they'll believe anything...
> > 'Doc
> >
> Yeah, this was tried back in 1960 against Kennedy. Was BS then, is BS
> now.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
> --
> "Just tellin the truth, and they cain't stand it."
>
>
> Sent via Deja.com
> http://www.deja.com/

594. Re: The KENWOOD BOYCOTT is on!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 02:14:56 UTC
From: aa7REMOVEya@arREMOVErl.net
Message-ID: <3a650008.326379867@news.montanavision.net>
Source record: 842

God I love my TS-850S

Stacey, AA7YA

On Sun, 07 Jan 2001 13:36:53 -0700, CW not CB <cwnotcb@ncnh.net>
wrote:

>KENWOOD, an corporate body and equipment maker attempting to influence
>public policy, tells the FCC to end code testing. This ABSOLUTELY PROVES
>that KENWOOD 1) is just a bunch of CBers and 2) willing to trash ham
>radio into CB, to line their pockets.
>
>BOYCOTT KENWOOD!
>
>Read their comments at http://cwrevolution.net
>

595. Re: "They oughta require a license....blah, blah, blah"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 03:01:58 UTC
From: W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com>
Message-ID: <9431vd$4j$1@iac5.navix.net>
Source record: 844

Can you say 666 boys and girls?

"Jake Brodsky" <frussle@erols.com> wrote in message
news:fh496t4af7l94gv4vnep9npbjhb5v6tn62@4ax.com...
> On Tue, 16 Jan 2001 12:20:38 -0500, "Leland C. Scott"
> <no-spam@junk-mail.net> wrote:
>
> >
> >"K0HB" <k0hb@my-deja.com> wrote in message
> >news:941ml3$mb4$1@nnrp1.deja.com...
> >
> >> Every so often a new guy like Leland comes up with the mistaken
> >> idea of placing restrictions on the wide availability of
> >> amateur radio equipment and supplies.
> >
> >And why should that be a mistake? You have to provide proof of insurance
to
> >get plates for a vehicle, provide a prescription from your doctor at the
> >drug store for powerful drugs, a photo ID (normally a driver's license)
to
> >pass a check, same thing with trying to buy booze, or get a drink at a
bar,
> >cops wants to see your driver's license when you get pulled over etc. The
> >list goes on and on. There are many things we are required to provide
proof
> >that we are who we say we are, and that we can do something, or we are
> >authorized to be where we are. Normally we just don't think about all the
> >cases. Asking to see your FCC license is not a big deal.
> >
> >So when you get pulled over by a cop, and he notices you are getting
public
> >service calls over your mobile rig, and tells you that you can't have a
> >scanner in your vehicle. You going to tell him you are a Ham, then
refuse
> >to show you license when he asks to see it, and then tell him to go
bugger
> >off because you don't have to?
>
> Sigh. The question is really "Is there a problem which is bad enough
> that we would insist on the expense and the enforcement of checking
> for a license before the sale?"
>
> That's a judgement call.
>

> >> These are the folks who
> >> suggest it be a crime to own amateur equipment without a
> >> license, and who are not thrilled about the fact that
> >> Radio Shack sells a line of UHF/VHF amateur equipment right out
> >> under the nose of the impressionable public.
> >
> >I have been to plenty of Hamfests where the policy is NOT to give a
winner
> >of the door prizes a Ham Radio TX of any kind UNLESS they have a license.
> >Instead they give them cash in the case they are unlicensed. So in a way
> >it's already being done. I bet you never even thought about it, even
> >bothered to notice.
>
> Personally, I don't think it's that big a problem.
>
> The real problem is that the FCC isn't enforcing its own laws very
> well. Laws against unlicensed operation exist. Maybe the FCC would
> consider licensing something like an Official Radio Monitor (Kind of
> like the ARRL OO, but with some sort of legal standing in a court of
> law) who could be called at a moment's notice to DF a signal they
> can't afford to track down.
>
> Then the real problem would disappear.
>
> Leland, I respect your position, but I can't help thinking that you're
> fighting the symptom, not the disease.
>
> 73,
>
>
> Jake Brodsky, AB3A mailto:frussle@erols.com
> "Beware of the massive impossible!"

596. Re: 10 bucks buys a ham license.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 03:11:58 UTC
From: Steve Woodruff <sjwoodr.nospam@nospam.email.com>
Message-ID: <9432hsdln1@flood.xnet.com>
Source record: 845
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"D. S. Platt" <jeepp@erols.com> wrote in message
news:3A645284.B34C8E3C@erols.com...
> Sorry about that... left a word out... should have read: Laurel (MD) VEC
has
> NEVER had a fee. Nice folks... fast and competent, too!!

I have no problem paying a fee.... but i was suprised tonight to learn that
i had to
pay the $10 fee for EACH exam i took. I upgraded to general, and had
intentions
of attempting the extra class exam.... but when i found out it would cost me
an
additional $10 i figured i'd wait until next month when i could be
reasonably sure
that i'd pass with ease.

--steve

597. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 03:31:41 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nospam.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.g7a6q40.pminews@ca.news.verio.net>
Source record: 846
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Tue, 16 Jan 2001 19:42:09 GMT, K0HB wrote:

>For those who get their shorts all knotted up about CB lingo on the ham
>bands, here is an excerpt from a book written 60 years ago by Clinton
>DeSoto.
>
> "Among radio amateurs there is a genuine brotherhood and informal
> camaraderie. Everyone is called by his "handle" -- his first name
> or nickname. The president of the Chicago Stock Exchange and the
> mechanic in a Birmingham garage are just "Paul" and "Joe" when
> they meet on the air."

It was obvious at the time that the CBers got it from us. Just
as they got their mutilated "10" codes from the police community.

The "country" and "good buddy" lingo came from an individual in
the Ozarks who was on the air some 20+ hours a day in the late
60s and actually talked like that as a regular thing. We used to
hear him very plainly at the monitoring stations in California.
--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

598. Re: 10 bucks buys a ham license.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 03:46:55 UTC
From: Glenn Miller <glennmiller@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <PA896.7050$Ep3.442734@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 847
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

The VEC fee is a session fee which means you can take as many exams as you like at a single examination session for one $10 fee. If a VE is charging the $10 fee per element at the same exam session, he needs to re-read his VE manual.
73
Glenn AA5PK

"Steve Woodruff" <sjwoodr.nospam@nospam.email.com> wrote in message news:9432hsdln1@flood.xnet.com...
> I have no problem paying a fee.... but i was suprised tonight to learn that
> i had to
> pay the $10 fee for EACH exam i took. I upgraded to general, and had
> intentions
> of attempting the extra class exam.... but when i found out it would cost me
> an
> additional $10 i figured i'd wait until next month when i could be
> reasonably sure
> that i'd pass with ease.
>
> --steve
>
>
>

599. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 05:49:05 UTC
From: jeffreyh@Hawaii.Edu
Message-ID: <943boh$pc1$1@news.hawaii.edu>
Source record: 848
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

In article <942u5v$r7t$1@nnrp1.deja.com>, Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@my-deja.com> wrote:
>You got it right. I'm sure your just trying to be nice. But the basic
>fact is CB stole most, if not all, of their proceedures and pro-words
>from either Ham, public service, or commercial service radio services.

Where did "slider" (as in VFO) originate, Dan? =:o

73, Jeff KH6O

600. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 06:07:46 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010117010746.14777.00000602@nso-bd.aol.com>
Source record: 849

In article <9422n4$9hh$1@iac5.navix.net>, "W4JLE" <Fred@w4jle.com> writes:

>If you are of average skills I can teach you to take off and land an
>airplane safely, as the sole occupant in about 10 hours.
>
>I suspect I would spend more time teaching you Morse code to the level I
>could "solo" you on the band. This assumes 5 WPM as the solo level.

These two examples are logically incongruent. There is no
need for flying skills in radio operation, any radio service.
To be legal, one has to have an amateur radio license in
order to transmit RF in the amateur radio bands...but the
necessity to "solo" for an amateur radio license in not a
federal requirement.

>How long it would take to teach yourself is another matter. However I once
>worked with a guy who was an avid simulator pilot that could probably have
>soloed in 4 hours. he claimed several thousand hours on his Microsoft flight
>simulator.

The above is both incongruent, illogical, and rather absurd.

As to self-learning radio arts, be they technology or
operating practices, that can be totally self-taught.

In a career of design and development of radio and
electronics, both myself and the vast majority of
career contemporaries were "self-taught" on the changing
state of the radio-electronics arts. There was no time to
attend "formal schooling" or get "accreditation" through
nice little paper certificates with grade points to attest to
"qualified new skills." Myself and the vast majority of my
career contemporaties already had formal schooling.
There were hardly any instructors or courses for each
new radio-electronic art that evolved.

By comparison, the necessary knowledge to get an
amateur license and to begin in the amateur radio
hobby can be entirely self-taught. There is no federal
requirement to "solo" in amateur radio under some
"instructor" who will "rank a student" based on the
"instructor's" opinion.

The amateur radio "solo" requirement is some
flight of fancy, or rather a fantasy based on some
"instructor's" aberrant self-professed "superiority."

didit

601. Re: 10 bucks buys a ham license.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 06:11:51 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <943d37$5ch$0@208.207.71.134>
Source record: 850
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Steve Woodruff wrote:
>

but i was suprised tonight to learn that
> i had to
> pay the $10 fee for EACH exam i took. I upgraded to general, and had
> intentions
> of attempting the extra class exam.... but when i found out it would cost me
> an
> additional $10 i figured i'd wait until next month when i could be
> reasonably sure
> that i'd pass with ease.

If that is permissable evidently they have changed the rules. When I
ran a VE team ('85 thru '93) the rules said one fee for all tests taken
at that session. Later it was deemed permissable to charge an additional
fee for a retest of a failed element at the same session, but we never
did.

602. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 06:34:42 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <943ee2$6nf$2@208.207.71.134>
Source record: 852

Cecil wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Oh,I hear jamming on a weekend net every week.
>
> VHF?
\

Nope. 40 meter SSB.

603. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 06:43:22 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <943eua$a1d$0@208.207.71.134>
Source record: 853

W1RFI wrote:
>
> >From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
>
> >What if a situation arose where people's lives depended on
> >communicating with the outside world, and the only mode that
> >would work was some form of Morse/CW? Ever hear of a
> >fractured larynx?
>
> How many hams do you think have operated Morse code in an emergency because
> they had fracturered their larynx?
>
> I miss the list of reasons to keep the code. "You might fracture your larynx
> someday in an emergency" could be the #1 answer.
>

There are an infinite number of circumstances that could occur. Suffice
to say only that Morse code communications on ham radio is the most
easily and widely available method of communications under the most
variable of circumstances requiring the least amount of overhead of any
amateur radio method - So long as hams are trained so as to be able to
use it.
That fact alone is reason enough to require hams to learn to make use
of it if the ARS is to be considered as a viable communications
auxiliary asset. If it is not, then it is fundamentally changed in its
nature and is well on its way to being nothing more than a hobby on par
with stamp collecting. Clearly there are those posting here who believe
it to be nothing more.

604. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 06:47:44 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <943f6g$aj7$0@208.207.71.134>
Source record: 854

Cecil wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Yeah, they followed the rules right out of the ARS into the Freeband
> > where there's no one like me to tweak their tails. some of you seem more
> > than willing to welcome whatever shows up at the door with a free
> > license, and then lament the nonsense they bring with them.
>
> If they obey the rules within the ham bands, who cares where they
> came from? If they are operating legally as hams within the ham bands,
> they aren't freebanders anymore, are they?

And you can affirm that this in in fact the case???

Seems ham radio has saved
> them from a life of crime. Seems that is a good thing to me. Do you
> disagree?

No, I don't disagree. What I disagree with is your premise that all
persons who so flagrantly violate whatever rule they please at will
should then be assumed to have reformed and become model citizens just
because the FCC gave them an essentially effortless and free ham radio
license. Those types don't reform just because they now have a ham
license in hand. For far too many it just opens another door to
mischief.

Do you condemn anyone who has not lead a perfect life like
> you have?
> --
> http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

605. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 06:48:54 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <943f8m$aj7$1@208.207.71.134>
Source record: 855

Cecil wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > Cecil wrote:
> > > Last year you were betting that hoards of CBers and freebanders were
> > > about to invade the ARS. Which is it?
> >
> > You read when I said it- they're already here, they came early.
>
> So exactly what is wrong with CBers and freebanders who enter the
> ARS and obey the rules?

What, indeed? Many have. Many have not.

Aren't you, in essence, advocating a sort
> of racism? Black = 0wpm. White = 20wpm. Hispanic = 5wpm. Asian = 13wpm.
> Blacks don't deserve equal rights.
>

that doesn't even deserve an answer.

606. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 06:55:51 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <943fln$aj7$2@208.207.71.134>
Source record: 856

Fred, I like it.

W4JLE wrote:
>
> How about a 5 question test for General.
>
> 1. State in 300 words or more why you want to be a ham.
>
> 2. Describe the procedure for calculating, adjusting, and connecting a 15
> meter dipole cut for the center of the phone band.
>
> 3. Explain the difference, if any, between an AC ground and a RF ground.
> Elaborate as to how each contributes or degrades operator and property
> safety.
>
> 4. Explain the procedures to make a contact on a non voice mode of your
> choosing.
>
> 5. Your neighbor calls and says you are interfering with his television, you
> are at a loss as to how to solve it. What do you do next?
>
> Now even if they memorize the answers they at least have some practical
> knowledge.
>
> "Cecil" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> news:3A64919E.9360C68C@IEEE.org...
> > Carl Zager wrote:
> > > Let me get this straight...random parameters? If there were ever a
> > > solution that would drive test takers to memorize the correct answers,
> > > this is it.
> >
> > How could that be? The answers would not be available until the
> > exam was generated. The examinee would see the answers for the
> > first time when he/she takes the exam under the watchful eyes
> > of the VEs. Every exam would be different.
> > --
> > http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

607. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 06:59:52 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010117015952.16762.00000428@nso-mp.aol.com>
Source record: 858

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.g7a6q40.pminews@ca.news.verio.net>, "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nospam.spam> writes:

>>For those who get their shorts all knotted up about CB lingo on the ham
>>bands, here is an excerpt from a book written 60 years ago by Clinton
>>DeSoto.
>>
>> "Among radio amateurs there is a genuine brotherhood and informal
>> camaraderie. Everyone is called by his "handle" -- his first name
>> or nickname. The president of the Chicago Stock Exchange and the
>> mechanic in a Birmingham garage are just "Paul" and "Joe" when
>> they meet on the air."
>
> It was obvious at the time that the CBers got it from us. Just
> as they got their mutilated "10" codes from the police community.

Phil, the etymology of the word "handle" goes back to the West of America and the American cowboy, used about the time an itinerant portrait painter in the east got financial help from a railroad family to develop a new landline communications mode.

Does the name Broderick Crawford ring a bell?

> The "country" and "good buddy" lingo came from an individual in
> the Ozarks who was on the air some 20+ hours a day in the late
> 60s and actually talked like that as a regular thing. We used to
> hear him very plainly at the monitoring stations in California.

Phil, again you have to go all the way west to Hollywood and a number of motion pictures and made-for-TV-films on the patois of CB...or to natives of Oklahoma who grew up to drive 18-wheelers and big rigs cross-country for a living. Oh, yes, we've heard them very plainly next to I-5 in Southern California... :-)

I'm wondering what kind of nonsense is being foisted on everyone. It is saintly and authoritative to refer to a location as "QTH" but it is evil mutilated robbery to refer to a location as "10-20." On voice. Why can't folks simply say "location?" :-)

Roger that.

didit

608. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 06:59:54 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010117015954.16762.00000429@nso-mp.aol.com>
Source record: 857

In article <942lvv$k2a$1@nnrp1.deja.com>, Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
writes:

>In article <20010116081357.05657.00001661@ng-cl1.aol.com>,
> w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:
>> >From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
>>
>> >They DO compare. Neither can be done with
>> >no training or practice.
>>
>> Dick is correct; one must learn the code before using it. One must
>learn how
>> to fly a plane before flying it. The difference is that one teaches
>one's self
>> Morse code. They can do so successfully in virtually all cases with
>or without
>> any formal demonstration of that ability. People would not get on the
>air and
>> try Morse code unless they had learned it first. For that reason, the
>plane
>> analogy is technically correct, but not very useful to the discussion
>at hand.

>Ed, who tought Orville Wright to fly? Who taught Sammy Morse the code?
>
>Either can be self-taught. Today it just depends on the gubmn't
>regulations.

Brian, it might be fair to point out that, for a living ---

The Wright brothers operated a bicycle sales/repair shop.

Sam Morse was an itinerant portrait painter.

didit

609. Re: Despicable 14.313 behavior resumes

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 07:04:52 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <943g6kcbn0@208.207.71.134>
Source record: 859

Brian wrote:
>
> So when I hear of ham misbehavior, its not a stretch to imagine an Extra
> doing it.

So whats new? Nothing is a stretch to your imagination.

610. Re: HA HA HA: Bush won popular vote!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 07:08:06 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <943gcmcbn1@208.207.71.134>
Source record: 860
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Dr. Conrad Connie" wrote:
>
I think Bubba Bush will be the worst president we've had in 40
> years.. but I could be wrong.

Yes you surely could. I believe you will.

611. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 07:22:14 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <943h76cbn2@208.207.71.134>
Source record: 861
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Brian wrote:
>
> "Hans the Humanitarian." It just doesn't ring true.
>

Would Hans the Hun sound better?

612. Re: 10 bucks buys a ham license.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 07:23:25 UTC
From: LRod <lr0d@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <943h9b$9s4$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 862
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <PA896.7050$Ep3.442734@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
"Glenn Miller" <aa5pk@hotmail.com> wrote:
> The VEC fee is a session fee which means you can take as many exams as
you
> like at a single examination session for one $10 fee. If a VE is
charging
> the $10 fee per element at the same exam session, he needs to re-read
his VE
> manual.

Unless the ARRL has changed, it's not quite a session fee. It is insofar
as you can take one of every element for one fee. Retakes of failed
elements are subject to another fee.

LRod

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

613. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 08:40:58 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010117034058.13433.00002552@nso-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 863

In article <3A63998C.E4EDB9D8@IEEE.org>, Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>Larry, are you a split personality? Last thing you said about the
>subject is that the 5wpm requirement might as well be done away
>with. That's what Bill is advocating. Both of you guys agree that
>there's no longer a good reason to have a 5wpm requirement.

Cecil:

Bill and I agree that the 5 WPM requirement should be eliminated,
but for different reasons. He doesn't see the value of *any* code
testing whatsoever; I say that a 5 WPM maximum code test is
virtually no code testing as it is...therefore, there's no point in
maintaining a requirement which will not foster operational
proficiency.

73 de Larry, K3LT

614. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 08:40:58 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010117034058.13433.00002553@nso-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 864

In article <3A639D38.B74B12ED@IEEE.org>, Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>There's absolutely no reason to require the skill if the equipment is
>not also required. How can one use CW for emergencies without any
>equipment?

Cecil:

Uh, don't look now, but people who know the Morse code and use
the CW mode on-the-air usually have the equipment to do so.

73 de Larry, K3LT

615. Re: Will you let them take away your guns?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 08:40:58 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010117034058.13433.00002551@nso-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 865

In article <940oi9$l1g$1@news.service.uci.edu>, "Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu>
writes:

>
>Weapons are not permitted on the steps of the Capitol. You could get
>arrested! An even better place to take the guns would be to Andrews Air
>Force base. Lots of things to shoot at there, and a great opportunity to
>size up the opposition.

If 10,000 armed citizens emerged on the steps of the Capitol, I don't
think they would be very concerned with being arrested. However,
it would be up to those who might do the "arresting" to decide whether
or not the shooting was going to start. Arresting people for acting on
their Constitutional rights would be a good way to do that.

73 de Larry, K3LT

616. Re: It's like this....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 09:33:46 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <943otq$g55$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 866

In article <942qh9nus1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
K0HB <k0hb@my-deja.com> wrote:
> In article <942ljijll1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
> Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com> wrote:
> > In article <941t2a$s62$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
> > K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org> wrote:
> > >
> > >
> > > http://www.callingcq.org/desoto/chap1.html
> > >
> > > Enjoy!
> > >
> > > 73, de Hans, K0HB
> >
> > Read it again, Hans. Key in on the phrases below. 73, Brian
> >

> -
> > He finds amateur radio "the means of communications with others on
> equal terms ONLY WHILE ON THE AIR
> >
> > It stands for the maintenance of fraternalism and a high standard of
> > conduct ONLY WHILE ON THE AIR.

> > To be considered a "good ham" ONLY WHILE ON THE AIR is just about
the highest mark
> > of honor there is.
> >
> > Among radio amateurs AND ONLY WHILE ON THE AIR there is a genuine
brotherhood and informal
> > camaraderie
> >
> > Fraternalism... good fellowship... ONLY WHILE ON THE AIR
...
> >
> > That's what amateur radio is like.
>
> Exactly!
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB
> --
>
> PS: The internet newsgroups are not amateur radio.

PS: That 1x2 after your name is for what? Decoration? Rank?

You're using the K3LT argument that since this isn't wireless, you're free to be a jerk.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

617. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 12:20:49 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010117072049.05313.00000991@ng-cd1.aol.com>
Source record: 867

>From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

>>There's absolutely no reason to require the skill if the equipment is
>>not also required. How can one use CW for emergencies without any
>>equipment?

>Uh, don't look now, but people who know the Morse code and use
>the CW mode on-the-air usually have the equipment to do so.

I think he missed the point, Cecil.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

618. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 12:23:18 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010117072318.05313.00000992@ng-cd1.aol.com>
Source record: 868

>From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

>What I disagree with is your premise that all
>persons who so flagrantly violate whatever rule they please at will
>should then be assumed to have reformed and become model citizens just
>because the FCC gave them an essentially effortless and free ham radio
>license.

US amateur licenses are far from effortless, Dick. To get one requires studying a 200+ page book and learning from a question pool that is about 20X more material than the 4 pages I studied to get my license.

I think you already know this.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

619. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 12:24:47 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010117072447.05313.00000993@ng-cd1.aol.com>
Source record: 869

>From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

>Those types don't reform just because they now have a ham
>license in hand. For far too many it just opens another door to
>mischief.

Can you provide some examples of former freebanders who have violated FCC rules
on the ham bands?

What percentage of the NALs listed have been issued to former freebanders?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

620. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 12:28:42 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010117072842.05313.00000998@ng-cd1.aol.com>
Source record: 870

>From: vlfiscus@mcn.net (Vince Fiscus, KB7ADL)

>Ya know ED, I must've of read 60 of your posts tonight in various
>threads and you're a living example of the Leagues restructuring proposal.

The League proposed 4 classes of license, with a 0, 5, 12, 12 wpm code structure. It also proposed that the written exams be strengthened to ensure that the overall level of accomplishment remained the same after the code speeds were reduced.

In what way do you feel my posts reflect this proposal?

>You won't promote anything that will improve ham radio and neither will
>your employer!

I think, Vince, that my professional work, as opposed to my personal-time posts, has very much improved ham radio. Care to discuss it?

>ARRL policy makes me want to vomit.

I'm sorry to hear that you are not well. Perhaps we could pick this up when you are feeling better.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

621. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 12:29:52 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010117072952.05313.00001000@ng-cd1.aol.com>
Source record: 871

>From: vlfiscus@mcn.net (Vince Fiscus, KB7ADL)

>Ed, this wouldn't be a fair test. no-coders aren't smart enough to build
>things, least of all their code speed.

In what way do you think learning Morse code will improve their ability to
construct equipment?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

622. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 12:32:45 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010117073245.05313.00001001@ng-cd1.aol.com>
Source record: 872

>From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

>Your argument that the other modes require equal testing status
>doesn't hold water, since using them doesn't require the user to be
>able to employ the same kind of conditioned response to external
>stimulation that is the essence of Morse/CW operation.

And that is exactly how I suggest that the mode be tested. As part of the exam, a 5-minute code segment should be sent and the applicant should be required to answer questions about its content, just as is done now.

What would equalize the testing with the way other modes are tested would be to include those questions in the overall exam, and require an overall pass rate of 75%.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

623. Re: QCWA TELLS FCC TO END INCENTIVE LICENSING

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 12:34:07 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010117073407.05313.00001003@ng-cd1.aol.com>
Source record: 873

>From: Bob Wex w2ilp w2ilp@juno.com

>While the Novic License
>was not producing many new Novices, let us not discount it as an entry
>to youths who prefered to start becoming real HF Hams...Or haven't you
>noticed.

The ones who didn't notice, Bob, were the new hams who were not choosing the Novice as their first license.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

624. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 12:36:58 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010117073658.05313.00001004@ng-cd1.aol.com>
Source record: 874

>From: Dan/W4NTI w4nti@my-deja.com

>But the basic fact is CB stole most, if not all, of their proceedures and pro-words
>from either Ham, public service, or commercial service radio services.

Where did hams get their use of Q codes?

I see nothing wrong with one radio service using the procedures developed in another.

Interestingly, the use of the 10 codes on voice is seen by some as having more validity than the use of Q codes on voice. Why does one create such moral outrage if heard on amateur frequencies?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

625. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 12:44:56 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010117074456.05313.00001006@ng-cd1.aol.com>
Source record: 875

>From: Carl Zager kb9rvb@my-deja.com

>Let me get this straight...random parameters? If there were ever a
>solution that would drive test takers to memorize the correct answers,
>this is it.

How could they memorize randomly generated answers? ESP? :-)

>And then we get bent out of shape when takers know the correct answer --
> ...because they ... knew the answer.

Are we now getting upset because the new hams might actually know the answer?
:-)

>Right now the only way we know folks are memorizing the question and
>answer pool is because that's what they are saying.

I have met only a handful of people who claim that they memorized the answers
to the ham tests. One of them is Cecil, who says he memorized the answers in
the 1950s. I personally think he knew more of the material than he thinks he
did.

>1. the Q&A pool is public information and available (therefore people will
>take the shortcut)

IMHO, the easiest way to pass the test is to know and understand the material.
I could not memorize the answers to hundreds of questions that I did not
understand.

> 2. a great many of the questions and distractors are so convoluted
> and so specific that the logical method is to memorize.

Are you saying that the questions should not be convoluted and specific? The
opposite of that is simple and vague.

If people memorize hundreds of right answers, they have learned more material
than I did to get my General in 1964.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

626. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 12:49:01 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010117074901.05313.00001007@ng-cd1.aol.com>
Source record: 876

>From: Cecil Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>My cousin could send and receive Morse code with lookup charts at
>approximately 4wpm. For receiving, he had the chart entries arranged
>in a logical manner so he could just follow a flow chart and write
>down the character.

If I remember his post correctly, Larry Roll has you beat. He can use a lookup table to decode an unknown OOK character set at either 10 or 13 wpm; I forget which.

Of course, he never did take me up on the lobster-dinner wager. :-)

Speaking of which, only a few more days and I have another one in the win column. I need it, too, because after the bath I took with Carl and Rick, and a recent loss to an ARRL HQ staffer over QRP DXCC, I am in a lobster-meal deficit. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

627. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 12:50:53 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010117075053.05313.00001009@ng-cd1.aol.com>
Source record: 877

>From: Brian brianburke@my-deja.com

>BTW, when you took the 13 and 20wpm exams in front of the FCC examiner,
>did you dazzle him with your coconut boat swing?

For the 13 wpm text, the examiner stopped me after about 2 words. For the 20
wpm test, the FCC gave me only a receiving test.

Then, as now, I did the best I could. If we ever have that CW QSO on the air,
you can tell me if I have a coconut boat swing. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

628. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 12:51:50 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010117075150.05313.00001010@ng-cd1.aol.com>
Source record: 878

>From: Brian brianburke@my-deja.com

>Certainly they learned by listening to the ARRL "Now Your Talking" 5wpm
>code tape and W1AW on the air.

I did not learn the code that way. I had a table and said "dit-dah" a lot.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

629. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 12:54:55 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010117075455.05313.00001012@ng-cd1.aol.com>
Source record: 879

>From: Cecil Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

> Learning Morse code was one of the easiest things I have ever done.
> Two hours for two nights was all it took for about 4wpm.

And I know a ham who took over a year of some pretty serious studying, using a number of different code tapes, and lots of advice from lots of experience hams, to pass the code est by the skin of her teeth. She is quite intellegent and articulate.

All it shows is that we are all different. By the rule that some have offered that the code test should measure effort, she should be given an Extra just for working so hard. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

630. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 12:56:13 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010117075613.05313.00001013@ng-cd1.aol.com>
Source record: 880

>From: vlfiscus@mcn.net (Vince Fiscus, KB7ADL)

>Personal Hygiene tip:
>Read your QST with gloves on so the bullshit doesn't run down your arms.
>Especially the League policy section.

Now that didn't add much to a discussion about Product Review, Vince.

Care to elaborate which League policy you disagree with and why?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

631. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 12:58:21 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010117075821.05313.00001014@ng-cd1.aol.com>
Source record: 881

>From: Cecil Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>Yep, it's digital voice. Just shows how outdated our nomenclature is.
>Seems the sub-band divisions should maybe be classified narrow band
>and broad band.

Digital voice is permitted in the voice/image bands on HF.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

632. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 13:06:40 UTC
From: Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com>
Message-ID: <3A6598E0.6440B6A1@dvol.com>
Source record: 882
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Dr. Conrad Connie" wrote:

> I did hear somebody say 10-4 the other day on 40, and quite frankly
> thats not from CB either.. a stolen product. The COPS have this as a
> part of their 10- code.. I am told.. and have had for decades.

>
The ten code was been dropped eons ago by the gendarmes in this area.
>
Every once in awhile I drop a "10-4" or a "what's yer 20?" on one of the 2m
machines just to see how many Bronx cheers I can generate.

633. Re: It's like this....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 13:17:26 UTC
From: "Steven J Robeson", K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <944612pbp1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 885

In article <943otq$g55$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com> wrote:

> > PS: The internet newsgroups are not amateur radio.
>
> PS: That 1x2 after your name is for what? Decoration? Rank?
>
> You're using the K3LT argument that since this isn't wireless, you're
> free to be a jerk.

I'd say you're trolling for a reason to CALL someone a jerk,
Burke...

Kinda like your brother Lennie who denies initiating calling
people names but has been calling Fred, W4JLE "Jelly" all week.

Birds of a flightless feather, I'd say......
--
"If You're Not A Ham....You're SPAM!"

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

634. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 13:18:11 UTC
From: Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com>
Message-ID: <3A659B93.6DD14B9@dvol.com>
Source record: 883

"Ed Hare, W1RFI" wrote:

> . . . As each issue is sent to the printer, the Product Reviews are
> put up there, giving members a faster look at them.

>
There's a trick I'll keep in mind! What's the lead time between shipping the
copy from HQ and distributing the magazine?
>

> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI
> ARRL Lab

>
w3rv

635. Anyone For An RRAP Meeting At Dayton?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 13:19:20 UTC
From: "Steven J Robeson", K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <94464jpck1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 884

Hmmmmm??????

--
"If You're Not A Ham....You're SPAM!"

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

636. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 14:00:12 UTC
From: Quequeg@quahog.com
Message-ID: <slrn96b9jk.4u.Quequeg@daystar.capecod.net>
Source record: 886

On 17 Jan 2001 12:29:52 GMT, W1RFI <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote:
>>From: vlfiscus@mcn.net (Vince Fiscus, KB7ADL)
>
>>Ed, this wouldn't be a fair test. no-coders aren't smart enough to build
>>things, least of all their code speed.
>
>In what way do you think learning Morse code will improve their ability to
>construct equipment?
>
>73,
>Ed Hare, W1RFI

I built radios for 40 years as a n0-code SWL. Many of the old school SWL's without the means to buy good radios built them. I used to raid the local dump for discarded tv's and radios for parts (remember tvs with hv transformers and lots of cool tubes?) Learned code recently as another facet of SWL'ing, but decided to take the ham tests. Without ever taking a class or using any ARRL materials other than an old handbook, I passed the tech, general, and code. Missed the extra by one point. Almost choked on the code cuz 5 wpm is too slow...

Q
call sign on way

-- "Dead Whale or a Stove Boat"
<---------[[[[[[[[[[[[[[[[[[

637. Re: HA HA HA: Bush won popular vote!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 14:12:44 UTC
From: ~Steve~ <mcsp@usa.net>
Message-ID: <3A65A85B.E44E287E@usa.net>
Source record: 887
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Dr. Conrad Connie" wrote:

> Well, as A liberal, more a libertarian or independent, I think you've
> got it wrong. All liberals do-not bow when Al Sharpton let's a fart or
> were happy about Senor Clinton's little extra marital affair.

I know, many are disgusted with the poor behavior of both (and others too)

>
> What the issue is and YOU conservatives distort it for your own agenda,
> is Christain faith, i.e. the Bible is NOT the religion of all Americans.
> We have the right of worship and the right NOT TO.

If you do not want to that's just fine. But to remove from public areas
which were already in place since the country began and have significant
value for another is just plain wrong. How does the pledge go? "One nation
under God"? How about your money - "In God We Trust"... you know, if it is
that offensive to some liberals to have the word "God" anywhere, I will be
happy to relieve them of that *objectionable* cash :)

>
> I haven't seen any church closings lately or the FCC putting any of
> those fire and brimstone shortwave pocket picking preachers off the air.
> Quite the contrary.

If the majority liberals had their way, that would begin to happen to those
who spoke out against gays, abortion, etc.

>
> As for abortion.. I'm opposed to it, but not because of a religious
> doctrine. Basically I say, why is it murder to strangle an infant after
> birth, but perfectly OK to crush its skull, inside the womb?
> Seems bizarre doesn't it?

Yes it does, we strongly agree on this point. It's good to see that others
view it as wrong even without religious backing.

>
> And why do abortions take place? Because somebody wasn't being
> reponsible with sex!!

Again I could have not said it better myself. Personal responsibility is a
strong aspect of what conservatism it's all about.

>
> Now, I'm a liberal ? Do I sound like one ?

Not at all, initially you sound more conservative than some conservatives.
Which is why I have to ask, why do you subscribe to the liberal title since
you think more like a conservative?

> Well, I think Bubba Bush will be the worst president we've had in 40
> years.. but I could be wrong.

I think you will be pleasantly surprised, he will be a fine president for
the next 8 years.

~Steve~

638. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 14:19:53 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A65AA09.832009F2@IEEE.org>
Source record: 889

Dick Carroll wrote:
> You might consider that when you and others insist that there is
> nothing more than "novelty" benefit to the mode that is the functional
> equivalent of saying that is it useless and therefore not worth
> preserving.

For hams who like CW, it is a useful and fun mode. I think all hams
should try CW to see if they like it or not. It is not worth preserving
through governmental requirements. It is worth preserving within ham
radio if its merits support that preservation. I think it does. A Governmental
requirement not based on merit is just another form of welfare.

> When the clamor by those who would expand the voice segments
> to the maximum limit consider your statements, how then will you react?
> And what good could it possibly do?

My Dad said always to tell the truth. When those people discover that you
are lying about CW's capabilities, what do you think will happen? If CW
cannot honestly stand on its own merits, then it deserves to be replaced
by modes with more merit. Obfuscation about CW's merits will just hasten
its demise.

> And you clearly overlook the fact that some posters here clearly state
> that Morse code is long past usefulness and the implication is clear
> that as far as they are concerned, it may as well pass from the scene.

You, personally, have alienated a number of hams to the point that they
would like to get rid of CW just to make you angry. If it weren't for
your (and others) viscous personal attacks, those same hams wouldn't
give CW a second thought. You (and other PCTA folk) are the worst
enemies that CW ever had.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

639. Re: HA HA HA: Bush won popular vote!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 14:20:10 UTC
From: ~Steve~ <mcsp@usa.net>
Message-ID: <3A65AA1A.A86C0739@usa.net>
Source record: 888
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Yeah, that does get really tiring after a while. It is always one of two things: "it was someone else's fault", or "we were wronged". I may sound condescending here, but my daughter stopped using those excuses when she was 11 after she realized it sounded... well... stupid.

Brian wrote:

> but we're just tired of the incessant whining.
>

640. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 14:32:14 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <944ade$t3q$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 890
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <943h3e$9r1$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
LRod <lr0d@my-deja.com> wrote:
>
> Now, "personal," and "all the good numbers" are a different story.
>

Talked to a young fella on the repeater the other day who introduced himself by saying "my first personal is Jim and you're my first contact, QSL?".

He seemed like a nice sort, delighted that he had just received his shiny new call sign, and was anxious to make some new friends. Kinda sounded like I felt when I put my new call sign on the air the first time way back when, except probably brighter, cuz Jim is one of those young computer jocks. Me, I still got problems with the LL scale on my Pickett slide rule. Yep, I think Jim sounded brighter than me, quick to catch on to things.

But I don't think Jim will be back on the repeater. Before I had a chance to really get to know much about Jim, or even wrangle an invite to lunch, another station, with an impressive "senior" call sign joined the contact, flashed his shiny Radio Cop badge, and proceeded to issue Jim a "verbal speeding ticket" for improper lingo on the radio. "Radio Cop" said the term "personal" (and for that matter "handle") were unwelcome in ham radio, and that Q-signals were not to be used on VHF voice. Just generally made my newfound friend feel like an unwashed interloper. (Gosh, I've been saying "handle" since I was a conditional class. Slow to catch on, you know.)

Now I should point out that "Radio Cop" took pains to appear very well meaning. Didn't use any bad words that I noticed, was quite polite, even seemed like he was trying to be "helpful." In other words, he thought he was doing Jim a favor by pointing out his transgression from our sacred Amateur Radio way of doing things. I think Jim felt just the same way I did back in a new school in third grade when the well meaning teacher pointed out that "we don't keep our pencil behind our ear in this room." Sure enough, I looked around and none of my new classmates had pencils behind their ears. Sure was embarrassing, and at that moment I really wished I was back with my good old buddies in second grade. Now, if I'd been allowed to hang out a couple of days, I'm sure I would have learned how to properly stow my pencil. And if Jim would have hung around a couple of days on our repeater I just bet he would have noticed that his lingo, perhaps learned in another radio service, was a bit out of place, and pretty soon Jim would sound "just

like the rest of us." Like I said, he seemed pretty bright to me, quick to catch on to things.

"Radio Cop", you have kept our hobby uncorrupted. I heard Jim down around 27 Mhz this morning, and saw his ad on eBay trying to sell his barely used 2-meter HT. I'm gonna miss my new friend Jim, because I think I could have learned something from him. Maybe you could have also.

Like I said, he seemed pretty bright to me, quick to catch on to things. What do think it was that he caught on to about us from "Radio Cop".

73, de Hans, K0HB

~~~
When a true genius appears in this world, you may know him by
this sign, that the dunces are all in confederacy against him.
~~~

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

641. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 14:34:31 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A65AD77.9621A2F0@IEEE.org>
Source record: 892

N2EY wrote:
> Can you prove to me that NOBODY wants the USE of Morse on the ham bands to end?
> I have read many diatribes against the mode, not the test.

That's asking someone to prove a negative. If the above folk had not
had Morse code forced down their throats, they would not feel the way
they do about the mode. Now the only reason they want to end the use
of Morse is to extract revenge on the PCTA folk. Morse code has become
more than a mode. It has become a religion on one side and a symbol
of religious oppression on the other side.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

642. Re: 10 bucks buys a ham license.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 14:42:02 UTC
From: Steve Woodruff <sjwoodr.nospam@nospam.email.com>
Message-ID: <944avp$q7a$1@flood.xnet.com>
Source record: 891
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"LRod" <lr0d@my-deja.com> wrote in message
news:943h9b$9s4$1@nnrp1.deja.com...
> Unless the ARRL has changed, it's not quite a session fee. It is insofar
> as you can take one of every element for one fee. Retakes of failed
> elements are subject to another fee.

Are all VE's subject to the same set of rules? These guys seemed pretty confident that they could charge $10 per exam ... which is why i did not even attempt the extra class written element.... figured i'd wait an extra month and study a little more so i wouldn't be wasting my money.

--steve

643. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 14:55:19 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A65B257.A67D307@IEEE.org>
Source record: 894

N2EY wrote:
>
> In article <3A639843.C5771496@IEEE.org>, Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>
> >n2ey@aol.com wrote:
> >> I condemn all jammers on the ham bands.
> > >
> >I won't be satisfied until I hear you say that you condemn all
> >jammers on the ham bands including code-tested jammers who use
> >their Morse code equipment for their jamming.
>
> The latter is a subset of the former. Your satisfaction is not my concern.

If you won't say it, you don't mean it.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

644. No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 15:00:48 UTC
From: Vincent Biancomano <103520.355@CompuServe.COM>
Message-ID: <944c30ndd1@sshuraab-i-1.production.compuserve.com>
Source record: 893

PS>Oh, and by the way, which of your opponents for Hudson Division Director
PS>made that quote which you paraphrased as:

"you know, there's no reason for Amateur Radio to be a technical hobby
today, simply because there's no jobs for engineers. You know, my father
was a plumber, and advised me to do the same. Looking back on it, you
know, he was right."

PS>?

PS>The individual who defeated you four times says that his father was not
PS>a plumber, and nothing resembling such a statement was made by him.

In that general context, the issue of making forthright statements, and staying
away from "cavalier, off the cuff" remarks during a campaign to avoid
unexpected disasters was, in the main, the subject of my letter to ARRL
during THEIR inquiry into "ethics" (and never forget, they came to me, not
vice versa).

>Perhaps exchanges with you in the past along these lines had motivated
>Gary Coffman, KE4ZV, to say the following:

>"Vince, you have provided essentially no documentation, merely a couple
>of one-liner out of context quotes that you repeat over and over, and a
>few paraphrased references to obscure documents you *claim* exist but
>refuse to properly identify or furnish. You are indeed not engaged in
>debate. You are simply spewing the same old propaganda, depending on
>repetition in classic Big Lie fashion, in an attempt to win your
>point. We aren't fooled."

If that were the case, Paul, you wouldn't even bother to speak with
me. Because you've spent all of your time trying to prove me wrong,
and not making it. Most likely, the fact that both you and Coffman did
extremely poorly in our exchanges explains your displeasure. The
'proof in the pudding,' though, is the end result, which predictions for
the Service were totally consistent with the documentation both you
and Coffman refused to accept. Thus I haven't see any great dispute over
that fact from anyone; just resentment. In the end, the Service was
caught short, as hams came to realize what had just happened to them.
That's why there's movement now (altho too late) to bring back some
Morse testing requirements, and a petition for reconsideration re:
theory exams. So in that context, the only statement that Coffman
was accurate about was his last, and that relating to the FCC:
"we aren't fooled."

Regards,
Vince, WB2EZG

645. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 15:06:25 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A65B4F1.11CC9CDE@IEEE.org>
Source record: 895

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> Uh, don't look now, but people who know the Morse code and use
> the CW mode on-the-air usually have the equipment to do so.

Many hams don't even own an HF transceiver. When I moved
to CA in 1971, I didn't take an HF rig with me. All I had
was VHF access. I was without CW capability for 15 years.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

646. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 15:08:32 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A65B570.6D7C7DE9@IEEE.org>
Source record: 896

W1RFI wrote:
>
> >From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
>
> >>There's absolutely no reason to require the skill if the equipment is
> >>not also required. How can one use CW for emergencies without any
> >>equipment?
>
> >Uh, don't look now, but people who know the Morse code and use
> >the CW mode on-the-air usually have the equipment to do so.
>
> I think he missed the point, Cecil.

Larry tends to ignore the R-E-Q-U-I-R-E-M-E-N-T.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

647. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 15:12:54 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A65B676.B352FFD2@IEEE.org>
Source record: 897

W1RFI wrote:
> I have met only a handful of people who claim that they memorized the answers
> to the ham tests. One of them is Cecil, who says he memorized the answers in
> the 1950s. I personally think he knew more of the material than he thinks he
> did.

Memorizing *is* knowing, Ed. How do you know your call letters if you didn't
memorize them?
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

648. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 15:14:22 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A65B6CE.44AC8AA1@IEEE.org>
Source record: 898

```
Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> Cecil wrote:
> >
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > Oh,I hear jamming on a weekend net every week.
> >
> > VHF?
>
> Nope. 40 meter SSB.

A "No Coder" is jamming you on 40m SSB?
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca
```

649. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 15:20:48 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A65B850.843471DD@IEEE.org>
Source record: 900

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> W1RFI wrote:
> > I miss the list of reasons to keep the code. "You might fracture your larynx
> > someday in an emergency" could be the #1 answer.
>
> There are an infinite number of circumstances that could occur.

Using exactly the same logic, automobile operators should be required
to wear crash helmets to prevent head injuries in many accidents.
It's called diminishing returns, Dick. There is a point where the
extra effort is not worth the return on investment. We have reached
that point with Morse code. The necessary return on investment just
does not exist anymore. And, no, making you feel good is not a good
enough return on investment to require Morse code skill of all hams.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

650. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 15:25:03 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A65B94F.A68EC39C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 899

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> Cecil wrote:
> > If they obey the rules within the ham bands, who cares where they
> > came from? If they are operating legally as hams within the ham bands,
> > they aren't freebanders anymore, are they?
>
> And you can affirm that this in in fact the case???

Yes, by definition, if they are operating legally as hams within the
ham bands, they are not freebanding.

> Those types don't reform just because they now have a ham
> license in hand. For far too many it just opens another door to
> mischief.

They are legal once they have a ham license in hand, Dick. When
they are legally talking on a ham band, they cannot possibly
be freebanding, now can they?
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

651. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 15:31:35 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A65BAD7.817A9BF5@IEEE.org>
Source record: 901

Vincent Biancomano wrote:
> Most likely, the fact that both you and Coffman did
> extremely poorly in our exchanges explains your displeasure.

Vince, you remind me of a friend of mine. When I aske him what
he would do if his wife caught him in bed with another woman,
he answered, "I'd just deny it."
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

652. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 15:39:20 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A65BCA8.4DACD57B@IEEE.org>
Source record: 902

W1RFI wrote:
> Speaking of which, only a few more days and I have another one in the win
> column. I need it, too, because after the bath I took with Carl and Rick, and a
> recent loss to an ARRL HQ staffer over QRP DXCC, I am in a lobster-meal
> deficit. :-)

I'm expecting Clinton to start WWIII this week, dissolve the Congress,
and declare himself King BJ. :-)

Which is worse lobster-meal deficit or lobster deficit? Are you going
to Ft. Tuthill this year and/or any hamfests in and around Texas?
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

653. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 15:49:09 UTC
From: K0HB <k0hb@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <944eti$10k$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 903
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

In article <942rf8ori1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com> wrote:

>
> "Hans the Humanitarian." It just doesn't ring true.
>

I think a paraphrase of the classic speech by Edgar Friendly is in order here.

I'm the enemy, 'cause I like to think, I like to point out the "not so obvious", I like to send "didahhhhhhhhhhdit", I like to champion the little guy, and I like to deflate the pompous and self-righteous granfalloons(*). I'm into freedom of speech and freedom of choice. I'm the kind of guy who likes to sit in a greasy spoon and wonder, "Gee! Should I have the T-bone steak or the jumbo rack of barbeque ribs with a side order of gravy fries?" I want high cholesterol. I want to eat bacon, and butter, and buckets of cheese, ok? I want to smoke a Cuban cigar the size of Cinncinnatti in the non-smoking section. Why? Because I suddenly might feel the need to, ok pal? I've seen your future, know what it is? It's a 43-year-old virtual-virgin sitting around in his beige pajamas drinking a banana-broccoli shake, singing "I'd like to be an Oscar-Mayer weiner."

73, Hans, K0HB

--
* If you wish to observe a granfalloon, peel the skin from a childs' balloon.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

654. Re: HA HA HA: Bush won popular vote!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 15:55:54 UTC
From: Steve <ai7w@NoSpam.com>
Message-ID: <#GyFd4JgAHA.341@cpmsnbbsa09>
Source record: 904
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Bush did not win the popular vote.

see
http://128.242.205.65/inboxer/outrage/bushvote.htm

This is just more conservative spin.

Steve

655. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 16:21:29 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <944gli$k9b$1@news.service.uci.edu>
Source record: 905

Carl Zager <kb9rvb@my-deja.com> wrote in message
news:941sq9$s17$1@nnrp1.deja.com...

> The only thing most multiple choice tests measure to any great degree of
> certainty is not the subject matter but rather the ability to take a
> test.

It is probably more accurate to say that multiple choice tests measure with
a degree of certainty, the test takers ability to prepare for a test.

73, Jim AC6XG

656. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 16:32:33 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <944hf1$3ir$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 906
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <944ade$t3q$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org> wrote:
> In article <943h3e$9r1$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
> LRod <lr0d@my-deja.com> wrote:
> >
> > Now, "personal," and "all the good numbers" are a different story.
> >
>
> Talked to a young fella on the repeater the other day who introduced
> himself by saying "my first personal is Jim and you're my first
> contact, QSL?".
>
> He seemed like a nice sort, delighted that he had just received his
> shiny new call sign, and was anxious to make some new friends. Kinda
> sounded like I felt when I put my new call sign on the air the first
> time way back when, except probably brighter, cuz Jim is one of those
> young computer jocks. Me, I still got problems with the LL scale on my
> Pickett slide rule. Yep, I think Jim sounded brighter than me, quick
to
> catch on to things.
>
> But I don't think Jim will be back on the repeater. Before I had a
> chance to really get to know much about Jim, or even wrangle an invite
> to lunch, another station, with an impressive "senior" call sign
joined
> the contact, flashed his shiny Radio Cop badge, and proceeded to issue
> Jim a "verbal speeding ticket" for improper lingo on the radio. "Radio
> Cop" said the term "personal" (and for that matter "handle") were
> unwelcome in ham radio, and that Q-signals were not to be used on VHF
> voice. Just generally made my newfound friend feel like an unwashed
> interloper. (Gosh, I've been saying "handle" since I was a conditional
> class. Slow to catch on, you know.)
>
> Now I should point out that "Radio Cop" took pains to appear very well
> meaning. Didn't use any bad words that I noticed, was quite polite,
> even seemed like he was trying to be "helpful." In other words, he
> thought he was doing Jim a favor by pointing out his transgression
from
> our sacred Amateur Radio way of doing things. I think Jim felt just
the
> same way I did back in a new school in third grade when the well
> meaning teacher pointed out that "we don't keep our pencil behind our
> ear in this room." Sure enough, I looked around and none of my new

> classmates had pencils behind their ears. Sure was embarrassing, and
at
> that moment I really wished I was back with my good old buddies in
> second grade. Now, if I'd been allowed to hang out a couple of days,
> I'm sure I would have learned how to properly stow my pencil. And if
> Jim would have hung around a couple of days on our repeater I just bet
> he would have noticed that his lingo, perhaps learned in another radio
> service, was a bit out of place, and pretty soon Jim would sound "just
> like the rest of us." Like I said, he seemed pretty bright to me,
quick
> to catch on to things.
>
> "Radio Cop", you have kept our hobby uncorrupted. I heard Jim down
> around 27 Mhz this morning, and saw his ad on eBay trying to sell his
> barely used 2-meter HT. I'm gonna miss my new friend Jim, because I
> think I could have learned something from him. Maybe you could have
> also.
>
> Like I said, he seemed pretty bright to me, quick to catch on to
> things. What do think it was that he caught on to about us
from "Radio
> Cop".
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB
>
> ~~~
> When a true genius appears in this world, you may know him by
> this sign, that the dunces are all in confederacy against him.
> ~~~
>
> Sent via Deja.com
> http://www.deja.com/
>
Sorry Hans, if he can't take some criticism then he needs to go be a
priest or something. Thats the trouble today. No one wants to pay
their way anymore. Heck when I first got on AM phone I was made to
feel 2 inches high. You know, not enough audio, your too week, give me
a call when you grow up youngun.. etc.

It didn't run me off, I just dug in and LEARNED.

Dan/W4NTI

--
"Just tellin the truth, and they cain't stand it."

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

657. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 16:36:33 UTC
From: K0HB <k0hb@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <944hmh$3n7$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 908
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

In article <943h76cbn2@208.207.71.134>,
Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

> Would Hans the Hun sound better?

K0CKB calls me "Hon" -- is that close enuf?

73, Hans, K0H(oney)B(uns)

--
A person's maturity consists in having found
again the seriousness one had as a child, at play.
--Friedrich Nietzsche

"God is dead" -- Nietzsche

"Nietzsche is dead" -- God

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

658. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 16:38:33 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <944hq8$3oi$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 907
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

In article <943boh$pc1$1@news.hawaii.edu>,
jeffreyh@Hawaii.Edu (Jeffrey Herman) wrote:
> In article <942u5v$r7t$1@nnrp1.deja.com>, Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@my-
deja.com> wrote:
> >You got it right. I'm sure your just trying to be nice. But the
basic
> >fact is CB stole most, if not all, of their proceedures and pro-words
> >from either Ham, public service, or commercial service radio
services.
>
> Where did "slider" (as in VFO) originate, Dan? =:o
>
> 73, Jeff KH6O
>
I really don't know Jeff. Since I never played on ten four, ya'll come
back good buddy radio. Just had to listen to the truckers once in a
while when I fixed em.

Dan/W4NTI

--
"Just tellin the truth, and they cain't stand it."

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

659. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 16:44:12 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <944i07kub1@news.service.uci.edu>
Source record: 910

W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com> wrote in message news:94260d$b7m$1@iac5.navix.net...
> How about a 5 question test for General.

> 1. State in 300 words or more why you want to be a ham.

How can this question be answered incorrectly?

> 2. Describe the procedure for calculating, adjusting, and connecting a 15
> meter dipole cut for the center of the phone band.

How high is it? Is it near other conductors or dielectrics? Questions
about the length of dipoles are in the question pool. What's wrong with
them?

> 3. Explain the difference, if any, between an AC ground and a RF ground.
> Elaborate as to how each contributes or degrades operator and property
> safety.

Looks like there's a typo in the test question. A better question might be
to explain the differences between a DC ground and an RF ground.

73, AC6XG

660. Re: 10 bucks buys a ham license.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 16:44:27 UTC
From: John Passaneau <jxp16@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <944i5d$kam@r02n01.cac.psu.edu>
Source record: 909
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

The ARRL VE book, said, 1 fee for each test session, and it covered as many elements as the test taker wanted to take, or the VE have. But it is a new fee to retake a failed element. So as long as you keep passing you can do as many elements as you can pass for 1 fee. Remember though that most VE sessions have only 2 or 3 versions of a test element available and if you flunk all that they have, your done for that session.

--
John Passaneau, W3JXP
Physics Dept. Electronics Shop
Penn State University
104 Davey Lab, University Park , Pa. 16802
814.863.4297, jxp16@psu.edu

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:943d37$5ch$0@208.207.71.134...
>
>
> Steve Woodruff wrote:
> >
>
> but i was suprised tonight to learn that
> > i had to
> > pay the $10 fee for EACH exam i took. I upgraded to general, and had
> > intentions
> > of attempting the extra class exam.... but when i found out it would
cost me
> > an
> > additional $10 i figured i'd wait until next month when i could be
> > reasonably sure
> > that i'd pass with ease.
>
>
> If that is permissable evidently they have changed the rules. When I
> ran a VE team ('85 thru '93) the rules said one fee for all tests taken
> at that session. Later it was deemed permissable to charge an additional
> fee for a retest of a failed element at the same session, but we never
> did.

661. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 16:58:29 UTC
From: Vincent Biancomano <103520.355@CompuServe.COM>
Message-ID: <944ivlqtr1@sshuraab-i-1.production.compuserve.com>
Source record: 911

VB> Most likely, the fact that both you and Coffman did
VB> extremely poorly in our exchanges explains your displeasure.

>Vince, you remind me of a friend of mine. When I aske him what
>he would do if his wife caught him in bed with another woman,
>he answered, "I'd just deny it."

In all honesty, you fared far worse in debate than those other
two fellas, Cecil. By your own admission as a tenth-rate debater.
Nothing to crow about, son.

Regards,
Vince, WB2EZG

662. Re: Will you let them take away your guns?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 17:02:59 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <944j3fljo1@news.service.uci.edu>
Source record: 912

Larry Roll K3LT <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20010117034058.13433.00002551@nso-cs.aol.com...

> If 10,000 armed citizens emerged on the steps of the Capitol, I don't
> think they would be very concerned with being arrested. However,
> it would be up to those who might do the "arresting" to decide whether
> or not the shooting was going to start. Arresting people for acting on
> their Constitutional rights would be a good way to do that.

I'd like to know how you feel about 10,000 armed abortion rights activists,
or 10,000 armed environmentalists, or 10,000 convicted felons, or 10,000
armed Klu Klux Klansmen standing on the Capitol steps threatening to shoot
your elected Congressman and Senators - acting on these Consitutional
rights.

That's different, right?

73, Jim AC6XG

663. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 17:14:47 UTC
From: "Steven J Robeson", K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <944jtu$5tg$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 914

In article <20010117010746.14777.00000602@nso-bd.aol.com>,
lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:

>These two examples are logically incongruent. There is no
>need for flying skills in radio operation, any radio service.

As usual, someone ELSE makes an analogy and Lennie the Loser tries
to dismiss it as "incongruent". LENNIE is incongruent, but we are
having an excessively difficult time dismissing HIM.

>To be legal, one has to have an amateur radio license in
>order to transmit RF in the amateur radio bands...but the
>necessity to "solo" for an amateur radio license in not a
>federal requirement.

No...to be "legal" one only need be in the PRESENCE of a third
party who DOES have an Amatuer license of appropriate class. Even YOU
can operate on the Amateur bands without a license...you just have to
find someone foolhearty enough to jeopardize THIER license in doing so.

>>How long it would take to teach yourself is another matter. However I
>>once worked with a guy who was an avid simulator pilot that could
>>probably have soloed in 4 hours. he claimed several thousand hours on
>>his Microsoft flight simulator.

>The above is both incongruent, illogical, and rather absurd.

Gee, Lennie, in another post in this same thread you correctly
point out that the Wright Brothers were self taught in flying skills,
yet HERE you call it "incongruent, illogical and rather absurd" that
someone could solo in only 4 hours.

In 1982 or thereabouts a Marine Lance Corporal named Foote
commandeered an A4 Skyhawk at MCAS El Toro and took it for over an hour
joyride. LCpl Foote was an accomplish sailplane pilot however had
never flown a jet aircraft before. He had recently been denied flight
school in the Armed Forces due to an alleged inner ear disorder.

He not only flew a nominal flight profile, but he also shot a
flawless approach at NZJ. And this he did with only "simulator" time
in any powered aircraft, let alone a jet fighter.

Sorry I don't have the specific dates, however I am sure the
Orange County Register could find the specifics and verify them for you.

>As to self-learning radio arts, be they technology or operating
>practices, that can be totally self-taught.

The FAA currently allows "self-taught" persons to fly without a
license under Part 103 of the FAR's.

>In a career of design and development of radio and
>electronics, both myself and the vast majority of
>career contemporaries were "self-taught" on the changing
>state of the radio-electronics arts.

"But that was yesterday, and yesterday's gone". TODAY'S engineers
routinely attend continuing education seminars, as I can testify to
since I process many of the requests at my current employment. Seems
they don't feel as though possession of MSEE's and PhD's prevent them
from sitting in a classroom.

>There was no time to attend "formal schooling" or get "accreditation"
>through nice little paper certificates with grade points to attest to
>"qualified new skills." Myself and the vast majority of my
>career contemporaties already had formal schooling.

"That was all the education we needed and pooh on the rest"
Today's EE's find it counter productive to waste time reinventing the
wheel and attend appropriate update courses as needed.

>There were hardly any instructors or courses for each new radio-
>electronic art that evolved.

Seems the Armed Forces didn't have a problem sending us to schools
for just that event. You "commercial" guys couldn't find the time,
huh...?!?!?

>By comparison, the necessary knowledge to get an amateur license and
>to begin in the amateur radio hobby can be entirely self-taught.

True...any your point is...?!?!

>The amateur radio "solo" requirement is some flight of fancy, or
>rather a fantasy based on some "instructor's" aberrant self-
>professed "superiority."

And your continued derision of Amateurs is only further evidence
of your own "bruised ego" that your self-inflicted hatred has made
manifest.

Get a life, creep.

--
"If You're Not A Ham....You're SPAM!"

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

664. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 17:18:25 UTC
From: xjim@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <944k4m$625$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 915

Sorry to bust up the No-Code kills (McDermott, KB1EVA) thread again,
Breaking news:

One of the men killed during this cowardly attack had a permit to carry
in NH; but was denied the ability to do so in Mass. because he wasn't
politically connected. Looks like Massachsuetts gun laws may have well
contributed to the death of at least five people:

"Source: Boston Herald (Letters)
Published: Friday, Jan 11, 2001
Author: David Bergquist

Louis "Sandy" Javelle was my friend. On Dec. 26 in Wakefield, he was
killed by a madman.

Sandy held both a federal firearms license and a permit to carry a
handgun in New Hampshire. Ironically, the gun laws in Massachusetts
prevented him from carrying a concealed handgun. But these same laws
did not prevent Michael McDermott from obtaining illegal firearms.

When the rampage started, Sandy told co-workers to lock the door behind
him and barricade it. He then confronted McDermott and became the third
victim. If Sandy had been permitted to carry a pistol, he could have
stopped McDermott. That meant that five other people could possible
have survived this tragedy. But Sandy did not have that option.

David Bergquist, Temple, N.H."

Actual scanned image of letter at:
http://www.KeepAndBearArms.com/images/wakefieldletter.jpg

Jim, ac6tk

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

665. Re: "They oughta require a license....blah, blah, blah"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 17:19:47 UTC
From: "Leland C. Scott" <no-spam@junk-mail.net>
Message-ID: <t6bl222c3ddje5@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 913

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:3A64E9EB.9AD1A836@dvol.com...
> on ham radio. Fact is they don't have any real impact on anything which is
why
> they're on the low end of the FCC's list of priorities.

They maybe on the low end of the FCC's list, but the ARRL is interested in how many show up on 10m. Now with the creation of MURS they have an excuse to use opened up Ham 2m rigs, and most likely start to show up on 2m. I guess you figure if they don't bother you it must not be a problem for anyone else.

--
Leland C. Scott
KC8LDO

666. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 17:31:19 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <944kolmfj1@news.service.uci.edu>
Source record: 916

Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3A623289.7398A209@IEEE.org...
> Ed, do you agree with Jim that dits
> or dahs sent for the purpose of jamming are not sent with Morse
> code equipment?

You need to research your attributions a little better before dropping names into such comments, Cecil.

ac6xg

667. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 17:36:41 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <944l79$74d$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 918
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

In article <20010117073658.05313.00001004@ng-cd1.aol.com>,
w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:

> Interestingly, the use of the 10 codes on voice is seen by some as having more
> validity than the use of Q codes on voice. Why does one create such moral
> outrage if heard on amateur frequencies?

What's interesting to me, is the "vintage" of those "outraged". With a few exceptions they are usually not "old timers" or "newbies" but rather those licensed in the 70's through about 1988 or so. These are the ones who posture about "purity of the ham race" and look down their nose at any ham who "isn't like them". They are, by and large, products of the incentive licensing system with it's fragmentation of the hobby into exclusive ghettos, reeking of "status" and "rank" and "I can beep faster than you can beep".

When you and I got into this hobby, you got no special call sign, no special status, no special band segments, the callbook didn't show your class, and nobody could poke around the QRZ.COM website to check your "status". All of us, >ALL OF US<, exuberantly played in the ether as equals, and nobody gave a rip if you were a Conditional, General, Advanced, or Extra. You were a ham - PERIOD! I think that's what makes us old-timers more accepting of those who "don't act just like us".

73, Hans, K0HB
--

There are two basic rules to being human.

Rule number one: Human beings want nothing more than
to contribute to other human beings.

Rule number two: Human beings will not tolerate being
contributed to.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

668. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 17:36:54 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <944l34$mk2$1@news.service.uci.edu>
Source record: 917

Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3A639E9F.304EE3D8@IEEE.org...
> The arguments are different. Jim says there is not one code-tested jammer
> using Morse code equipment. I say there is at least one and probably more.

I'm enjoying your argument in the third person here, Cecil. Which Jim are
you claiming said these things? Quotes might better illustrate your point.
Or they might not.

73, Jim

669. Re: "They oughta require a license....blah, blah, blah"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 17:50:21 UTC
From: Jake Brodsky <frussle@erols.com>
Message-ID: <tgmb6tcvho5oq6j2n1hj7qapm6cbhikshl@4ax.com>
Source record: 919

On Tue, 16 Jan 2001 19:56:23 GMT, K0HB <k0hb@my-deja.com> wrote:

>In article <fh496t4af7l94gv4vnep9npbjhb5v6tn62@4ax.com>,
> frussle@erols.com wrote:
>
>> The real problem is that the FCC isn't enforcing its own laws very
>> well. Laws against unlicensed operation exist.
>
>Exactly. We don't need more big-government rules! Enforce the
>ones we have.
>
>> Maybe the FCC would consider licensing something like an Official
>> Radio Monitor (Kind of like the ARRL OO, but with some sort of
>> legal standing in a court of law)......
>
>Groan.....
>
>We could have tin badges and blue jump-suits and all other sorts of
>cop-wannabe paraphenalia.
>
>On second though, fergit it! I don't think it is the function of
>hams to be hall-monitors for CBers and freebanders.

Well, somebody's got to do it. Why not certify an operation at a
local club? If people are serious about self enforcement, then get
the public backing of a club to pursue the nastiest cases the FCC
doesn't care about.

I agree with your assessment, Hans. I'm not fond of the idea either.
I figure that by insisting that club back the results, maybe some of
the frequency cops will see their limits and turn in their blue jump
suits and tin badges.

No, it's not a perfect solution. But maybe it's better than hiding
the problems under a rock, the way the FCC has over the last couple
decades.

73,

Jake Brodsky, AB3A mailto:frussle@erols.com
"Beware of the massive impossible!"

670. Re: Anyone For An RRAP Meeting At Dayton?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 17:51:29 UTC
From: Jake Brodsky <frussle@erols.com>
Message-ID: <prmb6tc5jd562vj6t4tbfc73qtac2ebrbn@4ax.com>
Source record: 920

On Wed, 17 Jan 2001 13:19:20 GMT, Steven J Robeson, K4YZ
<k4yz@my-deja.com> wrote:

>Hmmmmm??????

Why? Are you trying to start a fight or what? :-)

73,

Jake Brodsky, AB3A mailto:frussle@erols.com
"Beware of the massive impossible!"

671. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 17:53:15 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nospam.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.g7ba8x2.pminews@ca.news.verio.net>
Source record: 921

On 17 Jan 2001 06:59:52 GMT, Len Over 21 wrote:

>Does the name Broderick Crawford ring a bell?

"Why you dirty rotten stinking rat, Ten Four...."

>> The "country" and "good buddy" lingo came from an individual in
>> the Ozarks who was on the air some 20+ hours a day in the late
>> 60s and actually talked like that as a regular thing. We used to
>> hear him very plainly at the monitoring stations in California.
>
>Phil, again you have to go all the way west to Hollywood and
>a number of motion pictures and made-for-TV-films on the
>patois of CB...

I'm referring to a good five to ten years before CB made its
mark on TV and movies.

>or to natives of Oklahoma who grew up to drive
>18-wheelers and big rigs cross-country for a living.

Ditto...and from my short assignment in Oklahoma City in 1961,
by then all the "Oakies" lived in Bakersfield.....

>It is saintly and authoritative to refer to a
>location as "QTH" but it is evil mutilated robbery to refer
>to a location as "10-20." On voice. Why can't folks
>simply say "location?" :-)

"10-20" has a honorable history in public-safety voice comms
but the "mutilation" is to drop the "10" and just refer to your
"twenty".

>Roger that.

...good buddy and I'm gone.....

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

672. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 17:53:16 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nospam.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.g7bafq3.pminews@ca.news.verio.net>
Source record: 922
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Wed, 17 Jan 2001 08:06:40 -0500, Brian Kelly wrote:

>The ten code was been dropped eons ago by the gendarmes in this area.

The Los Angeles PD never used the "10" code. The only
non-plain-language "codes" were "Code 1" through "Code 7" and
they actually published a brochure detailing them.

The Los Angeles Sheriff's Department used a "nine" code.

The California Highway Patrol used a modified "10" code with
"eleven" code additions.

Made it interesting for us 50s-60s era police radio buffs
(before scanners were avaliable).

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

673. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 17:59:29 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <27nb6t8936sdto51sfq4url1uo2n589on8@4ax.com>
Source record: 923

w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:
>the easiest way to pass the test is to know and understand the material.

That's easy for an engineer to say...

How many hours of study do you estimate that it would take for a
non-technical person to "know and understand" all the material to
pass the Extra test?

674. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 17:59:31 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <j6nb6tsa7shqdeqiglus3ag9gvtlvi8sbf@4ax.com>
Source record: 925

w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:
>Interestingly, the use of the 10 codes on voice is seen by some as having more
>validity than the use of Q codes on voice.

Every hobby has it's preferred lingo. If you use the wrong lingo you
immediately identify yourself as an outsider...

675. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 17:59:32 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <r5nb6tgt62nvu4i2pcfmnkr9ajl2u70nqm@4ax.com>
Source record: 924

Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com> wrote:
>The ten code was been dropped eons ago by the gendarmes in this area.

The cops still use the 10 codes it in Phoenix. One of the favorite tricks the dispatchers liked to play on a rookie was to ask a question using a seldom used 10 code. Then time him to see how long it took him to look it up on his code sheet and reply...

676. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 17:59:34 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <e5nb6t4vr42j4ntiptnpsrksq1dag2soii@4ax.com>
Source record: 926

K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org> wrote:
>Talked to a young fella on the repeater the other day who introduced
>himself by saying "my first personal is Jim and you're my first
>contact, QSL?".

Of course he could have avoided the gaff by simply listening to the
repeater for a few weeks before using it to see how things are done.
That's good practice whether on FM, RTTY, CW or a new newsgroup...

677. Re: 10 bucks buys a ham license.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 17:59:35 UTC
From: K7MEM <jda@rupert.tds-az.lmco.com>
Message-ID: <3A65DD87.3F54BC7E@rupert.tds-az.lmco.com>
Source record: 927
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

John Passaneau wrote:
>
> The ARRL VE book, said, 1 fee for each test session, and it covered
> as many elements as the test taker wanted to take, or the VE have.
> But it is a new fee to retake a failed element. So as long as you
> keep passing you can do as many elements as you can pass for 1 fee.
> Remember though that most VE sessions have only 2 or 3 versions
> of a test element available and if you flunk all that they have,
> your done for that session.
>
> Dick Carroll"wrote:
> >
> > Steve Woodruff wrote:
> > >
> > > ..but i was suprised tonight to learn that i had to
> > > pay the $10 fee for EACH exam i took. I upgraded to general,
> > > and had intentions of attempting the extra class exam....
> > > but when i found out it would cost me an additional $10
> > > i figured i'd wait until next month when i could be
> > > reasonably sure that i'd pass with ease.
> >
> > If that is permissable evidently they have changed the rules. When I
> > ran a VE team ('85 thru '93) the rules said one fee for all tests taken
> > at that session. Later it was deemed permissable to charge an additional
> > fee for a retest of a failed element at the same session, but we never
> > did.

It's been a few years, but when I made General, I took the Tech,
General, and 13 WPM code at the same time for one fee ($6.45).
At another session I took the Extra and the 20 WPM code tests
again for one fee ($6.45). At the time, I was under the impression
that this fee went directly to the ARRL, to cover the cost
of the testing materials that they supplied. That ment that the
club, which was running the VE session, was really charging
nothing for their time.

Was I correct in my reasoning? Aren't they, the club, also allowed
to charge a small fee to cover their expenses?

Martin K7MEM

--
Martin E. Meserve K7MEM
martin.e.meserve AT lmco.com

I respond to news groups and E-Mail on my own time and therefore my responses may not be as timely as you, or I, would like them to be. If I seem to be ignoring you, send me another E-Mail to jog my memory. Opinions are my own and do not reflect the opinions of my employer.

678. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 18:11:52 UTC
From: xjim@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <944n8v$924$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 928

> > > If your memory is so good remembering the ones you guessed at, why
> didn't
> > you
> > > remember the exact answer as given in the Q pool?
> >
> > There was no question pool in those days.

Actually there was a question pool, but the actual questions and answers weren't available to the public. The ARRL Licence Manual and Ameco publications were study guides to give you an idea of what was required, and what to study. Many were paraphrased from the recollections of those who took the tests.

> > > How many times did you have to take the exams?
> >
> > Once. Other than blowing a few questions, it was pretty easy for me.

In the 70's you had to wait a year to retake the test. You would lose your Novice ticket if you didn't upgrade. These days I hear all the time of people taking the test numerous times. Really sad.

This all adds up to one big mistake. By lowering standards and force feeding numerous ignorant individuals onto the ham bands, how are we improving the standing of Amateur Radio? When I compare the technical discussions and considerate behavior of those who knew full well they could be heard everywhere, giving way to Hate and Discontent in order to impress a new group of listeners, who's going to want to (much less be savy enough to) save allocations in the future? I have seen Ham Radio Magazine die off and QEX almost die off. We used to have to fill out our own 610 forms, and we joked that it was a literacy test. Now that we don't have to do that, how many new hams won't even be able to read QST, much less give a S***?

We have to stop allowing ourselves to be re-formed for the wishes of "wanna bees".

Jim, ac6tk

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

679. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 18:16:29 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A65E17D.DF469859@IEEE.org>
Source record: 929

xjim@my-deja.com wrote:
> Sandy held both a federal firearms license and a permit to carry a
> handgun in New Hampshire. Ironically, the gun laws in Massachusetts
> prevented him from carrying a concealed handgun. But these same laws
> did not prevent Michael McDermott from obtaining illegal firearms.

Why does it make sense to allow criminals to have guns yet prohibit
law-abiding citizens the right to have a gun with which to defend
themselves?
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

680. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 18:18:17 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A65E1E9.A27B4CA@IEEE.org>
Source record: 930

xjim@my-deja.com wrote:
> In the 70's you had to wait a year to retake the test.

That doesn't make sense. I believe it was a month, not a year.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

681. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 18:28:28 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A65E44C.FE56CA41@IEEE.org>
Source record: 932

Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> news:3A639E9F.304EE3D8@IEEE.org...
> > The arguments are different. Jim says there is not one code-tested jammer
> > using Morse code equipment. I say there is at least one and probably more.
>
> I'm enjoying your argument in the third person here, Cecil. Which Jim are
> you claiming said these things? Quotes might better illustrate your point.
> Or they might not.

I redirect this thread from r.r.a.antenna where it doesn't belong.
Jim, N2EY, is redirecting everything back to r.r.a.antenna where it
doesn't belong. That's the reason for the disconnect. Jim will not
admit that there ever has been a single code-tested ham using Morse
equipment for the purpose of jamming. He refuses to condemn code-
tested hams who use Morse equipment for the purpose of jamming since
he says there never has been any. That's because any admission of
such would violate the immaculate conception virginal religious
aspect of Morse code to the PCTA.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

682. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 18:30:14 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A65E4B6.D4A78CA1@IEEE.org>
Source record: 933

Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> news:3A623289.7398A209@IEEE.org...
> > Ed, do you agree with Jim that dits
> > or dahs sent for the purpose of jamming are not sent with Morse
> > code equipment?
>
> You need to research your attributions a little better before dropping names
> into such comments, Cecil.

Felling guilty, are we? There's more than one person named Jim, Jim.
This thread originated on r.r.a.antenna where it doesn't belong.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

683. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 18:32:58 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A65E55A.BAB97AFE@IEEE.org>
Source record: 936

Vincent Biancomano wrote:
> In all honesty, you fared far worse in debate than those other
> two fellas, Cecil. By your own admission as a tenth-rate debater.
> Nothing to crow about, son.

I suspect you realize exactly how important your opinion is to me,
Vince, and I seriously doubt that you are old enough to be my father.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

684. Re: 10 bucks buys a ham license.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 18:34:10 UTC
From: kb0hae@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <3a65e558.2221618@news>
Source record: 931
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Hi Guys. You can get the latest ARR> VE manual here.
http://www2.arrl.org/arrlvec/vemanual/index.html

On Tue, 16 Jan 2001 22:19:18 +0800, "Ilan Rabinovitch" <ilan@fonz.net>
wrote:

>I paid $6 when I took my Technician test in Decmeber.
>
>Ilan
>KG6ERM
>
>In article <93bh3v$p32$1@nnrp1.deja.com>, jamesrhampton@my-deja.com wrote:
>
>> The cost is actually minimal anywhere. I think I paid $5.90
>> when I decided to get back into amateur radio and tested out in 1993
>> (after letting my tickets expire over 10 years earlier). Whats the
>> cost today?
>>
>> 73 from Rochester, NY
>> Jim (AA2QA)

685. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 18:35:50 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A65E606.96135EDA@IEEE.org>
Source record: 937

Aaron Jones wrote:
>
> w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:
> >the easiest way to pass the test is to know and understand the material.
>
> That's easy for an engineer to say...
>
> How many hours of study do you estimate that it would take for a
> *non-technical* person to "know and understand" all the material to
> pass the Extra test?

Just proves "we" don't want any truck drivers, janitors, garbage men,
or lawyers in ham radio. :-) However, the ham who gave me my first
exam-by-mail in 1952 was a lawyer.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

686. Re: 10 bucks buys a ham license.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 18:40:02 UTC
From: kb0hae@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <3a65e712.2663560@news>
Source record: 934
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Hi Guys. You can get the latest ARR> VE manual here.
http://www2.arrl.org/arrlvec/vemanual/index.html

On Tue, 16 Jan 2001 22:19:18 +0800, "Ilan Rabinovitch" <ilan@fonz.net>
wrote:

>I paid $6 when I took my Technician test in Decmeber.
>
>Ilan
>KG6ERM
>
>In article <93bh3v$p32$1@nnrp1.deja.com>, jamesrhampton@my-deja.com wrote:
>
>> The cost is actually minimal anywhere. I think I paid $5.90
>> when I decided to get back into amateur radio and tested out in 1993
>> (after letting my tickets expire over 10 years earlier). Whats the
>> cost today?
>>
>> 73 from Rochester, NY
>> Jim (AA2QA)

Cul8r

Martin kb0haespam.stinks@arrl.net KB0HAE

Spam Security is ON! To reply via e-mail remove the "spam.stinks" from
the above address.

Want to help stop Spam? (also known as UNSOLICITED COMMERCIAL E-MAIL)
Support the Anti-Spam Amendment. Join at http://www.cauce.org/

687. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 18:40:32 UTC
From: xjim@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <944ouu$ap6$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 938

> Memorizing *is* knowing, Ed. How do you know your call letters if you
didn't
> memorize them?

Memorizing these seemingly random "facts" is worthless (except for
frequency allocations and some regs) without deeper study. The test
questions are really easily performed signposts, designed to lead you
to further study along those lines. Much valuable knowlege can only
come through further research and investigation. The tests are like a
child's flash cards, helping you on to greater concepts.

If you go no further, you have failed at Amateur Radio.

Jim, ac6tk

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

688. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 18:41:36 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <tqpb6ts9co4heldjap94ddm9tcfab5cq9e@4ax.com>
Source record: 935

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nospam.spam> wrote:
> "10-20" has a honorable history in public-safety voice comms
> but the "mutilation" is to drop the "10" and just refer to your
> "twenty".

Even cops often shorten the 10 codes to just the last number. It makes
sense if it takes less air time and the meaning is understood by all.
10 codes, although codes, actually become words in the users minds,
and like words often evolve with use...

689. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 18:53:45 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A65EA39.40F945F3@IEEE.org>
Source record: 939

xjim@my-deja.com wrote:
>
> > Memorizing *is* knowing, Ed. How do you know your call letters if you
> didn't
> > memorize them?
>
> Memorizing these seemingly random "facts" is worthless (except for
> frequency allocations and some regs) without deeper study.

Nope, it's not and I speak from experience. I memorized those random facts and that same framework later served me as an outline for knowledge in electronics. I still fill in the blanks as needed.

> The test
> questions are really easily performed signposts, designed to lead you
> to further study along those lines. Much valuable knowlege can only
> come through further research and investigation. The tests are like a
> child's flash cards, helping you on to greater concepts.

Like I said, an outline to future knowledge.

> If you go no further, you have failed at Amateur Radio.

Lots of people fail at lots of things. Some people failed at amateur radio because they were chased away by hams requiring perfection in beginners. Some simply lost interest. What's wrong with live and let live?
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

690. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 18:59:27 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A65EB8F.B223DC94@IEEE.org>
Source record: 940
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> Sorry Hans, if he can't take some criticism then he needs to go be a
> priest or something. Thats the trouble today. No one wants to pay
> their way anymore. Heck when I first got on AM phone I was made to
> feel 2 inches high. You know, not enough audio, your too week, give me
> a call when you grow up youngun.. etc.

Sorry, Dan, this is amateur radio, not the Marines. Hazing has been
frowned on for a number of years now.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

691. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 19:01:05 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A65EBF1.F1578A73@IEEE.org>
Source record: 941

Aaron Jones wrote:
>
> w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:
> >Interestingly, the use of the 10 codes on voice is seen by some as having more
> >validity than the use of Q codes on voice.
>
> Every hobby has it's preferred lingo. If you use the wrong lingo you
> immediately identify yourself as an outsider...

That's my goal in life, Aaron, to be considered an outsider.
Why would anyone want to be a lemming?
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

692. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 19:04:02 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A65ECA2.C71764FA@uci.edu>
Source record: 942

Cecil wrote:
> Felling guilty, are we?

I don't know about you, but I'm not. Perhaps a quote from the person you're talking about might make things clearer. You know that you and I have been discussing this via email.

73, Jim AC6XG

693. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 19:14:43 UTC
From: K0HB <k0hb@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <944quqcos1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 943

In article <27nb6t8936sdto51sfq4url1uo2n589on8@4ax.com>,
Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com> wrote:

> How many hours of study do you estimate that it would take for a
> *non-technical* person to "know and understand" all the material to
> pass the Extra test?

40 years ago it took me at least 10 hours, maybe even 15.

73, Hans, K0HB

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

694. Re: 10 bucks buys a ham license.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 19:22:11 UTC
From: nielsen@WashingtonStateResident.oz.net
Message-ID: <944rd3$12v$0@216.39.171.5>
Source record: 944
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Wed, 17 Jan 2001 10:59:35 -0700, K7MEM wrote:
>John Passaneau wrote:
>>
>> The ARRL VE book, said, 1 fee for each test session, and it covered
>> as many elements as the test taker wanted to take, or the VE have.
>> But it is a new fee to retake a failed element. So as long as you
>> keep passing you can do as many elements as you can pass for 1 fee.
>> Remember though that most VE sessions have only 2 or 3 versions
>> of a test element available and if you flunk all that they have,
>> your done for that session.
>>
>> Dick Carroll"wrote:
>> >
>> > Steve Woodruff wrote:
>> > >
>> > > ..but i was suprised tonight to learn that i had to
>> > > pay the $10 fee for EACH exam i took. I upgraded to general,
>> > > and had intentions of attempting the extra class exam....
>> > > but when i found out it would cost me an additional $10
>> > > i figured i'd wait until next month when i could be
>> > > reasonably sure that i'd pass with ease.
>> >
>> > If that is permissable evidently they have changed the rules. When I
>> > ran a VE team ('85 thru '93) the rules said one fee for all tests taken
>> > at that session. Later it was deemed permissable to charge an additional
>> > fee for a retest of a failed element at the same session, but we never
>> > did.
>
>It's been a few years, but when I made General, I took the Tech,
>General, and 13 WPM code at the same time for one fee ($6.45).
>At another session I took the Extra and the 20 WPM code tests
>again for one fee ($6.45). At the time, I was under the impression
>that this fee went directly to the ARRL, to cover the cost
>of the testing materials that they supplied. That ment that the
>club, which was running the VE session, was really charging
>nothing for their time.
>
>Was I correct in my reasoning? Aren't they, the club, also allowed
>to charge a small fee to cover their expenses?

The ARRL VEC allows the VEs to retain a portion of the fee (up to $4 of
the current $10 fee, which is per session, not per exam) to cover
expenses if they wish to do so (this wasn't originally the case). The

ARRL requires that records of such expenses be kept, although the FCC no longer requires reporting. The FCC also no longer specifies the maximum amount which can be charged (there never has been a minimum). ARRL/VEC is charging $10, but others may charge more or less; the marketplace will probably decide.

From the ARRL letter, December 15, 2000:
==>FCC OPENS DOOR TO INCREASED TEST FEES FOR 2001

The FCC has suspended its regulatory limit on the reimbursement fee for Amateur Radio examinations, and the ARRL VEC says a new $10 test fee will go into effect January 1. An FCC Public Notice released December 4 explained that the Commission did not plan to announce a maximum reimbursement fee for 2001 since the requirement to do so no longer appears in the Communications Act.

For now, the FCC says, it will suspend enforcement of the fee provision, ?97.527(b), which continues to appear in the FCC rules. Some, if not all, of the nation's other Volunteer Examiner Coordinators are expected to follow suit, although at least one VEC charges no test fee whatsoever.

ARRL VEC Manager Bart Jahnke, W9JJ, says the ARRL VEC's current fee of $6.65 was based on the provision in the Communications Act, adopted in 1984, that established a $4 cap on reimbursement of out-of-pocket costs with an annual adjustment based on the Consumer Price Index. The new, higher fee reflects the fact that the ARRL VEC is doing more of the work on behalf of the FCC than was originally envisioned when the provision was included in the Communications Act. That effort includes data entry for all new and upgrade license applications once done by FCC staffers.

ARRL VEC volunteer examiners will continue to charge applicants $6.65 through the end of 2000.

--
Bob Nielsen, N7XY nielsen@oz.net
Bainbridge Island, WA http://www.oz.net/~nielsen

695. Re: Buy a ham ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 19:24:05 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A65F155.D045B958@uci.edu>
Source record: 947

K0HB wrote:

> In article <3A5F9BD2.2F0C05D1@uci.edu>,
> Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote:
>
> > Try this one on your wife tomorrow morning after she gets out of the
> > shower and gets dressed: "You look radiant and sterile this
> > morning, my darling." :-)

> She'd know I was lying. K0CKB and I have five children and thirteen
> granchildren. Sterile is not a word in her vocabulary.

Makes the connection with Morse code even more mystifying.

73, AC6XG

696. Re: "They oughta require a license....blah, blah, blah"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 19:27:12 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010117142712.24296.00000962@nso-fp.aol.com>
Source record: 946

In article <tgmb6tcvho5oq6j2n1hj7qapm6cbhikshl@4ax.com>, Jake Brodsky
<frussle@erols.com> writes:

>On Tue, 16 Jan 2001 19:56:23 GMT, K0HB <k0hb@my-deja.com> wrote:
>
>>In article <fh496t4af7l94gv4vnep9npbjhb5v6tn62@4ax.com>,
>> frussle@erols.com wrote:
>>
>>> The real problem is that the FCC isn't enforcing its own laws very
>>> well. Laws against unlicensed operation exist.
>>
>>Exactly. We don't need more big-government rules! Enforce the
>>ones we have.
>>
>>> Maybe the FCC would consider licensing something like an Official
>>> Radio Monitor (Kind of like the ARRL OO, but with some sort of
>>> legal standing in a court of law).....
>>
>>Groan.....
>>
>>We could have tin badges and blue jump-suits and all other sorts of
>>cop-wannabe paraphenalia.
>>
>>On second though, fergit it! I don't think it is the function of
>>hams to be hall-monitors for CBers and freebanders.
>
>Well, somebody's got to do it. Why not certify an operation at a
>local club? If people are serious about self enforcement, then get
>the public backing of a club to pursue the nastiest cases the FCC
>doesn't care about.
>
>I agree with your assessment, Hans. I'm not fond of the idea either.
>I figure that by insisting that club back the results, maybe some of
>the frequency cops will see their limits and turn in their blue jump
>suits and tin badges.
>
>No, it's not a perfect solution. But maybe it's better than hiding
>the problems under a rock, the way the FCC has over the last couple
>decades.

Lawlessness and vigilantism is never a solution. One cannot
undo the past to correct peceived mistakes or perceived "rocks."

Consider that CB users outnumber hams by at least 10:1 and
there are more big rig drivers among the CB users than there

are hams. Starting some vigilante movement against evil CB users and worse-than-evil freebanders might result in another big rig crash such as in Sacramento, CA, by one frustrated ex-felon who killed only himself and made a mess on the steps of the California Capitol Building. It served NO purpose.

There is no time machine to go back to undo the past. There is the possibility that the existing and future FCC can solve some problems in US civil radio. Support the FCC in regulation of radio...or become lawless vigilantes who are outnumbered by others. There is no honor or respect in vigilanteism.

didit

697. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 19:27:13 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010117142713.24296.00000963@nso-fp.aol.com>
Source record: 945

In article <20010117072952.05313.00001000@ng-cd1.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>>From: vlfiscus@mcn.net (Vince Fiscus, KB7ADL)
>
>>Ed, this wouldn't be a fair test. no-coders aren't smart enough to build
>>things, least of all their code speed.
>
>In what way do you think learning Morse code will improve their ability to
>construct equipment?

It makes them superior in all aspects...

One might even say "up their aspects!" :-)

didit

698. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 19:31:57 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A65F32D.794BB6C3@IEEE.org>
Source record: 949

Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> Cecil wrote:
> > Felling guilty, are we?
>
> I don't know about you, but I'm not. Perhaps a quote from the person
> you're talking about might make things clearer. You know that you and I
> have been discussing this via email.

The quotes are on r.r.a.antenna where this thread didn't belong.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

699. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 19:38:52 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A65F4CC.743F2879@uci.edu>
Source record: 948

Dick Carroll wrote:

> Either a test is valid and shows to some degree of confidence that the
> examinee has absorbed a minimum level of information, else he doesn't
> pass the test.

I think that's a pretty good assessment of our current exams. The tests are 1.) valid; 2.) provide some degree of confidence that the examinee has absorbed at least a minimum level of information; and 3.) the examinee won't pass the test if he doesn't exceed that threshhold.

73, Jim AC6XG

700. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 19:45:22 UTC
From: Vincent Biancomano <103520.355@CompuServe.COM>
Message-ID: <944soi$38i$1@sshuraac-i-1.production.compuserve.com>
Source record: 950

>I suspect you realize exactly how important your opinion is to
>me, Vince, and I seriously doubt that you are old enough to be
>my father.

No sense, no feeling, Cecil...

701. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 19:47:48 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A65F6E4.F43996D1@IEEE.org>
Source record: 951

Jim Kelley wrote:
> I think that's a pretty good assessment of our current exams. The tests
> are 1.) valid; 2.) provide some degree of confidence that the examinee
> has absorbed at least a minimum level of information; and 3.) the
> examinee won't pass the test if he doesn't exceed that threshhold.

Unfortunately, Dick seems to want to make his personal knowledge level into
the desired threshold. The threshold should never be below his knowledge
level whatever that happens to be at the time. He doesn't seem to realize
that that approach will guarantee that all hams are superior to him which
is not hard to visualize at all.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

702. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 19:50:35 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A65F78B.C69F80CA@IEEE.org>
Source record: 952

Vincent Biancomano wrote:
>
> >I suspect you realize exactly how important your opinion is to
> >me, Vince, and I seriously doubt that you are old enough to be
> >my father.
>
> No sense, no feeling, Cecil...

Actually, it's no nonsense, no subjective feeling about objective subjects. Why don't you just come out and admit that Morse code is your religion?
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

703. Re: "They oughta require a license....blah, blah, blah"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 20:16:48 UTC
From: "Steven J Robeson", K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <944uj4gfh1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 956

In article <20010117142712.24296.00000962@nso-fp.aol.com>,
lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:

> There is no time machine to go back to undo the past. There
> is the possibility that the existing and future FCC can solve
> some problems in US civil radio. Support the FCC in
> regulation of radio...or become lawless vigilantes who are
> outnumbered by others. There is no honor or respect in
> vigilanteism.

(Don't choke, Len) I agree. We need to put some teeth in present FCC regs and let THEM do the enforcing. However, just like your local police occassionally need extra eyes and ears, so does the FCC need people out there providing them with assistance and information. They can't be everywhere all the time.

Also, it doesn't hurt ANY radio user to be proactive in community issues, especially where education of "lay" users and consumers is important.

73

Steve, K4YZ
--
"If You're Not A Ham....You're SPAM!"

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

704. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 20:17:08 UTC
From: W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com>
Message-ID: <944ukq$4cs$1@iac5.navix.net>
Source record: 953

Len, I guess I can understand your resentment towards those that obtained a formal education. The fact is many have neither the ability or the self discipline to learn on their own. They are not blessed with your tenacity and innate intelligence.

The problem with being self taught is you have someone as ignorant as you for a teacher.

One wonders if a self taught instant extra has even considered the safety issues associated with high voltages and mechanical supports.

I suffered through a formal education that pointed me in directions I would not have even considered. Things that I would have discounted on my own as being useless, I admit some where, but many came to be of valuable use in latter years.

While your opinions of my stances were read and enjoyed, as always I disagree with you.

73 Fred W4JLE

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20010117010746.14777.00000602@nso-bd.aol.com...
>
> These two examples are logically incongruent. There is no
> need for flying skills in radio operation, any radio service.
> The above is both incongruent, illogical, and rather absurd.
>
> As to self-learning radio arts, be they technology or
> operating practices, that can be totally self-taught.

705. Re: Anyone For An RRAP Meeting At Dayton?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 20:21:22 UTC
From: "Steven J Robeson", K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <944urlgkv1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 957

In article <prmb6tc5jd562vj6t4tbfc73qtac2ebrbn@4ax.com>,
frussle@erols.com wrote:

> Why? Are you trying to start a fight or what? :-)

Naw...just trying to get photographic evidnece that most of us
aren't flamebreathing dragons. Time to put the guns away and have a
drink. Or two. (That's EACH, Cecil...not kegs!)

73

Steve, K4YZ
--
"If You're Not A Ham....You're SPAM!"

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

706. Black list

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 20:22:24 UTC
From: Swann <swann@dromadaire.com>
Message-ID: <944ulvgd1@front4m.grolier.fr>
Source record: 954

Don't waste QSL and time and visit :

http://www.dromadaire.com/black-list/1

73's

707. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 20:28:14 UTC
From: W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com>
Message-ID: <944v9l$4nf$1@iac5.navix.net>
Source record: 955

Probably the same moral outrage that causes all you Yankees to get your panties in a wad when you see a Confederate flag and scream KKK!

People have a tendency to assign values to something symbolic rather it is accurate or not!

I still say "handle", I used it a long time before any CBer used it, and the use by a CBer or anyone else does not obviate me using it.

Look at the term "Good Buddy", some where along the line it got changed from an unknown friend on the CB airwaves to a derisive term implying homosexuality.

Who is the grand guru of symbols that assigns these meanings?

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
> Interestingly, the use of the 10 codes on voice is seen by some as having more
> validity than the use of Q codes on voice. Why does one create such moral
> outrage if heard on amateur frequencies?
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
>

708. Re: Black list

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 20:49:02 UTC
From: K0HB <k0hb@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <9450fpibf1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 959

In article <944ulvgd1@front4m.grolier.fr>,
"Swann" <swann@dromadaire.com> wrote:

> Don't waste QSL and time and visit :
>
> http://www.dromadaire.com/black-list/1

Just for grins I checked the calls on your stupid list against my logs. In the past year I have had contest QSO's with 11 stations on the list. Five of them have sent me QSL's. So much for your credibility.

73, Hans, K0HB

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

709. Re: Vince Documentation Wild Goose Chase (was Re: No-code kills)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 20:58:30 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A660776.3956F2@uci.edu>
Source record: 960

"Paul W. Schleck" wrote:
> To paraphrase Dave Sumner, because of practical staff time and other
> understandable constraints, the League cannot retrieve arbitrary
> internal documents from years in the past on demand for private purposes
> (I, of course, suspected that, but did want to get a definitive answer
> for the purpose of this discussion).

Mr. Sumner probably didn't want to come right out and say that they have
a
specially shaped file for Vince's documents.

73, Jim AC6XG

710. Re: "They oughta require a license....blah, blah, blah"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 21:07:08 UTC
From: Jake Brodsky <frussle@erols.com>
Message-ID: <h81c6t07d3k505s9742uovbuoq5qpip20f@4ax.com>
Source record: 961

On 17 Jan 2001 19:27:12 GMT, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:

>Lawlessness and vigilantism is never a solution. One cannot
>undo the past to correct peceived mistakes or perceived "rocks."

Who said anything about vigilantism or lawlessness?

>Consider that CB users outnumber hams by at least 10:1 and
>there are more big rig drivers among the CB users than there
>are hams. Starting some vigilante movement against evil CB
>users and worse-than-evil freebanders might result in another
>big rig crash such as in Sacramento, CA, by one frustrated
>ex-felon who killed only himself and made a mess on the
>steps of the California Capitol Building. It served NO purpose.

I think in your haste, you may have misread my post.

I'm talking about a monitoring station run by someone who knows what IMD is, who knows how to DF a signal and determine source, who knows how to measure frequency and bandwidth, and most importantly who would have an opinion which a court of law could recognize. That's all. The purpose would be strictly to act as witnesses for prosecution of offenders inside the amateur radio bands.

Prosecution would still have to be done by the FCC. The difference here is that at least they wouldn't have to use valuable time at a monitoring station.

>There is no time machine to go back to undo the past. There
>is the possibility that the existing and future FCC can solve
>some problems in US civil radio. Support the FCC in
>regulation of radio...or become lawless vigilantes who are
>outnumbered by others. There is no honor or respect in
>vigilanteism.

I agree completely. And I assure you, that is not what I'm suggesting.

73,

Jake Brodsky, AB3A mailto:frussle@erols.com
"Beware of the massive impossible!"

711. Re: Buy a ham ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 21:31:05 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A660F19.1E88F782@uci.edu>
Source record: 962

K0HB@USWEST.NET wrote:
> Sterile, precise, machine-like code is best copied by machines, automatons, or
> Brian. Reminds me of trying to engage in casual conversation with HAL from
> 2001 -- yecchhhh! I am a human, and prefer to copy code which sounds like it
> is being sent by a human. Didaahhhhhhhhhhdit?

I really don't want to be drawn into your argument about how lovely someone swing is or isn't. I simply wanted to comment on your use of the word sterile. A lack of a swing is not sterile code. I would simply like to understand your negative attitude about properly timed code.

73, Jim AC6XG

712. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 21:40:50 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A661162.922D1213@uci.edu>
Source record: 963

Cecil wrote:
>
> Jim Kelley wrote:
> > I think that's a pretty good assessment of our current exams. The tests
> > are 1.) valid; 2.) provide some degree of confidence that the examinee
> > has absorbed at least a minimum level of information; and 3.) the
> > examinee won't pass the test if he doesn't exceed that threshhold.

> Unfortunately, Dick seems to want to make his personal knowledge level into
> the desired threshold.

That might be, but I don't think Dick is really the issue. I just think it would be constructive to discuss testing from the standpoint of threshold rather than painting with so broad a brush to describe it as invalid.

73, Jim AC6XG

713. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 22:01:16 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A66162C.9B73BD97@uci.edu>
Source record: 965

Cecil wrote:

> Nobody said anything about Morse operators. The accusation is that
> Morse equipment is being used by code-tested hams for the purpose
> of jamming. The answer is obvious.

Is there an obvious answer to an accuasation that digital modes are also
now used for jamming?

73, Jim AC6XG

714. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 22:04:14 UTC
From: Vincent Biancomano <103520.355@CompuServe.COM>
Message-ID: <9454su$m3v$1@sshuraaa-i-1.production.compuserve.com>
Source record: 964

>Actually, it's no nonsense, no subjective feeling about
>objective subjects. Why don't you just come out and admit that
>Morse code is your religion?

What? Cecil = demoted to 11-rate debater. The ISSUE
for 18 YEARS has been eased requirements, code AND
theory, Vic Clark. Proven by FCC's R&O. Remember?

Regards,
Vince, WB2EZG

715. Re: Buy a ham ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 22:19:14 UTC
From: K0HB@USWEST.NET
Message-ID: <9455p2$6md$1@news.netmar.com>
Source record: 958

In article <3A65F155.D045B958@uci.edu>, Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
writes:
>
>
>K0HB wrote:
>
>> In article <3A5F9BD2.2F0C05D1@uci.edu>,
>> Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote:
>>
>> > Try this one on your wife tomorrow morning after she gets out of the
>> > shower and gets dressed: "You look radiant and sterile this
>> > morning, my darling." :-)
>
>> She'd know I was lying. K0CKB and I have five children and thirteen
>> granchildren. Sterile is not a word in her vocabulary.
>
>Makes the connection with Morse code even more mystifying.

Sterile, precise, machine-like code is best copied by machines, automatons, or
Brian. Reminds me of trying to engage in casual conversation with HAL from
2001 -- yecchhhh! I am a human, and prefer to copy code which sounds like it
is being sent by a human. Didaahhhhhhhhhhdit?

73, Hans, K0HB

----- Posted via NewsOne.Net: Free (anonymous) Usenet News via the Web -----
http://newsone.net/ -- Free reading and anonymous posting to 60,000+ groups
NewsOne.Net prohibits users from posting spam. If this or other posts
made through NewsOne.Net violate posting guidelines, email abuse@newsone.net

716. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 22:33:55 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A661DD3.58DE6F10@uci.edu>
Source record: 968

"Ed Hare, W1RFI" wrote:
>
> Len Over 21 <lenover21@aol.com> wrote:
>
> > Jim: The "boring" part is due to spread-spectrum not being
> > intuitive...and few have explained either direct-sequence or
> > frequency-hopping in simpler terms or in terms that long-
> > timers can accept. Long-timers referring to being used to
> > conventional narrowband frequency tuning as practiced in
> > amateur radio today.

> I think the biggest issue here is that some think of SS as a 'digital' mode.

The biggest issue, Ed? How so? I don't even know if it's true, let
alone the biggest issue.

73, Jim AC6XG

717. Re: Old Calls

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 22:39:15 UTC
From: "R.L. Tannehill, P.E." <rickw7rt@firstinter.net>
Message-ID: <3A661F13.E2729811@firstinter.net>
Source record: 966

Phil Kane wrote:
>
> On 11 Jan 2001 06:25:23 GMT, Qrm2000 wrote:
>
> >If any of the FCC guys are reading this, perhaps they can check with some
> >Department old timers or Commission history books and give us the exact
> >sequence. (J. at Columbia--can you help?)
>
> There are no more "old timers" (of my vintage, at least) left,
> nor are there any history books other than a file of Commission
> orders maintained by a third-party legal publisher (Pike and
> Fischer).
>
> With that said, I researched the case against Richard Zeigler,
> the seller-of-call-signs, and came up with this time line:
>
> 1. Effective in 1968 with "incentive licensing", any Extra
> class licensee who had been a licensed Amateur for 25 years or
> more could apply for a non-specific ("sequential") "1x2" call
> sign.
>
> 2. Effective July 1, 1976, any Extra class licensee who had
> been a licensed Amateur for 25 years or more could select one
> specific "1x2" call sign.
>
> 3. Effective October 1, 1976, anyone who had held an Amateur
> Extra class license since prior to November 22, 1967, could
> select one specific "1x2" call sign.
>
> 4. Effective January 1, 1977, anyone who had held an Amateur
> Extra class license since prior to July 2, 1974, could select
> one specific "1x2" call sign.
>
> 5. Effective April 1, 1977, anyone who held an Amateur Extra
> class license since prior to July 1, 1976, could select one
> specific "1x2" call sign.
>
> 6. Effective July 1, 1977, any Amateur Extra class licensee
> could select one specific "1x2" call sign.
>
> 7. Effective March 30, 1978 this was all replaced by the
> strict "sequential" system until the advent of "vanity" call
> sign selection in June 1997.
>

> This, I hope, settles the question.
>
> --
> 73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP
> FCC SF District Director (retired)

Phil, you are absolutely correct on these. I was an Extra in 1966, and got in on the second window in 1976 for a callsign. BTW, there was a one-time $30 fee for selection of a personalized callsign. We are not defined as "vanity" calls now however. That window is long forgotten by the FCC.

Rick Tannehill - W7RT
(K7PSU prior to 1977)

718. Re: Buy a ham ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 23:02:06 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A66246E.9F831460@uci.edu>
Source record: 969

K0HB@USWEST.NET wrote:

> In article <3A660F19.1E88F782@uci.edu>, Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
> writes:

> >I really don't want to be drawn into your argument about how lovely
> >someone swing is or isn't. I simply wanted to comment on your use of
> >the word sterile. A lack of a swing is not sterile code. I would
> >simply like to understand your negative attitude about properly timed
> >code.

> Jim,
>
> I don't know how much plainer I can make this! It sounds like robots
> talking to robots.

So it's more of a personal preference rather than an absolute kind of
thing. I prefer code that is easy to copy to the mal-adjusted bug,
non-robotic sound.

> If you don't agree with that attitude, don't answer my CQ, because you
> won't be treated to "properly timed" code.

Well, practice makes perfect I always say. ;-)

73, Jim AC6XG

719. Re: 10 bucks buys a ham license.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 23:13:43 UTC
From: LRod <lr0d@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <9458uuqit1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 970
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <3A65DD87.3F54BC7E@rupert.tds-az.lmco.com>,
K7MEM <jda@rupert.tds-az.lmco.com> wrote:

> At the time, I was under the impression that this fee went directly
> to the ARRL, to cover the cost of the testing materials that they
> supplied.

At one time that was completely correct. I ran a DeVry/Great Lakes core from 1984 (before League involvement, by the way) through 1993. At first the local core didn't get anything, but eventually DeVry/Great Lakes started a core reimbursement progam. By the time they folded and we changed over to ARRL, the League was reimbursing up to $4 to the local core.

> That ment that the club, which was running the VE session, was
> really charging nothing for their time.

Also correct. That's why we are called "volunteer examiners." My club, however, covered all my costs for materials since I prepared all of our written and code exam materials and purchased or prepared other materials such as blank paper, pencils, 610s, etc.

> Was I correct in my reasoning? Aren't they, the club, also allowed
> to charge a small fee to cover their expenses?

Not at the VE Core level. Only at the VEC (coordinator) level. And when a VEC does allow expenses to be covered by a core, it's always as a rebate from the VEC (I speak from DeVry/Great Lakes and ARRL experience only).

LRod

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

720. Re: 10 bucks buys a ham license.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 23:19:17 UTC
From: LRod <lr0d@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <94599b$qv4$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 971
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <944avp$q7a$1@flood.xnet.com>,
"Steve Woodruff" <sjwoodr.nospam@nospam.email.com> wrote:

> Are all VE's subject to the same set of rules? These guys seemed
pretty
> confident that they could charge $10 per exam ... which is why i did
not
> even attempt the extra class written element.... figured i'd wait an
extra
> month and study a little more so i wouldn't be wasting my money.

I'm sorry you had that experience. I can't answer whether a VEC can instruct their cores to charge for each element. I can say that ARRL does not, nor did DeVry/Great Lakes when I was with them.

Who was the VEC for your exam? I have my own suspicion, and if I'm correct it's further confirmation of why I will never have anything to do with him.

Irrespective of who it is, it's an example of poor training of the VE team. That's one of the things that should have been basic in their instruction. I suggest you write a letter of complaint to the VEC.

LRod

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

721. Re: "They oughta require a license....blah, blah, blah"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 23:31:33 UTC
From: Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com>
Message-ID: <3A662B55.A451E26@dvol.com>
Source record: 972

"Leland C. Scott" wrote:

> > on ham radio. Fact is they don't have any real impact on anything which is
> why
> > they're on the low end of the FCC's list of priorities.
>
> They maybe on the low end of the FCC's list, but the ARRL is interested in
> how many show up on 10m.

>
They've been on the low end of ten for eons when the spots are up and I've been there, too. Right off most of those who are audible here are Central and South American stations which nobody in this country including the FCC or the ARRL can do anything about. I've never had a problem working either thru or around them with 100 watts worth of cw, they're just some more ignorable garbage on the ham bands. I'd sure as hell rather have to deal with a freebander on ten for a new one than I would have to deal with Radio Moscow for a new one on 40.
>

> Now with the creation of MURS they have an excuse
> to use opened up Ham 2m rigs, and most likely start to show up on 2m. I
> guess you figure if they don't bother you it must not be a problem for
> anyone else.

>
I chose to not make it a problem for myself. You wanna make it a problem for yourself go for it and good luck "fixing" it.
>

> --
> Leland C. Scott
> KC8LDO

>
w3rv

722. Re: "They oughta require a license....blah, blah, blah"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 23:45:57 UTC
From: Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com>
Message-ID: <3A662EB5.79A21E16@dvol.com>
Source record: 973

Len Over 21 wrote:

>
> There is no time machine to go back to undo the past. There
> is the possibility that the existing and future FCC can solve
> some problems in US civil radio. Support the FCC in
> regulation of radio...or become lawless vigilantes who are
> outnumbered by others. There is no honor or respect in
> vigilanteism.

>
Indeed and agreed. Probable factoid: The FCC would much prefer dealing
with some inane but basically harmless freebanders than they would a
phlanx of amateur (in the more common sense) "helper" frequency cops up
their butts.
>

> didit

>
w3rv

723. Re: Anyone For An RRAP Meeting At Dayton?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-17 23:51:42 UTC
From: Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com>
Message-ID: <3A66300E.86223529@dvol.com>
Source record: 974

Steven, J, Robeson, K4YZ wrote:

> Hmmmmm??????

>
Maybe if I can pack and my catcher's aluminum jock strap still fits.
>
w3rv

724. Re: Buy a ham ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 00:04:42 UTC
From: K0HB@USWEST.NET
Message-ID: <945buq$c5o$1@news.netmar.com>
Source record: 967

In article <3A660F19.1E88F782@uci.edu>, Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
writes:

>I really don't want to be drawn into your argument about how lovely
>someone swing is or isn't. I simply wanted to comment on your use of
>the word sterile. A lack of a swing is not sterile code. I would
>simply like to understand your negative attitude about properly timed
>code.

Jim,

I don't know how much plainer I can make this! It sounds like robots
talking to robots.

Machine-perfect code is just fine for sending recorded traffic, navy
messages (way back then), and other similar "formal" uses. Just like
police dispatchers speak in monotone automaton fashion.

But when I'm in casual conversation on the airwaves, with another human
being, enjoying the art of Morse, I want it to have character, inflection,
and contextual emphasis.

If you don't agree with that attitude, don't answer my CQ, because you
won't be treated to "properly timed" code. Hopefully that doesn't make
me a bad person, but I'm sure Brian will call me a jerk anyhow.

73, de Hans, K0HB

----- Posted via NewsOne.Net: Free (anonymous) Usenet News via the Web -----
http://newsone.net/ -- Free reading and anonymous posting to 60,000+ groups
NewsOne.Net prohibits users from posting spam. If this or other posts
made through NewsOne.Net violate posting guidelines, email abuse@newsone.net

725. Re: 10 bucks buys a ham license.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 00:39:32 UTC
From: Glenn Miller <glennmiller@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <8Xq96.363$7b2.15060@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 975
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"LRod" <lr0d@my-deja.com> wrote in message
news:943h9b$9s4$1@nnrp1.deja.com...
>
> Unless the ARRL has changed, it's not quite a session fee. It is insofar
> as you can take one of every element for one fee. Retakes of failed
> elements are subject to another fee.

I guess it's a matter of semantics. Retests of failed elements are, for
paperwork purposes, considered separate sessions (or sittings).

The ARRL/VE Manual says "The ARRL/VEC charges $6.65 per candidate, per
session." Of course, that was published before the fee increased to $10.

The original poster said they were going to charge for each exam (element),
which is inappropriate.

Glenn AA5PK

726. Re: Anyone For An RRAP Meeting At Dayton?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 01:16:58 UTC
From: Kerry King <kking@houston.net>
Message-ID: <3A66440A.8917A991@houston.net>
Source record: 976

The Round Rotund Amateur Porkers now meet at KC8JBO's house. Dayton is out.

727. Sound Familiar?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 01:34:56 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <4jhc6tcpartogfhd6eao3ss6t6vb2cv8pr@4ax.com>
Source record: 977

A vigorous attempt is to be made at the Cairo Conference to take the present 160meter band away from the amateurs. Our prized 40-meter band is the goal of other interests. One of the more-important commercial radio executives recently said to this writer-"the amateur will eventually find his resting place in the five-meter band, unless he is aggressive enough to fight for the privileges he now enjoys."
The cry of this magazine has been for aggressive leadership! Look to Congress for leadership . . . to pull us out of the sea of difficulty. Congress can help us get some amateur-minded men on the Delegation to Cairo. And, while we are at it, why not ask President Roosevelt to put a couple of good amateurs on the FCC, if only in an advisory capacity without any cost whatsoever to the Government? We know of many good men who are anxious to serve!

Political Editor - December 1934 Radio magazine

728. Re: Anyone For An RRAP Meeting At Dayton?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 01:37:54 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <945hdi$27b$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 979

In article <94464jpck1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
Steven J Robeson, K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com> wrote:

> Hmmmmm??????

Just as long as you's guys don't embarass me in front of my friends.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

729. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 01:43:45 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <945hoh$2c6$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 978
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

```
In article <943h76$cbn$2@208.207.71.134>,
Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>
>
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > "Hans the Humanitarian." It just doesn't ring true.
> >
>
> Would Hans the Hun sound better?
>
It'll have to do. "Ghengus Hans" doesn't ring true either.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/
```

730. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 01:56:11 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A664D3B.44A4EC3E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 980

Jim Kelley wrote:
> Is there an obvious answer to an accuasation that digital modes are also
> now used for jamming?

There's lots of accidental jamming because of mail boxes. I suspect all
modes are used for jamming at one time or another. I once heard someone
playing music using FM on 3950.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

731. Re: Buy a ham ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 01:56:16 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <945ift$34p$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 982

In article <3A66246E.9F831460@uci.edu>,
Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote:

>
> So it's more of a personal preference rather than...
>

Yep, all my preferences are >personal<. Saves me having to keep track
of prevailing public preferences.

>
> Well, practice makes perfect I always say. ;-)
>

That's true, and I'm happy that the more I practice the art of Morse,
the further from machine code it sounds. If this trend continues a
couple more decades, I may indeed reach perfection.

73, Hans, K0HB

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

732. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 01:59:46 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A664E12.2626E56B@IEEE.org>
Source record: 981

Vincent Biancomano wrote:
> The ISSUE
> for 18 YEARS has been eased requirements, code AND
> theory, Vic Clark.

18 years is too long to grieve for an outdated requirement.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

733. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 02:08:27 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <945j6m$3lm$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 983

In article <944n8v$924$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
xjim@my-deja.com wrote:

> In the 70's you had to wait a year to retake the test. You would lose
> your Novice ticket if you didn't upgrade. These days I hear all the
> time of people taking the test numerous times. Really sad.

Yes, it is sad.

> This all adds up to one big mistake. By lowering standards and force
> feeding numerous ignorant individuals onto the ham bands, how are we
> improving the standing of Amateur Radio?

What standards have been lowered? The existing "entry" level ticket
material is so large and complex that it cannot be run away from.

When I compare the technical
> discussions and considerate behavior of those who knew full well they
> could be heard everywhere,

My comments prior to the restructuring:

What I fear most about the restructuring is a lack of enforcement. And
what I fear most about maintaining the status quo is a lack of
enforcement.

> giving way to Hate and Discontent

Ex-Jim, much of the hate and discontent is coming from some OTs. The
ones wha have been hams a long time. The ones who know and count on
being heard everywhere.

in order
> to impress a new group of listeners, who's going to want to (much less
> be savy enough to) save allocations in the future? I have seen Ham
> Radio Magazine die off and QEX almost die off.

Hey, AntenneX resurfaced on the web. Check it out.

> We used to have to fill
> out our own 610 forms, and we joked that it was a literacy test. Now
> that we don't have to do that, how many new hams won't even be able to
> read QST, much less give a S***?

They'll have to be web savvy and take care of biddness via the FCC ULS
page. It's complexity goes beyond a mere literacy test.

> We have to stop allowing ourselves to be re-formed for the wishes
> of "wanna bees".

>
> Jim, ac6tk

Jim, I wish I could agree with you over the last 2/3 of your message, but I see things differently. I give a S***, yet I am dead set against unnecessary government regulation and interference in my life. I am for a simplified licensing structure, and have advocated ONE amateur radio license of about the level of General. I will support a simplified entry level license, with reduced privileges.

Behavior problems should be met with a nice letter from Riley. Followed by a big stick.

73, Brian

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

734. Re: Anyone For An RRAP Meeting At Dayton?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 03:16:33 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3A666002.2C21C9D8@sccoast.net>
Source record: 984

Brian wrote:
>
> Just as long as you's guys don't embarass
> me in front of my friends.

Your friends would be tramatized for life. ;-)

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net

735. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 03:17:09 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <945n7lqa1@208.207.71.177>
Source record: 985

```
Cecil wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > Cecil wrote:
> > >
> > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > > Oh,I hear jamming on a weekend net every week.
> > >
> > > VHF?
> >
> > Nope. 40 meter SSB.
>
> A "No Coder" is jamming you on 40m SSB?

Well if a "No licenser" did it what's to stop a "No coder"?
```

736. Re: Anyone For An RRAP Meeting At Dayton?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 03:26:01 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3A666238.39E1ED12@sccoast.net>
Source record: 986

Steven, J, Robeson, K4YZ wrote:
>
> Hmmmmm??????

Can't make Dayton this time. Nice idea though. Perhaps next time.

Hey, we're having an earthquake here (it started just as I was typing the last line). Nothing big - just enough to vibrate the water in my glass (can barely feel it). Strange!

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net

737. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 03:40:38 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <945ojm$8sh$0@208.207.71.177>
Source record: 987

Ed:

You betcher bippy I know what it means. And what it doesn't.

When you take a driver's test you 1.)take a written test and 2.)take a
practical operational exam where you demonstrate that you can actuall
drive the darn thing.

When you qualify as a pilot you 1.)take a written test, and 2.)take a
practical operational exam where you demonstrate that you actually can
fly the darn thing.

When you take a ham radio test you 1.)take a written test and 2.)take a
practical operational exam where you demonstrate that you can actually
copy code.

In neither case is one exam "emphasized" over the other. You have to
make a passing grade on both. It's called MEETING THE REQUIREMENTS FOR
THE LICENSE!

All the whiners are still at it just a loudly as though the 5wpm code
test actually amounted to something. Whatta joke!

W1RFI wrote:
>
> >From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
>
> >> Do you believe that having a test that emphasizes one more over all others
> >> IS infinitely multfaceted?
>
> >It is simply NOT TRUE that the tests emphasize one mode over all
> >others.
>
> Do you believe that having one mode and one mode only have a pass/fail test is
> not emphasis? If I don't pass the code test, I don't get my license. If I
> don't answer the SSB questions correcty, I can still be a ham.
>
> What does the word "emphasis" mean to you?
>
> I know you know what it means.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

738. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 03:58:34 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <945plabhm0@208.207.71.177>
Source record: 988

Cecil wrote:

> It (CW)is worth preserving within ham
> radio if its merits support that preservation. I think it does. A Governmental
> requirement not based on merit is just another form of welfare.
>

You say it has merit. Then you say it has no merit. Which is it?

> > When the clamor by those who would expand the voice segments
> > to the maximum limit consider your statements, how then will you react?
> > And what good could it possibly do?
>
> My Dad said always to tell the truth.

Your day was clearly a better fella than you.

When those people discover that you
> are lying about CW's capabilities, what do you think will happen?

So would you care to lay out just how it is that I'm "lying" about
CW's capabilities?
CW *has no* capabilities until PEOPLE are able to use it.

If CW
> cannot honestly stand on its own merits, then it deserves to be replaced
> by modes with more merit. Obfuscation about CW's merits will just hasten
> its demise.

You are not only a fool, you are also a liar. CW as a vital functioning
operational traffic handling mode has been in steady use for a century.
Nothing *but* the lack of operators who can use it can change that.
You can't avoid knowing that so you think you can just destroy truth.
Won't work, at least as there are a few of us left. When all testing is
gone it is only a matter of a little time.

>
> > And you clearly overlook the fact that some posters here clearly state
> > that Morse code is long past usefulness and the implication is clear
> > that as far as they are concerned, it may as well pass from the scene.
>
> You, personally, have alienated a number of hams to the point that they
> would like to get rid of CW just to make you angry. If it weren't for
> your (and others) viscous personal attacks, those same hams wouldn't
> give CW a second thought. You (and other PCTA folk) are the worst
> enemies that CW ever had.

You talk like you and everyone else posting here in support of totally dropping it are its friends. What an idiot.

739. The loss of 11 meters...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 04:01:22 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <b4qc6tg7g566ts0k7og7tf3m368d0f3s1i@4ax.com>
Source record: 989

September 1958
Excerpts from FCC comments for removal of the 11 meter amateur band:

Reallocation of frequencies in the range 26.96-27.23 Mc.

The Notice of Proposed Rule Making in this proceeding recognized a need for additional spectrum space for personal use by any individual, especially those persons now holding authorizations for Class A stations in the Citizens Radio Service who will not be able to establish eligibility in any of the Industrial or Land Transportation Radio Services, as well as a substantial need for additional frequencies in the 28 Mc. range for use in the remote control of such objects or devices as model aircraft. Accordingly, it was proposed to reallocate frequencies in the band 26.96-27.23 Mc. from the Amateur Radio Service to the Citizens Radio Service for use by Class A stations for general purposes and, in addition, provide certain other frequencies, to Class C stations exclusively for the purpose of remote control. The Commission stated that this reallocation appeared appropriate because the frequencies in this band are a part of a larger frequency band within which interference may normally be expected and must be accepted from industrial, scientific and medical (1SM) devices and because, as a result of the foregoing, only limited use of this band has been made by the amateurs. In addition, it was pointed out that amateurs, as individuals, would be able to obtain licenses in the Citizens Radio Service for either radio control or voice communication in this band.
In connection with this proposal, the Commission received a very large number of comments from both individual amateurs and modelers, as well as clubs and organizations representing persons active in each of these hobbies. In general, it may be said that all but a few comments from modelers enthusiastically supported the proposal and most of those from persons who are both amateurs and modelers also supported the reallocation. Most of the comments from other amateurs were in complete opposition to any use by the Citizens Radio Service of frequencies in this band. However, a substantial number suggested that the band be shared by the Amateur and Citizens Radio Services. A few amateurs suggested that other amateur frequencies be substituted in lieu of those proposed, or concurred in tile proposed reallocation.

Typical of the reasons set forth by the amateurs opposing deletion of the availability of frequencies in the 26.96-27.23 Mc. range to the Amateur Radio Service are:

(a) The adoption of the Commission a proposal would constitute a violation of the Atlantic City Radio Regulations to which the United

States is a signatory nation.
This band is the only one in the lower frequency ranges open to the amateurs where the Commission permits certain types of emissions and operations, and accordingly where the amateurs may engage in experimentation in facsimile, continuous carrier, and duplex operations.
(b) The characteristic which make these frequencies particularly good for long range and international communications will cause too much interference from skip, and prevent the widespread use of this band for short range communications and remote control.
(c) The recent non-use of this band by amateurs is due to cyclical "sun spots".
(d) Other amateur bands are overcrowded, the service is expanding at a rapid rate, and the 26.96-27.23 Mc. band is the only area left for expansion.
(e) The fact that an amateur might obtain a Citizens Radio Service authorization is not an adequate substitute because some amateurs could not meet the age requirement of that service, and in addition, amateurs would not be permitted to make their own adjustments to a citizens radio station.

On the other hand, the modelers point out their dire and immediate need for additional frequencies, stating that the situation has been aggravated by recent authorizations of high-powered stations in other radio services on the frequency 27.255 Mc. for such purposes as traffic controls and remote radio paging. They further state that the use of frequencies in the 26.96-27.23 Mc. band for control of models is feasible and is similar to allocation practices found practical by other governments. The Commission is well aware of the history of the Amateur Radio Service in the development of the radio art and in providing a springboard of interest for future engineers and scientists. However, it must also be remembered that the remote control of models fosters a similar interest in young people and is a hobby in which young people are able to participate. The Commission is aware of the Amateurs outstanding record of assistance in local and national disasters. The Commission also recognizes that the Amateur Radio Service is a rapidly expanding service, but then, so is tile number of persons engaged in the remote control of models expanding at an ever increasing rate. While both amateurs and modelers suggest that spot frequencies located in different portions of the spectrum might be more desirable for remote control, such allocations are simply not possible at this time with the present scarcity of spectrum space.
In addition to filling the need for additional frequencies for remote control purposes, the proposed reallocation would also fill all urgent need for additional frequencies for voice communications by persons who will be unable to establish their eligibility in any of the Land Transportation or Industrial Radio Services, Although the Commission may have originally underestimated the use of the 26.96-27.23 Mc. band by amateurs, the use of that band is still considerably less than in other bands available to the amateurs, a fact which is admitted by

many amateurs and established by monitoring observations of tile Commission. As to whether the proposed reallocation would be in violation of the Atlantic City Radio Regulations, the Commission considers that no violation is involved. The primary world-wide allocation (if that frequency band is to the Fixed and Mobile Services and the footnote permitting its use by amateurs is merely permissive. Therefore, the reallocation ordered herein and in the companion proceeding in Docket No. 11959 from the Amateur Radio Service to the Citizens Radio Service is not in violation of the Regulations.
.As stated above, the 26.96-27.23 Mc. band is a part of a larger band in which interference may normally be expected from ISM devices. Most of the reasons presented in opposition to the proposed reallocation of that band to the, Citizens Radio Service were based upon potential use of this band in tile future by the Amateur Radio Service instead of actual need or existing use of the band. Monitoring records indicate that this band is not heavily used by the Amateur Radio Service, due obviously to the interference hazard presented by the operation of ISM devices on 27.12 Ale.
The Commission feels that substantially greater use can be made of this band by the Citizens Radio Service and that the loss to the Amateur Radio Service is negligible. While it is true that certain operations have been possible in this band which were not permitted on lower frequencies available to the Amateur Radio Service, such operations are still possible on frequencies above 51 Mc. and frequencies in those ranges appear to be coming into even greater usage by the amateurs than the band here under consideration. Although the Commission realizes that, in many cases an authorization in the Citizens Radio Service may not be an adequate substitute for the Privileges lost in this band; nevertheless, the Commission finds that public interest, convenience and necessity requires the reallocation of the 26.96-27.23 Mc. band to the Citizens Radio Service for the purposes proposed. The recommendation that this band be shared by the two services involved is not adopted, since that action would be inconsistent with the Commission's position in international affairs regarding the shared use of amateur bands.

740. Re: It's like this....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 04:27:03 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <945ranfep0@208.207.71.177>
Source record: 990

Brian wrote:
>
>
> You're using the K3LT argument that since this isn't wireless, you're
> free to be a jerk.

So then you're the only one free to do that?

741. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 04:33:09 UTC
From: LRod <lr0d@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <945rm5$a0e$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 991
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

In article <943boh$pc1$1@news.hawaii.edu>,
jeffreyh@Hawaii.Edu (Jeffrey Herman) wrote:

> Where did "slider" originate, Dan?

Now we're getting into an area I can speak about.

As any self respecting Chicagoan (and the environs) knows, a slider is a small square hamburger with a pickle and onions that is only purchased and eaten in quantities of 5 or more. Fries and onion rings are NOT optional, they must be consumed as well for the full effect. And that effect probably is what gives them the name "sliders."

Oh, I guess their real name is White Castle. I don't think that's a pronouncable word, however. Everytime I've heard someone try, it comes out "sliders." TAKE HOME A SACKFUL is their slogan.

Anyone having to live somewhere besides Chicago (and the environs) is comforted by the fact that they are available frozen in many other areas of the country.

LRod

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

742. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 04:42:02 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <945s6qidr0@208.207.71.177>
Source record: 992

Aaron Jones wrote:
>
> "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nospam.spam> wrote:
> > "10-20" has a honorable history in public-safety voice comms
> > but the "mutilation" is to drop the "10" and just refer to your
> > "twenty".
>
> Even cops often shorten the 10 codes to just the last number. It makes
> sense if it takes less air time and the meaning is understood by all.
> 10 codes, although codes, actually become words in the users minds,
> and like words often evolve with use...

And it *is* faster. "54, 10-20?" as a question saves time and verbiage
over
"Car 54 where are you located?"

743. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 04:43:05 UTC
From: LRod <lr0d@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <945s8paec1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 995
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.g7bafq3.pminews@ca.news.verio.net>,
"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nospam.spam> wrote:

> ...The only non-plain-language "codes" were "Code 1" through "Code
> 7" and they actually published a brochure detailing them.
>
> The California Highway Patrol used a modified "10" code ...

So do several departments in the western suburbs of Chicago
(combination of 10 sigs and Codes 1-7).

In Metro Dade County, Florida (Miami), they use Q signals.......on
voice.

Harrumph.

LRod

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

744. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 04:44:46 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <945sbuidr1@208.207.71.177>
Source record: 993
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Dan/W4NTI wrote:
>
if he can't take some criticism then he needs to go be a
> priest or something. Thats the trouble today. No one wants to pay
> their way anymore. Heck when I first got on AM phone I was made to
> feel 2 inches high. You know, not enough audio, your too week, give me
> a call when you grow up youngun.. etc.
>
> It didn't run me off, I just dug in and LEARNED.

They don't make survivors anymore, just jittery, fragile newbies with
sensitivities.

745. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 04:48:41 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <945sj9idr2@208.207.71.177>
Source record: 994

Aaron Jones wrote:
>
> K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org> wrote:
> >Talked to a young fella on the repeater the other day who introduced
> >himself by saying "my first personal is Jim and you're my first
> >contact, QSL?".
>
> Of course he could have avoided the gaff by simply listening to the
> repeater for a few weeks before using it to see how things are done.
> That's good practice whether on FM, RTTY, CW or a new newsgroup...

The poor kid is sure to have a rough life, what with being too ignorant to grasp a new procedure in a new environment, then being put off so easily when gently corrected. What *is* this new generation ever going to amount to, anyway?

746. Re: QCWA TELLS FCC TO END INCENTIVE LICENSING

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 04:52:53 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <945sr5kmn0@208.207.71.177>
Source record: 996

W1RFI wrote:
>
> >From: Bob Wex w2ilp w2ilp@juno.com
>
> >While the Novic License
> >was not producing many new Novices, let us not discount it as an entry
> >to youths who prefered to start becoming real HF Hams...Or haven't you
> >noticed.
>
> The ones who didn't notice, Bob, were the new hams who were not choosing the
> Novice as their first license.

Why should they? Another few questions and they had Tech Plus with all
Novice privileges plus 2 meters and up. With such a convoluted
licensing system, no wonder the Novice class faded away.
There was a time when FCC bothered to find out what they could expect
from changes to be made in ham radio before they made them. Somewhere
along the way that went by the way. Right along with retirements, I
suppose.

747. Re: QCWA TELLS FCC TO END INCENTIVE LICENSING

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 05:00:04 UTC
From: Bob Wex w2ilp <w2ilp@juno.com>
Message-ID: <945t8i$b8b$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 997

In article <20010117073407.05313.00001003@ng-cd1.aol.com>,
w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:
> >From: Bob Wex w2ilp w2ilp@juno.com
>
> >While the Novic License
> >was not producing many new Novices, let us not discount it as an
entry
> >to youths who prefered to start becoming real HF Hams...Or haven't
you
> >noticed.
>
> The ones who didn't notice, Bob, were the new hams who were not
choosing the
> Novice as their first license.

Here I agree with you Ed. Perhaps this was because of the Morse exam, which might be considered ancient and snail-like by modern youngsters... but I believe it is also because ham radio, even without a Morse code exam, is considered old hat by those who are already using cell-phones and capable of brousing on the Internet. In my opinion we should not have abandoned the Novice concept because of the response that the Novice entry was getting....Instead we should have made a more modern Novice entry, including a test where high school techies could show off all that they were learning with regard to computer operation and modern personal communication. Maybe if the ITU won't eliminate the CW HF requirement...the Novice license should only grant VHF and above privilages...but when the ITU eliminates CW requirements some HF privileges should also be granted...not just so future Novices could practice Morse code...but so they could get some taste of HF DX SSB. At any rate the present license structure is not set up to allow entry in a way that it can compete with non-licensed communication. At the other end... the highest class of Ham license (Extra Class) can not qualify anyone as a modern communications maven.

Three classes of license can not fit all; Can not provide motivation for easy entry; Can not indicate the value of advanced Hams to the USA! The present structure can only serve to satisfy OT hams who do not want to be tested on modern communications methods and are only interested in retaining their existing privileges;...it can not attract new blood as it appears to be too difficult for beginners and much too easy for advanced modern communication experimenters. Without lots of eager beginners, as well as knowlegable techie experimenters, the future of the hobby is doomed...

UNLESS...Hams get MORE license classes and official FCC technical
endorsements.

Thanks for your comments Ed...I know that you mean well....BUT haven't
YOU noticed?
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

73,
Bob Wex w2ilp (Insure License Potential) (Influence Little People)

It was once said that the moral test of
government is how that government treats
those who are at the dawn of life, the
children; those who are at the twilight
of life, the elderly; and those who are
in the shadow of life - the sick, the
needy and the handicapped.
--Hubert H. Humphry (1977)--

Americans have always had an ambivalent
attitude toward intelligence. When they
feel threatened, they want a lot of it,
and when they don't, they regard the whole
thing as somewhat immoral.
--Vernon A. Walters (1978)--

I beleve that we have an obligation to
those in need, but that government
should not be the provider of first
resort for things that the private
sector can produce better.
--George Bush [Sr] (1989)--

I believe that private industries must
be the providers of first resort but
I wouldn't feel safe flying without
the FAA...or communicating without
the FCC...and I wouldn't want to have
to depend on "Consumer Reports" and
"Sixty Minutes" to warn me of recalls
that should have been made public by
Ford or Goodyear.
--w2ilp--

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

748. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 06:01:16 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <9460migaa1@news.service.uci.edu>
Source record: 998

Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3A664D3B.44A4EC3E@IEEE.org...
> Jim Kelley wrote:
> > Is there an obvious answer to an accuasation that digital modes are also
> > now used for jamming?

> There's lots of accidental jamming because of mail boxes.

The timing is impecable. Why would those things run in beacon mode - on 40
meter phone frequencies?

> I suspect all
> modes are used for jamming at one time or another.

Good point.

>I once heard someone
> playing music using FM on 3950.

I doubt there's anything that hasn't been heard on that frequency.

73, Jim AC6XG

749. newbie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 06:23:21 UTC
From: 2obvious@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <94624leno1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 999

I'm an art student with no radio experience who needs to buy an FM transmitter for a project he's working on. I have this metal box with an FM radio inside it. It picks up all local stations fine, even inside the metal box. For my project, I'm trying to broadcast digital voice from my computer onto an FM frequency and into the box. I spent $30 on a transmitter from Radioshack, and it worked so poorly that I could barely pick up the signal even when the radio was outside of the metal box. I don't want to make this mistake again.

Keeping in mind that I can't build a radio and that I need an FM transmitter with a stereo jack on it (so I can hook it into my computer), does anyone know of a cheap solution to my problem? Or if this isn't the best usenet group to post this in, can anyone point me to a more appropriate one?

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

750. Re: Buy a ham ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 06:27:40 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <946281$h3f$1@news.service.uci.edu>
Source record: 1000

K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org> wrote in message news:945ift$34p$1@nnrp1.deja.com...
> > Well, practice makes perfect I always say. ;-)

> That's true, and I'm happy that the more I practice the art of Morse,
> the further from machine code it sounds. If this trend continues a
> couple more decades, I may indeed reach perfection.

Is 'perfection' a new synonym for the word 'obliteration'? Ya arta just go
for speed. If'n ya get fast enough, nobody will be able to copy what you're
sayin' that way either! That'll show 'em.

I really have no idea what you are talking about, Hans. But I'm glad you
do.
Each to his own in this hobby. Keep your words and letters separate, and
I'll try an foller ya.

73, Jim "Lonsome Dove" Kelley

751. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 06:58:35 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3A66941B.FBFACD32@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 1001
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

We have these in NJ, but never heard the term...

LRod wrote:

> In article <943boh$pc1$1@news.hawaii.edu>,
> jeffreyh@Hawaii.Edu (Jeffrey Herman) wrote:
>
> > Where did "slider" originate, Dan?
>
> Now we're getting into an area I can speak about.
>
> As any self respecting Chicagoan (and the environs) knows, a slider is a
> small square hamburger with a pickle and onions that is only purchased
> and eaten in quantities of 5 or more. Fries and onion rings are NOT
> optional, they must be consumed as well for the full effect. And that
> effect probably is what gives them the name "sliders."
>
> Oh, I guess their real name is White Castle. I don't think that's a
> pronouncable word, however. Everytime I've heard someone try, it comes
> out "sliders." TAKE HOME A SACKFUL is their slogan.
>
> Anyone having to live somewhere besides Chicago (and the environs) is
> comforted by the fact that they are available frozen in many other areas
> of the country.
>
> LRod
>
> Sent via Deja.com
> http://www.deja.com/

752. Re: newbie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 07:46:35 UTC
From: Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com>
Message-ID: <3A669F5B.57B0F93D@dvol.com>
Source record: 1002

2obvious@my-deja.com wrote:

> transmitter with a stereo jack on it (so I can hook it into my
> computer), does anyone know of a cheap solution to my problem? Or if
> this isn't the best usenet group to post this in, can anyone point me
> to a more appropriate one?

>
One better group would be rec.radio.amateur.equipment. It sounds like you need a transmitter like those used in wireless microphones. Poke around the music and broadcast industries.
>
Brian Kelly

753. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 08:17:50 UTC
From: Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com>
Message-ID: <3A66A6AE.AADF43BA@dvol.com>
Source record: 1003
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Phil Kane wrote:

> On Wed, 17 Jan 2001 08:06:40 -0500, Brian Kelly wrote:
>
> >The ten code was been dropped eons ago by the gendarmes in this area.
>
> The Los Angeles PD never used the "10" code. The only
> non-plain-language "codes" were "Code 1" through "Code 7" and
> they actually published a brochure detailing them.
>
> The Los Angeles Sheriff's Department used a "nine" code.
>
> The California Highway Patrol used a modified "10" code with
> "eleven" code additions.
>
> Made it interesting for us 50s-60s era police radio buffs
> (before scanners were avaliable).

>
I forget how many 10 codes there are/were on the "official list" but I think it's around to thirty of 'em. 40? Looney-tunes. All they do is tax memories and generate mistakes and confusion when you least needed either.

>
In the mid-70s I set up a passive CB-equipped neighborhood Townwatch security association and created a completly non-standard 10 code list of about 12 codes which still works well. Those codes don't go any farther than routine operations, mostly to avoid spilling the beans about when the patrols are or are not "on the street" or where they are, etc. All other comms are plain language per all police operations in the Philly area I've heard. I've noticed that the locals are also packing cell phones these days, that oughta cut down on problems with the scanner nuts.
>

> --
> 73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

>
w3rv

754. Re: Sound Familiar?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 08:25:13 UTC
From: Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com>
Message-ID: <3A66A869.A73DBDF6@dvol.com>
Source record: 1004

Aaron Jones wrote:

> Cairo. And, while we are at it, why not ask President Roosevelt to put
> a couple of good amateurs on the FCC, if only in an advisory capacity
> without any cost whatsoever to the Government? We know of many good
> men who are anxious to serve!
>
> Political Editor - December 1934 Radio magazine

>
. . . and today we have greatly expanded HF privs vs. 1934 with more
coming, the old brawl has simply moved up the spectrum.
>
w3rv

755. Re: Black list

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 08:38:34 UTC
From: Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com>
Message-ID: <3A66AB8A.D9CBAE95@dvol.com>
Source record: 1005

K0HB wrote:

> In article <944ulvgd1@front4m.grolier.fr>,
> "Swann" <swann@dromadaire.com> wrote:
>
> > Don't waste QSL and time and visit :
> >
> > http://www.dromadaire.com/black-list/1
>
> Just for grins I checked the calls on your stupid list against my
> logs. In the past year I have had contest QSO's with 11 stations on
> the list. Five of them have sent me QSL's. So much for your
> credibility.

>
. . . a couple of 'em are my fellow dx contest club members who routinely roll up 10,000-20,000 contacts per YEAR depending on whether they go single or multi-op. They gave up qsling years ago, no way they can possibly handle the volumes of cards they get.
>

>
> 73, Hans, K0HB

>
w3rv

756. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 08:42:05 UTC
From: Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com>
Message-ID: <3A66AC5D.D43B1133@dvol.com>
Source record: 1006

Aaron Jones wrote:

> "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nospam.spam> wrote:
> > "10-20" has a honorable history in public-safety voice comms
> > but the "mutilation" is to drop the "10" and just refer to your
> > "twenty".
>
> Even cops often shorten the 10 codes to just the last number. It makes
> sense if it takes less air time and the meaning is understood by all.
> 10 codes, although codes, actually become words in the users minds,
> and like words often evolve with use...

>
Ya mean like cw exchanges are a languge?
>
w3rv

757. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 09:15:17 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010118041517.05040.00002250@ng-ff1.aol.com>
Source record: 1007

>From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

>You betcher bippy I know what it means. And what it doesn't.

I bet lobster dinners, Dick, not my bippy.

> When you take a driver's test you 1.)take a written test and 2.)take a
>practical operational exam where you demonstrate that you can actuall
>drive the darn thing.

The present testing for Morse code is analogous to my driving test determining only if I signal correctly. If I fail to signal correctly, I don't get my license.

If you really believe that Amateur Radio testing requires practical testing, you would advocate a wide range of practical tests that test the ability of the applicant to operate a wide range of modes.

Did your comments to the FCC ask that they give practical tests in setting up a station, selecting a radio, operating modes other than Morse code, etc? If not, then, IMHO, you are seeking only to keep Morse code testing and a "practical operating exam" has nothing to do with it.

I'm sure you know this.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

758. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 09:16:44 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010118041644.05040.00002251@ng-ff1.aol.com>
Source record: 1008

>From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

>All the whiners are still at it just a loudly as though the 5wpm code
>test actually amounted to something. Whatta joke!

If you believe that the 5 wpm test doesn't amount to anything, why are you
"whining" so loudly to keep it?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

759. Re: Sound Familiar?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 09:21:43 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010118042143.05040.00002252@ng-ff1.aol.com>
Source record: 1009

>From: Brian Kelly kelly@dvol.com

>> Political Editor - December 1934 Radio magazine

>. . . and today we have greatly expanded HF privs vs. 1934 with more
>coming, the old brawl has simply moved up the spectrum.

And those threats did actually surface, again and again over the decades. It was only by addressing them at the international level that Amateur Radio retained its spectrum.

Don't just look to VHF and up for spectrum threats. There are HF allocations on the plate now, both with new spectrum being sought and with spectrum under challenge. Even 40 meters is once again going to be considered. The goal is, of course, to get an exclusive allocation near 7 MHz, but this may not end up quite as good as it sounds. How would you feel if that exclusive allocation were 200 kHz wide? I can tell you, the European hams would claim great victory, of course, going from 100 kHz to 200 kHz, but in the US, we would "lose" 100 kHz if that came to pass. IMHO, we are better off if it happens, because I can't make much effective use of spectrum above 7.1 MHz anyway; if 7.1-7.2 were cleared of broadcasters, the band, IMHO, would be "expanded."

Of course, if it did come down that way, we would hear from the doom and gloom contingent pretty quickly. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

760. Re: Black list

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 09:24:03 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010118042403.05040.00002253@ng-ff1.aol.com>
Source record: 1010

>From: Brian Kelly kelly@dvol.com

>. . . a couple of 'em are my fellow dx contest club members who
>routinely roll up 10,000-20,000 contacts per YEAR depending on whether
>they go single or multi-op. They gave up qsling years ago, no way they
>can possibly handle the volumes of cards they get.

Something I consider when working search and pouncing in the SS contest. Those stations who did not answer my QSL requests from years past do not get my time for another contact.

I am sure this applies to DXers, too.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

761. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 09:26:00 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010118042600.05040.00002254@ng-ff1.aol.com>
Source record: 1011

>From: xjim@my-deja.com

>By lowering standards and force
>feeding numerous ignorant individuals onto the ham bands, how are we
>improving the standing of Amateur Radio?

The scope of the Technician exam is at least an order of magnitude more than
was the scope of the 1963 Novice exam I took.

How is this "lowering standards?"

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

762. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 09:29:09 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010118042909.05040.00002255@ng-ff1.aol.com>
Source record: 1012

>From: Brian brianburke@my-deja.com

>Ex-Jim, much of the hate and discontent is coming from some OTs.

Brian, if this forum is a snapshot of the hate and discontent, there is plenty to go around. I have seen some very mean-spirited comments come out of OTs and out of relative newcomers. I have lost my "cool" once or twice -- haven't you?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

763. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 09:33:22 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010118043322.05040.00002256@ng-ff1.aol.com>
Source record: 1013

>From: Aaron Jones nomail@nomail.com

>Of course he could have avoided the gaff by simply listening to the
>repeater for a few weeks before using it to see how things are done.

I didn't listen to the bands for a few weeks before using my Novice ticket. The day it showed up in the mailbox, I sent my first CQ and made a few contacts.

The "gaff" could have been avoided if everyone had decided that it wasn't a big enough deal to be labeled a "gaff" in the first place. How was he to know that he might face criticism if he didn't choose the correct words when he introduced himself to people? Let's see, after a few weeks, he MIGHT have figured out that "handle" was okay if he was talking to an old timer, but a newcomer might think he used to be a CBer, and he MIGHT have been a freebander, so he should ....

At any rate, I hope he received a warm welcome to our community instead of a lecture.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

764. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 09:34:35 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010118043435.05040.00002257@ng-ff1.aol.com>
Source record: 1014

>From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

> The poor kid is sure to have a rough life, what with being too ignorant
>to grasp a new procedure in a new environment, then being put off so
>easily when gently corrected. What *is* this new generation ever going
>to amount to, anyway?

I sure hope no one told him he was "ignorant" when they "gently corrected" him.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

765. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 09:35:30 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010118043530.05040.00002258@ng-ff1.aol.com>
Source record: 1015

>From: Aaron Jones nomail@nomail.com

>Every hobby has it's preferred lingo. If you use the wrong lingo you
>immediately identify yourself as an outsider...

You do mean "former" outsider, do you not? This fellow did get a ham license,
so he is now one of us.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

766. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 09:36:36 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010118043636.05040.00002259@ng-ff1.aol.com>
Source record: 1016

>From: Aaron Jones nomail@nomail.com

>How many hours of study do you estimate that it would take for a
>*non-technical* person to "know and understand" all the material to
>pass the Extra test?

IMHO, less than it would take to memorize over a thousand questions without developing any understanding.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

767. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 09:39:14 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010118043914.05040.00002260@ng-ff1.aol.com>
Source record: 1017

>From: "W4JLE" Fred@w4jle.com

>The problem with being self taught is you have someone as ignorant as you
>for a teacher.

After someone obtains a degree, if they are successful in their chosen field,
they all spend a lifetime being self taught.

A very few people cannot learn anything on their own, but they are not likely
to be hams.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

768. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 09:42:14 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010118044214.05040.00002261@ng-ff1.aol.com>
Source record: 1018

>From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

>> > Nope. 40 meter SSB.

>> A "No Coder" is jamming you on 40m SSB?

>Well if a "No licenser" did it what's to stop a "No coder"?

Did the person identify so you could determine whether he or she had a license or not and whether they had passed a code test?

Would the jamming have been aceptable to you if you learned it had been done by someone who passed a code test?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

769. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 09:43:28 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010118044328.05040.00002262@ng-ff1.aol.com>
Source record: 1019

>From: Cecil Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>If you won't say it, you don't mean it.

Can we presume, then, Cecil, that you don't mean all the things you don't say?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

770. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 09:50:10 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010118045010.05040.00002263@ng-ff1.aol.com>
Source record: 1020

>From: Cecil Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>N2EY wrote:

>> Can you prove to me that NOBODY wants the USE of Morse on the
>>ham bands to end?

>> I have read many diatribes against the mode, not the test.

>That's asking someone to prove a negative.

It does not need to be proved to me that there is someone, somewhere that would like to see Morse code use on the bands ended.

I have seen a few diatribes here against Morse code. Even if one feels it is a mode that offers no redeeming value (I disagree), their discussion of same does not mean that they necessarily feel its use should be outlawed.

We CAN look to the comments made to the FCC, because I don't think that we can infer that those who say here that they think Morse code should be outlawed are necessarily serious. Lacking any evidence to the contrary, I think it quite likely that those statements were made more to stir the pot than to be serious. If those saying they believe the mode should be outlawed were serious, they would have made their views known where they could have an actual effect.

Probably about as close to "proof" as we can get, Cecil. Is it at least "a preponderance of the evidence?" This is a "civil" debate, so we don't need "beyond a reasonable doubt."

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

771. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 09:52:14 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010118045214.05040.00002264@ng-ff1.aol.com>
Source record: 1021

>From: Dan/W4NTI w4nti@my-deja.com

>Heck when I first got on AM phone I was made to
>feel 2 inches high.

Exactly why AM phone is of interest to so few, I imagine...

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

772. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 09:54:23 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010118045423.05040.00002265@ng-ff1.aol.com>
Source record: 1022

>From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

> They don't make survivors anymore, just jittery, fragile newbies with
>sensitivities.

That could describe me when I was first licensed as a Novice.

Fortunately, I didn't find anyone who felt that it was best for Amateur Radio
that he reminded me that I was a jittery, fragile newbie with sensitivities.

Frankly, Dick, I would much rather see new hams with sensitivities than those
who are cold and insensitive to the feelings of others.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

773. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 09:55:57 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010118045557.05040.00002266@ng-ff1.aol.com>
Source record: 1023

>From: Cecil Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>You (and other PCTA folk) are the worst enemies that CW ever had.

Careful with that broad brush, Cecil. I have seen some who advocate code testing who feel they don't need to insult new hams to make their points.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

774. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 09:57:44 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010118045744.05040.00002267@ng-ff1.aol.com>
Source record: 1024

>From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

> You talk like you and everyone else posting here in support of totally
>dropping it are its friends. What an idiot.

Dick, refresh my memory; who here is in support of totally dropping code?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

775. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 10:00:05 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010118050005.05040.00002268@ng-ff1.aol.com>
Source record: 1025

>From: Brian Kelly kelly@dvol.com

>There's a trick I'll keep in mind! What's the lead time between shipping the
>copy from HQ and distributing the magazine?

The magazine is usually sent to the printer around the 25th of the month. The Reviews are usually posted around the 1st. The magazine usually starts hitting mailboxes around the 15th. The issue will be dated the first of the next month, so the March issue should arrive in your mailbox on or about Feb 15.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

776. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 10:03:07 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010118050307.05040.00002269@ng-ff1.aol.com>
Source record: 1026

>From: Cecil Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>Which is worse lobster-meal deficit or lobster deficit? Are you going
>to Ft. Tuthill this year and/or any hamfests in and around Texas?

There is a 99% shot I will be at Ft Tuthill this year. But, as I recently
learned, lobster is mighty expensive in AZ. How about we settle for a steak,
or you can cook me a hot dog around the infamous Ft Tuthill QRP campfire?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

777. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 10:05:53 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010118050553.05040.00002270@ng-ff1.aol.com>
Source record: 1027

>From: xjim@my-deja.com

>If you go no further, you have failed at Amateur Radio.

I agree, Jim. I believe that your statement applies to the ham tests of any era. It applies to those who have a BSEE. I think it is expected that we will actually do something with our licences. The FCC does not allocate us spectrum because we pass tests. .

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

778. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 10:07:05 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010118050705.05040.00002271@ng-ff1.aol.com>
Source record: 1028

>From: "Jim Kelley" jwkelley@uci.edu

>It is probably more accurate to say that multiple choice tests measure with
>a degree of certainty, the test takers ability to prepare for a test.

Well, I gotta' add that if it is broken, it has been broken since the mid 60s.
All of my FCC-given tests were 100% multiple choice.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

779. Re: QCWA TELLS FCC TO END INCENTIVE LICENSING

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 10:10:00 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010118051000.05040.00002272@ng-ff1.aol.com>
Source record: 1029

>From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

>> The ones who didn't notice, Bob, were the new hams who were not choosing
>>the Novice as their first license.

> Why should they? Another few questions and they had Tech Plus with all
>Novice privileges plus 2 meters and up.

And their meeting additional requirements is bad how?

Oh, and the "another few questions" was an additional 30 questions, from a
question pool of about 330.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

780. Re: QCWA TELLS FCC TO END INCENTIVE LICENSING

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 10:11:56 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010118051156.05040.00002273@ng-ff1.aol.com>
Source record: 1030

>From: Bob Wex w2ilp

>I believe it is also because ham radio, even without a Morse code
>exam, is considered old hat by those who are already using cell-phones
>and capable of brousing on the Internet.

Why are there more hams now than there were before cell phones and internet
became widespread?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

781. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 10:15:28 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010118051528.05040.00002274@ng-ff1.aol.com>
Source record: 1031

>From: "Jim Kelley" jwkelley@uci.edu

>Looks like there's a typo in the test question.

There are questions in the current pool that contain similar faux pas.

> A better question might be to explain the differences between a DC
> ground and an RF ground.

He may have also meant an AC-line safety ground.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

782. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 11:36:45 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010118063645.07593.00002569@nso-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 1032

In article <frM86.849$e5.2163286@news.ntplx.net>, "Ed Hare, W1RFI"
<w1rfi@arrl.net> writes:

>
>First, let me be clear that I do not believe we should have a one-class
>license system. Though I believe that not grandfathering existing licencees
>when incentive licensing was put into effect was a mistake, I think that the
>premise of incentive licensing is appropriate.

Ed:

As long as the "incentive" isn't attached to making a dedicated effort
to learn and master a practical communications skill, eh?

>The biggest problem I think we face, Larry, is one of spectrum. That will
>be solved as much by useage of the bands as it will anything else. Let me
>turn the question around and ask you how having a multi-WPM test series will
>solve that problem?

Apparently, it could do a lot more than merely giving away HF privileges.
So far, Restructuring has been a colossal flop. Sure, there was a lot of
upgrading activity, with people taking advantage of grandfathering. But
the total numbers of new hams has, to date, been shockingly low.
Therefore, one could draw the conclusion that easier licensing requirements
aren't the answer to our situation. I think the answer is that ham radio
in the USA is about as big as it's ever going to get, without a national,
major media advertising campaign to get the word out about what we do.
Again, I say -- word of mouth, hams "talking up" ham radio in their local
area, IS NOT ENOUGH -- and never will be. For the most part, all hams
do is talk to other hams -- "preaching to the choir" as it were.

>Another problem is that we are not seen as being relevant by many in
>industry and at the FCC. How will having a multi-WPM test series solve that
>problem? IMHO, this is the most important reason to replace the Morse code
>tests with tests relating to newer technology.

Uh, don't look now, Ed, but Morse code testing, at as many levels
as you like, and "tests relating to newer technology" are not mutually
exclusive! Why does one have to be eliminated in order to implement
the other? I want a full explanation for that, Ed. Answer that question.
Why does testing for knowledge of a practical manual communications
skill prohibit the updating of written tests to reflect technology advances --
or vice versa?

>When the no-code VHF license was introduced, there was a sudden influx of
>newcomers for which there simply was not sufficient Elmering. How will
>having a multi-speed code test series solve that problem.

I'll answer your question that answered my question with another question: Why is "Elmering" so essential? I became an Extra-class licensee under the "old" system with virtually no one-on-one "Elmering" whatsoever. I knew how to open a book and read it, and that's what I did. I've offered my services as an "Elmer" many times in the past, but one requirement I made was that the books must first be opened up, and read. Sorry, no sale. What the "elmerees" wanted was to be shown the right button to push to make the radio work. I said, "OK, open up your instruction manual -- it'll tell you in there!" "Waaaaahhh!! Don't wanna read and learn anything --- wanna talk on radio!! WaaaaaHHHH!!!"

>I see the petty bickering that is taking place here and elsewhere and the
>sour grapes and/or gloating as being harmful to the amateur radio service.
>How wil having a multi-speed code test series solve that problem.

What are the sour grapes and gloating about? Mainly, jealousy over certain accomplishments certain hams have made, and the fact that making the same accomplishment would require the person with the "sour grapes" to get off their collective duffs and do the work necessary to make that achievement for themselves! I'm sure I'm considered to be "gloating" merely for having a 1x2 callsign -- I've already been told as much by certain local hams. I'm sorry I'm not "politically correct" in the eyes of the slouchers, Ed. I'm sure you'll do your part to make up for it.

>What problems do you think are facing the Amateur Radio Service and how do
>you think having a multi-speed code-test series will solve them?

I think the problem we have in Amateur Radio is that we've lost track of traditional values, as we have in virtually every other aspect of our society. I don't think multi-speed code test series will solve that, but the fact that the code tests are a main part of the "problem" for the slouchers places them at the locus of concern. If getting an HF license required the learning of a foreign language, and testing for fluency in same, then THAT would be the issue. The whole thing revolves around the laziness of people who want privileges without making the effort to learn practical skills in order to earn them. Solve that, and this newsgroup will come to an end.

73 de Larry, K3LT

783. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 11:36:46 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010118063646.07593.00002570@nso-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 1033

In article <t69urethiab696@news.supernews.com>, vlfiscus@mcn.net (Vince Fiscus, KB7ADL) writes:

>
>Ya know ED, I must've of read 60 of your posts tonight in various
>threads and you're a living example of the Leagues restructuring proposal.
>You won't promote anything that will improve ham radio and neither will
>your employer!
>
>ARRL policy makes me want to vomit.

Watch out, Vince! Now Ed's gonna ask you several questions, each ending with: How is a multi-level code test going to help?

Naturally, you're correct. Ham radio is heading down the drain, particularly with regard to it's attractiveness to young people. The irony is, young people used to be attracted to ham radio by the very thing that the middle-aged white men don't want anything to do with -- the Morse code! Kids love learning the code, they make a competitive challenge out of it, and, if given a chance to use it on-the-air, usually become experts at it in very short order. The requirement to learn the code doesn't keep young people away from ham radio -- the overbearing, overwhelming negative influence of middle-aged white men does! They get on the air, and all they get to discuss -- on voice or CW -- is the health and welfare of the individual at the other end of the QSO. There is little original discussion of events, new ideas, science, music, the arts -- the talk is usually all about the person doing the talking, as if he (usually male) were the center of the universe. When young people get together to chat, they rarely talk about themselves. That's why the typical CW QSO, consisting of call sign, name, QTH in Florida, age, how many years retired, local WX report, and "Got to QRT to get to the Senior Center for the free lunch" just don't cut it with young people who are curious about amateur radio. The ARRL's dumbing-down policies are pandering to more of this. Young people don't need reduced licensing requirements -- just a less "lame" ARS!

73 de Larry, K3LT

784. Re: Sound Familiar?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 11:40:33 UTC
From: Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com>
Message-ID: <3A66D631.16122CDB@dvol.com>
Source record: 1034

W1RFI wrote:

> >From: Brian Kelly kelly@dvol.com
>
> >> Political Editor - December 1934 Radio magazine
>
> >. . . and today we have greatly expanded HF privs vs. 1934 with more
> >coming, the old brawl has simply moved up the spectrum.
>
> And those threats did actually surface, again and again over the decades. It
> was only by addressing them at the international level that Amateur Radio
> retained its spectrum.

>
No question about that. Since the QPC is into testing things like modes not used
by hams they might as well also toss in a test for having read the DeSoto
chronicles for a reality check on how scary close it got and what really matters.

>

> Don't just look to VHF and up for spectrum threats. There are HF allocations
> on the plate now, both with new spectrum being sought and with spectrum under
> challenge.

>
. . . just love those Part 15 widgets . .
>

> Even 40 meters is once again going to be considered. The goal is,
> of course, to get an exclusive allocation near 7 MHz, but this may not end up
> quite as good as it sounds. How would you feel if that exclusive allocation
> were 200 kHz wide?

>
Thankful.
>

> I can tell you, the European hams would claim great
> victory, of course, going from 100 kHz to 200 kHz, but in the US, we would
> "lose" 100 kHz if that came to pass. IMHO, we are better off if it happens,
> because I can't make much effective use of spectrum above 7.1 MHz anyway; if
> 7.1-7.2 were cleared of broadcasters, the band, IMHO, would be "expanded."

>
I absolutely agree with that. Sure, we're allowed to operate from 7.0 to 7.3. But
on a shared basis with a large number of the biggest BC boomers in the biz.
Complete with both sidebands and mongo carriers, the ultimate spectrum hogs. And

we're getting spanked for not using state-of-the-art modes to conserve spectrum space? Humbug. Tell it to Putin.
>
On any given nite I doubt we have a really usable 75 Khz to ourselves. I'll take a clean 200 Khz any day.
>
What's the latest rumors on that issue? I keep hearing 6.9-7.1 Mhz. If that becomes reality there's gonna be a lot of interesting diode snipping and/or a big market for replacement PROMs. Or something.
>
I can see the QST articles now: "How to Booger Yer $3k Type-Accepted SMT-Fabbed Xcvr to Get It On 6.9-7.1 . . . ".
>
>Of course, if it did come down that way, we would hear from the doom and gloom

> contingent pretty quickly. :-)

>
Uh huh. They're still wringing their hands over the loss of 11m . . . I was there, that band was an RF trashpit long before the CBers got it. The early 11m CBers got screwed but fortunately weren't smart enough to understand that.
>

> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

>
w3rv

785. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 11:42:38 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <946kre$t33$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1036

In article <20010118042909.05040.00002255@ng-ff1.aol.com>,
w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:
> >From: Brian brianburke@my-deja.com
>
> >Ex-Jim, much of the hate and discontent is coming from some OTs.
>
> Brian, if this forum is a snapshot of the hate and discontent, there
is plenty
> to go around. I have seen some very mean-spirited comments come out of
OTs and
> out of relative newcomers. I have lost my "cool" once or twice --
haven't you?
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

Oh Absolutely! As a 13 year articipant in the ARS, I not only have tired of hearing the OTs bitching, but I've begun countering they're insane accusations. And as a 13 participant, I am a rank beginner in Ham Years.

That should put some perspective on the situation.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

786. CA power crisis caused by internet

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 11:43:44 UTC
From: kking@no-mail.com
Message-ID: <946ktg$b6c$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 1035
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

The California power crisis is not due to what we have been led to
believe. Instead, it is the fault of the internet.

You who are reading this helped cause the problem, as CNN has documented
at http://www.cnn.com/2001/TECH/computing/01/17/internet.energy.idg

Shame on all of you!

787. Re: Anyone For An RRAP Meeting At Dayton?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 11:52:33 UTC
From: Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com>
Message-ID: <3A66D901.6B7D086A@dvol.com>
Source record: 1037

Brian wrote:

> In article <94464jpck1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
> Steven J Robeson, K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com> wrote:
>
> > Hmmmmm??????
>
> Just as long as you's guys don't embarass me in front of my friends.

>
You actually got friends? OK, that's easy. Don't bring your friends. We
want you all by yerself . . .

788. Re: Sound Familiar?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 12:03:30 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <946m2gtuk1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1038

In article <4jhc6tcpartogfhd6eao3ss6t6vb2cv8pr@4ax.com>,
Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com> wrote:
snip
> Cairo. And, while we are at it, why not ask President Roosevelt to put
> a couple of good amateurs on the FCC, if only in an advisory capacity
> without any cost whatsoever to the Government? We know of many good
> men who are anxious to serve!
>
> Political Editor - December 1934 Radio magazine

I thought the ARRL handled the advisory role in 1934?

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

789. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 12:18:12 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3A66DEE0.1CD3D57D@sccoast.net>
Source record: 1039
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

K0HB wrote:
>
> [snip] Like I said, he seemed pretty bright to me,
> quick to catch on to things. What do think it was
> that he caught on to about us from "Radio Cop".

I'll never forget my worst incident with a "radio cop." I had encouraged my wife to get her license. Since she knew absolutely nothing about radio before studying for that exam, and had studied for three weeks to pass the exam, that license was hard earned and she was darn proud of it.

Anyway, part way through our second conversation on the radio, the "radio cop" made his grand entrance. The previous night, my wife had problems getting her radio set up to work correctly (it was my old radio - purchased because it was loaded with features, not because it was necessarily easy to use). So our conversation was somewhat limited that night.

However, the next night, I had set the radio up to default to an easier mode (preset memory channels), so that we could concentrait more on conversation (figuring she would eventually learn the radio eventually on her own).

Anyway, that night, we tried several of the memory channels (each set to a different repeater), trying to figure out which repeater would be best for her to talk on during her trip to and from work each day (which repeater had coverage of the whole trip distance).

Finally, we settled on two memory channels - the main one and a backup (which would be set to memory channels one and two on the radio). As we were discussing this, a male voice boomed in with the words, "frequencies, not channels." Believing that someone else might want to use the repeater, I told my wife to hold on a second and invited the person to go ahead.

At that point, the "radio cop" started lecturing my wife about how we use frequencies instead of channels in ham radio and further suggested that she should also stop using CB slang (she had said "roger" earlier).

When he was finished, I explained that we were referring to the memory channels on her radio, that she was new to ham radio, that my goal was just to get her talking on the radio at this point, and that little issues like that could be corrected later.

In response, he pointed out that radio memories were nothing more than memorized frequencies, that I should refer to the frequencies memorized

instead of the memory channels, that I was failing my wife by not teaching her properly from the beginning, and then turned back to lecture my wife some more, ending with a suggestion that she find someone better than me to teach her in the future if she wants to learn how to do things correctly.

After he was finished, I thanked him for his input and tried to contact my wife again. She simply said that she was almost home (she wasn't) and that she would talk to me when she got there.

It took me almost four days to get her to talk on the radio again, and then only on a frequency that I was able to assure her was not likely monitored by anyone else. And, dispite our almost nightly conversations, it was going to be another five months before she would be confident enough to talk to someone else. In fact, to this day (almost two years later), she has only talked to two people, besides myself, on the radio. And her enthusiasm about, and pride in, radio are long gone.

In the end, the "radio cop" did a good job of defending "proper" tradition on the radio. But in doing so, he ruined my wife's enjoyment of this hobby (and, for all practical purposes, ended her hobby before it even got started). And that is why I'll never forget that "radio cop."

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net

790. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 12:47:17 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010118074717.26248.00000006@ng-fm1.aol.com>
Source record: 1040

>From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

>As long as the "incentive" isn't attached to making a dedicated effort
>to learn and master a practical communications skill, eh?

As long as the incentive is directed toward what I believe will help further the long-term goals of the Amateur Radio Service.

>So far, Restructuring has been a colossal flop. Sure, there was a lot of
>upgrading activity, with people taking advantage of grandfathering.

You believe that people learning new things and passing new tests is a "colossal flop?"

>But the total numbers of new hams has, to date, been shockingly low.

A slight increase, reversing a trend that had been a slight decline.

>Therefore, one could draw the conclusion that easier licensing requirements
>aren't the answer to our situation.

I absolutely agree; the problems facing the Amateur Radio Service will not be solved if only we could test hams in just the right way.

> I think the answer is that ham radio in the USA is about as big as it's ever
> going to get, without a national, major media advertising campaign to
> get the word out about what we do.

Although I disagreed with you that prime-time TV advertising was needed, I agree that Amateur Radio, and ARRL, need to do a better job promoting ham radio. However, I wonder what percentage of those that might be interested in ham radio, but have not yet taken any tests, are not aware of its existence? Probably few. I do imagine that a lot of those who are interested are already hams. We might gain a significant number if we got the word out better about restructuring.

>Again, I say -- word of mouth, hams "talking up" ham radio in their local
>area, IS NOT ENOUGH -- and never will be. For the most part, all hams
>do is talk to other hams -- "preaching to the choir" as it were.

I am much more likely to buy a product if I get good word of mouth about it than if I read an ad. Unfortunately, the word of mouth at this point may not be very good. Ever since I did it, our ranks have always had a high percentage of people whose first personal experience with radio was on 11 meters. The 11-meter folks of that day looked up to hams, and felt that if they became hams, they would be doing a better version of what they were doing at the time. How about today? I have read some of the CB newsgroups, and talked to a number of CBers. Do you not think they might resent the use of "CBer" as an

insulting term within ham radio? Do you think they are not well aware that if they join our ranks, a few curmudgeons will go out of their way to tell them how dumbed-down they are because they took these new exams? Do you think our reputation for "gently reminding" them that they must choose exactly the right words when the join in amateur conversations would help bring in these newcomers.

I will believe your sincerity about wanting to bring in newcomers to ham radio with mass-media advertising when I see your personal conduct reflecting the same desire.

>Uh, don't look now, Ed, but Morse code testing, at as many levels
>as you like, and "tests relating to newer technology" are not mutually
>exclusive! Why does one have to be eliminated in order to implement
>the other? I want a full explanation for that, Ed.

Yes, you usually do want a full explanation, Larry. :-) You are correct, Morse code testing and relevant testing are not mutually exclusive, but I do not believe that Morse code testing adds to the perceived value of Amateur Radio outside of some amateur circles. I do not want to eliminate Morse code testing in the Amateur Radio Service, btw; I believe it should continue to be part of our testing process as long as it enjoys significant popularity on the air. I just believe that it should be tested as is the testing for other modes -- by including the questions about sent text as part of the overall exam.

>I'll answer your question that answered my question with another
>question: Why is "Elmering" so essential? I became an Extra-class
>licensee under the "old" system with virtually no one-on-one "Elmering"
>whatsoever.

Yes, but Larry, you are so far advanced over mere humans that you can do that. I did not. If it weren't for W1BNB, I don't think I would have been nearly as successul at setting up and using my station. I think, however, the real reason that I believe Elmering to be important is that we can see the evidence of lack of Elmering in the low activity rate and probable low renewal rate of the Technicians who entered ham radio right after the no-code Tech was put into place.

>I knew how to open a book and read it, and that's what
>I did.

If you agree that opening a book and read it is adequate to obtain the practical knowledge that is passed along by Elmering, perhaps you could consider advocating opening a book and reading it as a good way of obtaining the practical knowledge of Morse code use...

>WaaaaaHHHH!!!"

I do agree, Larry; you should probably not be an Elmer. No one likes to see a grown man carry on so.

>What are the sour grapes and gloating about? Mainly, jealousy over
>certain accomplishments certain hams ...

I have seen you offering what I believe to be sour grapes, Larry. Who are YOU jealous of?

>I'm sure I'm considered to be "gloating"

No, the gloating was by those who wanted to rub in the code-test changes to the pro-code test folks. I put you in the sour grapes category in that regard, Larry; sorry.

>I'm not "politically correct" in the eyes of the slouchers, Ed.

Is it now "politically correct" to call what my upbringing taught me was rudeness and insensitivity "politically correct?"

> I'm sure you'll do your part to make up for it.

Thank you, Larry, but it is not that simple.

>I think the problem we have in Amateur Radio is that we've lost track of
>traditional values, as we have in virtually every other aspect of our
>society.

Are the mean-spirited things I have seen you say about or to some newcomers and some of those who disagree with you part of those "traditional values?"

> I don't think multi-speed code test series will solve that, but the
>fact that the code tests are a main part of the "problem" for the slouchers
>places them at the locus of concern.

Some of those who believe that the code testing should be changed have passed the code tests already, Larry; are they "slouchers" or do you have another category into which you can neatly lump them all?

>The whole thing revolves around the laziness
>of people who want privileges without making the effort to learn practical
>skills in order to earn them.

The problem is not laziness at all, Larry; it is that some people are not willing to learn the one practical skill that will satisfy you. If hams WERE required to learn a foreign language to be licensed, let's say,oh, 26 words and 10 numbers, would you be satisfied?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

791. Re: Anyone For An RRAP Meeting At Dayton?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 12:47:18 UTC
From: "Steven J Robeson", K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <946oklvoi1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1043

In article <945hdi$27b$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com> wrote:

> Just as long as you's guys don't embarass me in front of my friends.

Both of them?

--
"If You're Not A Ham....You're SPAM!"

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

792. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 12:53:08 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010118075308.26248.00000007@ng-fm1.aol.com>
Source record: 1041

>From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

>Watch out, Vince! Now Ed's gonna ask you several questions, each
>ending with: How is a multi-level code test going to help?

No, I just invite Vince to discuss what he disagrees with and why, rather than a sweeping generalization about the state of his appetite.

>Naturally, you're correct. Ham radio is heading down the drain,
>particularly with regard to it's attractiveness to young people.

Are you saying that young people were joining ham radio in droves up until April 15, 2000?

>The irony is, young people used to be attracted to ham radio by the
>very thing that the middle-aged white men don't want anything
>to do with -- the Morse code!

Morse code is still a very much alive and well part of ham radio, Larry.

> Kids love learning the code, they
make a competitive challenge
> out of it, and, if given a chance to use it on-the-air, usually become
experts
> at it in very short order.

Then why do you feel they will love it even more if they are given tests in it? I remember lots of spelling tests from school, but not one single kickball test. Guess which activity I spent more time doing.

>The requirement to learn the code doesn't keep young people
>away from ham radio -- the overbearing, overwhelming negative
>influence of middle-aged white men does!

Do you feel that the things you have been saying on this forum are not overwhelming and negative?

> They get on the air, and all they get to discuss -- on voice or CW --
> is the health and welfare of the individual at the other end of the QSO.

And here we discuss whether Vince's stomach is feeling well. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

793. Re: Sound Familiar?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 12:55:40 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010118075540.26248.00000008@ng-fm1.aol.com>
Source record: 1042

>From: Brian Kelly kelly@dvol.com

>Since the QPC is into testing things like modes not used
>by hams

On what basis do you make this statement? Because of my opinion on what should be on the exams? I am not a member of the QPC.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

794. Re: Black list

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 12:57:25 UTC
From: "Steven J Robeson", K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <946p7i$98$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1045

In article <9450fpibf1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
K0HB <k0hb@my-deja.com> wrote:
> In article <944ulvgd1@front4m.grolier.fr>,
> "Swann" <swann@dromadaire.com> wrote:
>
>>Don't waste QSL and time and visit :

> Just for grins I checked the calls on your stupid list against my
> logs. In the past year I have had contest QSO's with 11 stations on
> the list. Five of them have sent me QSL's. So much for your
> credibility.

I have QSO's with 6 and four QSL'd. The other two I haven't sent
QSL's to, so I guess I can't expect a reply.

Take your list and......well, I am trying to be gentler and kinder
today........

Steve, K4YZ

--
"If You're Not A Ham....You're SPAM!"

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

795. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 13:00:25 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010118080025.26214.00000008@ng-fm1.aol.com>
Source record: 1044

>From: Brian brianburke@my-deja.com

> I have lost my "cool" once or twice --
>haven't you?

>I not only have tired of hearing the OTs bitching, but I've begun countering
> they're insane accusations.

On purpose?

>That should put some perspective on the situation.

Yes, I think it did.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

796. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 14:31:02 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A66FE26.D4C0DA3F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 1047

N2EY wrote:
>
> Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> >My feelings have nothing to do with it.
>
> They have everything to do with it.

One would hope the FCC is operating on more than just feelings.

> > There simply are not enough
> >people who want to eliminate Morse code to matter.
>
> All it takes is a few in the right places.

Only if they are at the FCC.

> You didn't write that there weren't enough to matter. You wrote that nobody who
> matters wants to eliminate the Morse code. Not the same thing at all.

It means exactly the same thing to a Texan. If there's not enough of them
to matter then they don't matter. Same thing.

> >Nope, the number of them is what matters.
>
> That's not what you wrote.

Yep, it is. Bone up on your Texan, Jim.

> > Tens of thousands of hams
> >want to eliminate Morse code testing.
>
> I don't see that at all. Maybe two, three thousand, max. Hundreds of thousands
> want to keep it.

You've got your opinion and I've got mine. From my point of view, it appears
that the division is swinging toward equality with each passing day.

> Ah - OK. So it was OK with you to steal the TLA of the National Cancer
> Institute.

I didn't say it was OK but it certainly has a better ring to it than NCTI.

> Depends on who they are. Do you agree that allowing DSSS on the HF ham bands
> could seriously disrupt the use of other modes?

IMO, DSSS is not suited for the HF ham bands with the possible exception
of 10m. Aren't broadband transmissions limited to 6kHz on ham HF?
--

http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

797. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 14:31:58 UTC
From: K0HB <k0hb@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <946uou$5f5$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1046
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <3A66DEE0.1CD3D57D@sccoast.net>,
stewartx@sccoast.net wrote:

> And that is why I'll never forget that "radio cop."

Probably N2EY?

73, Hans, K0HB

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

798. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 14:36:44 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A66FF7C.7AB4D442@IEEE.org>
Source record: 1048

Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> > There's lots of accidental jamming because of mail boxes.
>
> The timing is impecable. Why would those things run in beacon mode - on 40
> meter phone frequencies?

I hear Iran is trying to jam Iraq and vice versa.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

799. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 14:37:40 UTC
From: K0HB <k0hb@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <946v3j$5kg$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1050
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

In article <945rm5$a0e$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
LRod <lr0d@my-deja.com> wrote:

> Anyone having to live somewhere besides Chicago (and the environs) is
> comforted by the fact that they are available frozen in many other
> areas of the country.

I think they're headquartered in Ohio somewhere.

I lived on sliders (12 cents each in those days) all the way through college. We have 3 or 4 "slider stores" here in the Mpls/St.Paul area, and about once-a-month several hams in the area get together for "gut-bomb" luncheon on the tailgate in their parking lot.

There are two kinds of people in the world.... those who like sliders and admit to it, and those who do not admit to it.

73, Hans, K0HB

--
> >Frisbeetarianism: The belief that when you die,
> >your soul goes up the on roof and gets stuck.

> What roof would this be?

The Roof of the Universe. And in the Last Days,
when the Great Frisbee that shineth in the sky
hath gone out, then shalt the Almighty Thrower
ascend the Ladder of Life and collect the souls
of those who have flown free, and take them The
Eternal Park, where we shall sail upon the Spring
Breezes for ever and ever, and be Fetched by the
Holy Dog. Amen.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

800. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 14:40:41 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A670069.34B584D8@IEEE.org>
Source record: 1051

Dick Carroll wrote:
> > A "No Coder" is jamming you on 40m SSB?
>
> Well if a "No licenser" did it what's to stop a "No coder"?

I get it now. You said, "Oh,I hear jamming on a weekend net every week.
But we just ignore the idiot and he takes his No Code arse somewhere
else to try to gain his 'revenge'." - and you have no idea who it was
so you labeled him/her a No Coder? Such a collectivist, Dick, tsk, tsk.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

801. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 14:45:10 UTC
From: K0HB <k0hb@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <946vhj$64b$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1054

In article <e5nb6t4vr42j4ntiptnpsrksq1dag2soii@4ax.com>,
Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com> wrote:

> Of course he could have avoided the gaff by simply listening to the
> repeater for a few weeks before using it to see how things are done.
> That's good practice whether on FM, RTTY, CW or a new newsgroup...

You can join N2EY over there in the "keep these newcomers off my ham-
bands" jury box.

73, de Hans, K0HB

--

Beware of the man who works hard to learn something,
learns it, and finds himself no wiser than before.

He is full of murderous resentment of people who
are ignorant without having come by their ignorance
the hard way.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

802. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 14:47:54 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A67021A.4A0EA094@IEEE.org>
Source record: 1053

Dick Carroll wrote:
> When you take a driver's test you 1.)take a written test and 2.)take a
> practical operational exam where you demonstrate that you can actuall
> drive the darn thing.

There's a strong implication that the examinee wants to drive a vehicle.
Why is no operating exam required for a bicycle?

> When you qualify as a pilot you 1.)take a written test, and 2.)take a
> practical operational exam where you demonstrate that you actually can
> fly the darn thing.

There's a strong implication that the examinee wants to fly a plane.
Why is there no operating exam for a hot air balloon?

> When you take a ham radio test you 1.)take a written test and 2.)take a
> practical operational exam where you demonstrate that you can actually
> copy code.

There is absolutely no implication that the examinee wants to use Morse
code. The exam is forced upon him/her even though he/she may have no
intention of using it.

> In neither case is one exam "emphasized" over the other. You have to
> make a passing grade on both. It's called MEETING THE REQUIREMENTS FOR
> THE LICENSE!

You have one pass/fail test dedicated to Morse code. You have another pass/
fail test dedicated to everything else in Amateur Radio combined. Therefore,
Morse code is considered as important as everything else in Amateur Radio
combined. That certainly sounds like emphasis to me, Dick.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

803. Re: Black list

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 14:49:23 UTC
From: Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com>
Message-ID: <3A670273.5CB67FD6@dvol.com>
Source record: 1049

W1RFI wrote:

> Something I consider when working search and pouncing in the SS contest. Those
> stations who did not answer my QSL requests from years past do not get my time
> for another contact.
>
> I am sure this applies to DXers, too.

>
Never ran into the issue before quite frankly. I seriously doubt that the big guns lose many contacts because they snubbed dx qsls. In their defense they will ship a card if it comes direct but not if it's in the heaps of pro-forma cards which come via the bureau. There's a Polish station which qsls every contact on every band every contest, I must have 20 of his cards. That's ridiculous, I stopped shipping him cards years ago and he still answers my cq's.
>

>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

>
w3rv

804. Re: Sound Familiar?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 14:54:51 UTC
From: Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com>
Message-ID: <3A6703BB.C4E1E5A@dvol.com>
Source record: 1052

W1RFI wrote:

> >From: Brian Kelly kelly@dvol.com
>
> >Since the QPC is into testing things like modes not used
> >by hams
>
> On what basis do you make this statement? Because of my opinion on what should
> be on the exams? I am not a member of the QPC.

>
. . . just ruminating . . . heh.
>

> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

>
w3rv

805. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 14:59:52 UTC
From: Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com>
Message-ID: <3A6704E8.D62A4FB7@dvol.com>
Source record: 1055

W1RFI wrote:

> The magazine is usually sent to the printer around the 25th of the month. The
> Reviews are usually posted around the 1st. The magazine usually starts hitting
> mailboxes around the 15th. The issue will be dated the first of the next
> month, so the March issue should arrive in your mailbox on or about Feb 15.

>
Boy, that's really quick. I guess I'm lost in time again, usta take at least two
months.
>

> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

>
w3rv

806. Re: It's like this....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 15:02:10 UTC
From: K0HB <k0hb@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <9470hd$743$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1056

In article <943otq$g55$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com> wrote:
>
> You're using the K3LT argument that since this isn't wireless, you're
> free to be a jerk.
>

Get a grip, Brian. For reasons known only to you, you have decided
to treat me like Robeson treats Len Anderson, casting me in the role
of some sort of radio-ogre. It was amusing for awhile, now it's just
an annoyance sorta like when an excited but untrained puppy pees on
the floor when he sees his master first time in the morning.

73, Hans, K0HB

--
I am, of course, any thinking woman's everyday fantasy.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

807. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 15:03:20 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A6705B8.38365FCD@IEEE.org>
Source record: 1057

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> Cecil wrote:
>
> > It (CW)is worth preserving within ham
> > radio if its merits support that preservation. I think it does. A Governmental
> > requirement not based on merit is just another form of welfare.
>
> You say it has merit. Then you say it has no merit. Which is it?

You are confused and mistaken again, Dick. I have always said that
I believe CW has merit and can stand on its own without government
subsidy. You are the one who says that CW doesn't have enough merit
to stand on its own merits. It's the Morse code *TEST* that I believe
is without merit.

> So would you care to lay out just how it is that I'm "lying" about
> CW's capabilities?

"CW gets through when no other mode can." is one lie you told.
Another is, "CW is useless at 5wpm."

> If CW
> > cannot honestly stand on its own merits, then it deserves to be replaced
> > by modes with more merit. Obfuscation about CW's merits will just hasten
> > its demise.
>
> You are not only a fool, you are also a liar.

It is impossible to lie when one prefaces a statement with an "If".
It's known as a conditional statement. Better brush up on your English
and logic, Dick.

True or False: If CW cannot honestly stand on its own merits, then it
deserves to be replaced by modes with more merit. There's no way that
statement can be false.

True or False: Obfuscation about CW's merits will just hasten its demise.
That one seems prima facie true to me, Dick. When you say CW is as good
as sex, everyone knows you're lying.

> When all testing is gone it is only a matter of a little time.

It's rather obvious that I have more faith in CW than you do, Dick.
Why do you think CW has so little merit that it cannot survive without
government support? I thought you were against welfare.

> You talk like you and everyone else posting here in support of totally
> dropping it are its friends. What an idiot.

There you go again, Dick. Virtually no ham wants to drop CW. Many, many hams want to drop the CW *test* requirement. When are you going to get that fact through your thick skull? CW needs to stand on its own merits. I believe that it can. You believe that it cannot. You are no friend of the mode.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

808. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 15:08:05 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A6706D5.3AF1E6DD@IEEE.org>
Source record: 1058

W1RFI wrote:
>
> >From: Cecil Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
> >You (and other PCTA folk) are the worst enemies that CW ever had.
>
> Careful with that broad brush, Cecil. I have seen some who advocate code
> testing who feel they don't need to insult new hams to make their points.

The brush was not intended to be broad at all, Ed. I didn't mean to
imply "all other PCTA folk". Just a handful of individuals. I probably
should have said, "and a few other PCTA folk". That was my meaning.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

809. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 15:12:10 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A6707CA.1CC50397@IEEE.org>
Source record: 1059

W1RFI wrote:
> Probably about as close to "proof" as we can get, Cecil. Is it at least "a
> preponderance of the evidence?" This is a "civil" debate, so we don't need
> "beyond a reasonable doubt."

I was not arguing against it, Ed. I was just pointing out that someone
was asking that a negative be proven, which is generally impossible in
a context like that one. It more correctly should have been stated as a
positive premise to be proven.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

810. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 15:13:55 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A670833.DE942E84@IEEE.org>
Source record: 1060

W1RFI wrote:
>
> >From: Cecil Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>
> >If you won't say it, you don't mean it.
>
> Can we presume, then, Cecil, that you don't mean all the things you don't say?

I probably don't 100% mean the things that I am challenged to say and don't.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

811. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 15:18:39 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A67094E.17442697@IEEE.org>
Source record: 1061

W1RFI wrote:
> There is a 99% shot I will be at Ft Tuthill this year. But, as I recently
> learned, lobster is mighty expensive in AZ. How about we settle for a steak,
> or you can cook me a hot dog around the infamous Ft Tuthill QRP campfire?

The prices at Red Lobster are not too bad. How are you going to feel
eating a steak while I'm having lobster? :-)
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

812. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 15:33:35 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A670CCF.6BA79B75@IEEE.org>
Source record: 1062

Dick Carroll wrote:
> The poor kid is sure to have a rough life, what with being too ignorant
> to grasp a new procedure in a new environment, then being put off so
> easily when gently corrected. What *is* this new generation ever going
> to amount to, anyway?

Absolutely nothing as long as your generation keeps bullying them.
Newness is something fragile that needs to be nurtured, not jumped
on with golf shoes.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

813. Re: CA power crisis caused by internet

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 15:56:53 UTC
From: 'Doc <w5lz@oio.net>
Message-ID: <3A671245.FCC7FC2C@oio.net>
Source record: 1063
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Kerry,
Sure... I believe that, uh huh. Just like the Easter Bunny
and Santa Clause.
'Doc

814. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 16:38:01 UTC
From: Jeff Goodspeed <cmsx42@email.mot.com>
Message-ID: <3A671BE9.9A8913D@email.mot.com>
Source record: 1065

Why is everyone assuming that it was this "incident" that dissuaded the young fella from continuing with the hobby?

Isn't it his generation that has grown up with the reality that politically correct speech is more important than content or intent? Doesn't he have to live in a world where accidentally speaking non-politically correct words will bring down an immediate wrath.

Isn't it his generation that has grown up with the reality that wearing the "wrong" color/brand of cloths or tilting the brim of you baseball cap the "wrong" direction will get you shot to death by some gang-banger?

Hasn't every generation grown up knowing that using the right "lingo" around your piers determines whether your accepted or shunned?

I'm going to assume that the youngster is acutely aware of his environment and is more attuned to saying the "right" thing vs. the "wrong" thing than any previous generation. I would guess that he would appreciate being informed in a gentle way what lingo is "used" here.

The reality just may be that he finds CB more fun to play with than Ham radio. Only he knows the real reason. No one else really has a clue, so lets stop using it as irrefutable evidence of anything.

KA9S

Dick Carroll wrote:

> Aaron Jones wrote:
> >
> > K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org> wrote:
> > >Talked to a young fella on the repeater the other day who introduced
> > >himself by saying "my first personal is Jim and you're my first
> > >contact, QSL?".
> >
> > Of course he could have avoided the gaff by simply listening to the
> > repeater for a few weeks before using it to see how things are done.
> > That's good practice whether on FM, RTTY, CW or a new newsgroup...
>
> The poor kid is sure to have a rough life, what with being too ignorant
> to grasp a new procedure in a new environment, then being put off so
> easily when gently corrected. What *is* this new generation ever going
> to amount to, anyway?

815. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 17:17:42 UTC
From: K0HB <k0hb@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <9478fb$ev4$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1067
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <3A6718C7.3E101484@zylay.com>,
Gene <webmaster@zylay.com> wrote:
> > > ARRL says Q signals aren't recommended on voice at all.
>
> Does this mean that we now have to ask other hams for
> "contact-confirmation postcards"?

Yeah, and when we talk about a construction article from their magazine on the air, we gotta change modes to CW to send the name of the magazine? Maybe we can't say "73" or "CQ" on phone anymore, cuz those also originated in Morse-only days? I just love it when these purists come down from Mount Newington with their engraved stone tablets!

73, Hans, K0HB

--
All great truths began as blasphemies.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

816. Re: CA power crisis caused by internet

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 17:20:09 UTC
From: Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com>
Message-ID: <3A6725C9.21D00AE@dvol.com>
Source record: 1066
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Kerry King wrote:

> The California power crisis is not due to what we have been led to
> believe. Instead, it is the fault of the internet.
>
> You who are reading this helped cause the problem, as CNN has documented
> at http://www.cnn.com/2001/TECH/computing/01/17/internet.energy.idg

>
That's ten days old. It's a La-la land power industry scam from top to
bottom, capitalism gone berserk.
>

>
> Shame on all of you!

>
I notice that you're still connected.

817. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 17:49:03 UTC
From: K0HB@USWEST.NET
Message-ID: <947aafogo1@news.netmar.com>
Source record: 1064

In article <20010118063645.07593.00002569@nso-ch.aol.com>, Larry Roll K3LT
<yodoc@aol.comnospam> writes:

> I became an Extra-class licensee under the "old" system with
> virtually no one-on-one "Elmering" whatsoever.

It shows Larry, it shows.

73, de Hans, K0HB

----- Posted via NewsOne.Net: Free (anonymous) Usenet News via the Web -----
http://newsone.net/ -- Free reading and anonymous posting to 60,000+ groups
NewsOne.Net prohibits users from posting spam. If this or other posts
made through NewsOne.Net violate posting guidelines, email abuse@newsone.net

818. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 17:49:46 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A672CBA.E57A603A@uci.edu>
Source record: 1069

Cecil wrote:

> Jim Kelley wrote:

> > Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> > > There's lots of accidental jamming because of mail boxes.

> > The timing is impecable. Why would those things run in beacon mode - on 40
> > meter phone frequencies?

> I hear Iran is trying to jam Iraq and vice versa.

They use mail boxes to accidentally jam each other? You must have a
perty big antler to hear Iran on 40. I doubt I'm hearing 'em.

ac6xg

819. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 18:02:13 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A672FA5.90F3BEFD@uci.edu>
Source record: 1070

W1RFI wrote:

> >From: "Jim Kelley" jwkelley@uci.edu

> >Looks like there's a typo in the test question.

> There are questions in the current pool that contain similar faux pas.

If you find them, let me know and I'll send them to the QPC. ;-)

> > A better question might be to explain the differences between a DC
> > ground and an RF ground.

> He may have also meant an AC-line safety ground.

I recall seeing similar faux pas in the current question pool - where
you have to speculate as to what the question might mean. One can
usually figure it out from the answer and distractors. Thank goodness
for those. :-)

73 de ac6xg

820. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 18:22:38 UTC
From: xjim@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <947c92iqm1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1072

In article <3A65E17D.DF469859@IEEE.org>,
Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> xjim@my-deja.com wrote:
> > Sandy held both a federal firearms license and a permit to carry a
> > handgun in New Hampshire. Ironically, the gun laws in Massachusetts
> > prevented him from carrying a concealed handgun. But these same laws
> > did not prevent Michael McDermott from obtaining illegal firearms.
>
> Why does it make sense to allow criminals to have guns yet prohibit
> law-abiding citizens the right to have a gun with which to defend
> themselves?
> --
> http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

Because the people prefer to be controlled by emotions like fear,
rather than be bothered by politcs. Crime is "good" for fear.
to be

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

821. Re: "They oughta require a license....blah, blah, blah"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 18:25:51 UTC
From: "Leland C. Scott" <no-spam@junk-mail.net>
Message-ID: <t6eda3ipvnj9ca@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 1071

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:3A662B55.A451E26@dvol.com...
> >
> I chose to not make it a problem for myself. You wanna make it a problem
for
> yourself go for it and good luck "fixing" it.

So if you don't operate there then you don't care, right? So, if it was not
a problem in the first, then it would not need fixing either. Time will
tell.

As far as CB stations on the bottom end of 10m goes, the operators seem to
be speaking English real good, no Spanish accent to be heard when I tuned
in. They are easy to find, just tune around for the "CW pile up".

--
Leland C. Scott
KC8LDO

822. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 18:33:22 UTC
From: xjim@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <947ctijet1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1074

In article <20010118042600.05040.00002254@ng-ff1.aol.com>,
w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:
> >From: xjim@my-deja.com
>
> >By lowering standards and force
> >feeding numerous ignorant individuals onto the ham bands, how are we
> >improving the standing of Amateur Radio?
>
> The scope of the Technician exam is at least an order of magnitude
more than
> was the scope of the 1963 Novice exam I took.
>
> How is this "lowering standards?"
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
Because you don't have to do the homework anymore. All you have to do
is take the test over and over until you get the answer right.

If it takes 5 times to learn something you really want to learn, how
many times does it take to learn something you don't feel like learning?

Sorry this is a trick question.

The biggest mistake we make is to believe that everyone would want
think and be like us (if only they knew).

Should you even be required to take a license test to be able to bitch
someone out without getting your face slapped?

Jim, ac6tk

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

823. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 18:34:10 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A673722.FC9865FE@IEEE.org>
Source record: 1076

Jim Kelley wrote:
> You must have a
> perty big antler to hear Iran on 40. I doubt I'm hearing 'em.

At night, I hear 40m commercial broadcast stations from all over
the world. The ARRL email newsletter told about the Iran/Iraq
jammers.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

824. Re: CA power crisis caused by internet

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 18:42:34 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A67391A.7D3E9075@IEEE.org>
Source record: 1086
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Kerry King wrote:
>
> The California power crisis is not due to what we have been led to
> believe. Instead, it is the fault of the internet.

When a state doesn't build any power generating plants during the
ten years the population is doubling, the result is 100% predictable.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

825. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 18:42:35 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nospam.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.g7d6to0.pminews@ca.news.verio.net>
Source record: 1075
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Thu, 18 Jan 2001 04:33:09 GMT, LRod wrote:

>Anyone having to live somewhere besides Chicago (and the environs) is
>comforted by the fact that they are available frozen in many other areas
>of the country.

I subjected my stomach to White Castle's fare in NY long before I
knew exactly where Chicago was.

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

826. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 18:48:34 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <ebee6tcoo4fo4gppfvcnnuuaajk5ctvhvh@4ax.com>
Source record: 1077

K0HB <k0hb@my-deja.com> wrote:

>In article <e5nb6t4vr42j4ntiptnpsrksq1dag2soii@4ax.com>,
> Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com> wrote:
>
>> Of course he could have avoided the gaff by simply listening to the
>> repeater for a few weeks before using it to see how things are done.
>> That's good practice whether on FM, RTTY, CW or a new newsgroup...
>
>You can join N2EY over there in the "keep these newcomers off my ham-
>bands" jury box.

I was just pointing out how the gaff could have been easily been
avoided. The next time that you wear a bathing suit to church, will
you get mad at those who laugh at you??

827. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 18:48:35 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <74ee6t0bin9j7fiq2pkv0i6ssgototb1o9@4ax.com>
Source record: 1078

w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:

>>From: Aaron Jones nomail@nomail.com
>
>>Every hobby has it's preferred lingo. If you use the wrong lingo you
>>immediately identify yourself as an outsider...
>
>You do mean "former" outsider, do you not? This fellow did get a ham license,
>so he is now one of us.

I said "every hobby". Let me rephrase my sentence for ham radio:

Ham radio has it's preferred repeater lingo. If you use the wrong
lingo you immediately identify yourself as an outsider (to repeater
operation)...

If I said "W7xxx monitoring" on CW in order to get a contact, I think
I might be thought of as an outsider...or worse... :-)

828. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 18:48:37 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <0vde6t4u5jj1svjg83k90vnsrqspi3laub@4ax.com>
Source record: 1079

w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:
>I didn't listen to the bands for a few weeks before using my Novice ticket. The
>day it showed up in the mailbox, I sent my first CQ and made a few contacts.

I was getting practice on the air before my Novice came... :-)

>The "gaff" could have been avoided if everyone had decided that it wasn't a big
>enough deal to be labeled a "gaff" in the first place.

A gaff is simply a social error. Using the wrong language in a
particular social setting is a gaff. Once it is done a gaff has
occurred, no matter what anyone labels it...

>How was he to know that he might face criticism if he didn't choose
>the correct words when he introduced himself to people?

In society most people are too polite to tell someone about his gaff.
They just think of him poorly behind his back. At least hams are
honest and straightforward... :-)

829. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 18:48:38 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <ltde6tkj4rbcnogncr30bpbgp2q9vbnu5u@4ax.com>
Source record: 1080

Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com> wrote:
>Aaron Jones wrote:
>
>> "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nospam.spam> wrote:
>> > "10-20" has a honorable history in public-safety voice comms
>> > but the "mutilation" is to drop the "10" and just refer to your
>> > "twenty".
>>
>> Even cops often shorten the 10 codes to just the last number. It makes
>> sense if it takes less air time and the meaning is understood by all.
>> 10 codes, although codes, actually become words in the users minds,
>> and like words often evolve with use...
>
>>
>Ya mean like cw exchanges are a languge?

I mean that when a cop hears "10-20" he doesn't think "I must decode
10-20....decoded....it means location". In his mind he knows directly
what "10-20" means and "10-20" has become a word in his vocabulary.
It's the same with hams and common Q signals. When I hear "QTH" there
is no mind decoding, I hear and think of it as a word. And yes the
language *quality* of CW makes me think of code groups as words in my
vocabulary, no separate mind decoding step needed...

830. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 18:48:39 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <arde6t077dmhohge2iiacvs645o2sd1pvg@4ax.com>
Source record: 1082

Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com> wrote:
>I forget how many 10 codes there are/were on the "official list"

There is no "official list". Some codes seem universal (like "10-4")
but many are not, and they vary in meaning from list to list. The
Phoenix Police Department has even changed the meaning of some of it's
10 codes over the years...

831. Re: Sound Familiar?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 18:48:41 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <cqde6tcfrv6jl9kah237qdn7ue47j6b3jc@4ax.com>
Source record: 1083

Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com> wrote:
>I thought the ARRL handled the advisory role in 1934?

Radio magazine, which was an established 17 year old publication in 1934, appears to have had an anti-ARRL editorial policy. ARRL had just removed voting privileges from non-hams and that was causing quite a stir. I think Radio was trying to capitalize from the controversy. From time to time (when things bog down here) I'll scan and post excerpts from a few of these articles...

832. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 18:48:42 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <uode6ton057sp07eglct4rir360s2ikj73@4ax.com>
Source record: 1081

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote:
>the [QSO] talk is usually all about the person doing the talking,
>as if he (usually male) were the center of the universe.

I have always found it interesting to hear about
someone else's life experiences.

>When young people get together to chat,
>they rarely talk about themselves.

You haven't been around teenagers much have you... :-)

>That's why the typical CW QSO, consisting of
>call sign, name, QTH in Florida, age, how many years retired,
>local WX report...

I still find this information interesting and it hasn't changed much
in the past 40+ years that I've been doing it (whether on phone or
CW). Sometimes this preliminary information leads nowhere, and
sometimes it leads to new lifelong friends...

833. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 18:48:58 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <iode6tsi5706c3aua35odh2r5cjh4a2uc1@4ax.com>
Source record: 1085

w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:
>The FCC does not allocate us spectrum
>because we pass tests. .

If "us" means us humans that's exactly what the FCC does...

834. Re: Black list

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 18:48:59 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <3ode6tsrjsjltbcm6c6vjjnro6ll7skhii@4ax.com>
Source record: 1084

w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:
>Those stations who did not answer my QSL requests
>from years past do not get my time for another contact.

You keep a W1RFI preferred hams list?? :-)

835. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 18:59:51 UTC
From: W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com>
Message-ID: <947eg5mco1@iac5.navix.net>
Source record: 1088
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

It has been my experience that the biggest "radio Cops" turn out to be no-code techs that have had a licenses for a year or so. I had one start on me one morning when I used the term handle.

He proceeded to tell me how "handle" was a CB term and not used on the repeater. Being the shrinking violet I am, I went on to explain I used "handle" on 11 meters when it was a ham band along with a dissertation about correcting people who may be new and somewhat hesitant such as your wife.

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message news:3A66DEE0.1CD3D57D@sccoast.net...
> K0HB wrote:
> >
> > [snip] Like I said, he seemed pretty bright to me,
> > quick to catch on to things. What do think it was
> > that he caught on to about us from "Radio Cop".
>
>
> I'll never forget my worst incident with a "radio cop." I had
> encouraged my wife to get her license. Since she knew absolutely
> nothing about radio before studying for that exam, and had studied for
> three weeks to pass the exam, that license was hard earned and she was
> darn proud of it.
>
> Anyway, part way through our second conversation on the radio, the
> "radio cop" made his grand entrance. The previous night, my wife had
> problems getting her radio set up to work correctly (it was my old radio
> - purchased because it was loaded with features, not because it was
> necessarily easy to use). So our conversation was somewhat limited that night.
>
> However, the next night, I had set the radio up to default to an
> easier mode (preset memory channels), so that we could concentrait more
> on conversation (figuring she would eventually learn the radio
> eventually on her own).
>
> Anyway, that night, we tried several of the memory channels (each set
> to a different repeater), trying to figure out which repeater would be
> best for her to talk on during her trip to and from work each day (which
> repeater had coverage of the whole trip distance).
>
> Finally, we settled on two memory channels - the main one and a backup
> (which would be set to memory channels one and two on the radio). As we
> were discussing this, a male voice boomed in with the words,

> "frequencies, not channels." Believing that someone else might want to
> use the repeater, I told my wife to hold on a second and invited the
> person to go ahead.
>
> At that point, the "radio cop" started lecturing my wife about how we
> use frequencies instead of channels in ham radio and further suggested
> that she should also stop using CB slang (she had said "roger" earlier).
>
> When he was finished, I explained that we were referring to the memory
> channels on her radio, that she was new to ham radio, that my goal was
> just to get her talking on the radio at this point, and that little
> issues like that could be corrected later.
>
> In response, he pointed out that radio memories were nothing more than
> memorized frequencies, that I should refer to the frequencies memorized
> instead of the memory channels, that I was failing my wife by not
> teaching her properly from the beginning, and then turned back to
> lecture my wife some more, ending with a suggestion that she find
> someone better than me to teach her in the future if she wants to learn
> how to do things correctly.
>
> After he was finished, I thanked him for his input and tried to
> contact my wife again. She simply said that she was almost home (she
> wasn't) and that she would talk to me when she got there.
>
> It took me almost four days to get her to talk on the radio again, and
> then only on a frequency that I was able to assure her was not likely
> monitored by anyone else. And, dispite our almost nightly
> conversations, it was going to be another five months before she would
> be confident enough to talk to someone else. In fact, to this day
> (almost two years later), she has only talked to two people, besides
> myself, on the radio. And her enthusiasm about, and pride in, radio are
> long gone.
>
> In the end, the "radio cop" did a good job of defending "proper"
> tradition on the radio. But in doing so, he ruined my wife's enjoyment
> of this hobby (and, for all practical purposes, ended her hobby before
> it even got started). And that is why I'll never forget that "radio cop."
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net

836. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 19:07:39 UTC
From: W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com>
Message-ID: <947eun$mm6$1@iac5.navix.net>
Source record: 1089

You have to stop making such controversial statements Ed, their going to take away your love beads 8>)

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message news:20010118043914.05040.00002260@ng-ff1.aol.com...
> >From: "W4JLE" Fred@w4jle.com
>
> >The problem with being self taught is you have someone as ignorant as you
> >for a teacher.
>
> After someone obtains a degree, if they are successful in their chosen field,
> they all spend a lifetime being self taught.
>
> A very few people cannot learn anything on their own, but they are not likely
> to be hams.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

837. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 19:07:46 UTC
From: K0HB@USWEST.NET
Message-ID: <947eu2rtl1@news.netmar.com>
Source record: 1068

In article <3A671BE9.9A8913D@email.mot.com>, Jeff Goodspeed
<cmsx42@email.mot.com> writes:
>Why is everyone assuming that it was this "incident" that dissuaded the
>young fella from continuing with the hobby?
>
>Isn't it his generation that has grown up with the reality that politically
>correct speech is more important than content or intent? Doesn't he have to
>live in a world where accidentally speaking non-politically correct words
>will bring down an immediate wrath.
>
>Isn't it his generation that has grown up with the reality that wearing the
>"wrong" color/brand of cloths or tilting the brim of you baseball cap the
>"wrong" direction will get you shot to death by some gang-banger?
>
>Hasn't every generation grown up knowing that using the right "lingo" around
>your piers determines whether your accepted or shunned?
>
>I'm going to assume that the youngster is acutely aware of his environment
>and is more attuned to saying the "right" thing vs. the "wrong" thing than
>any previous generation. I would guess that he would appreciate being
>informed in a gentle way what lingo is "used" here.
>
>The reality just may be that he finds CB more fun to play with than Ham
>radio. Only he knows the real reason. No one else really has a clue, so lets
>stop using it as irrefutable evidence of anything.
>
>KA9S

What a delightfully convoluted fabric you have woven to justify the boorish
behaviour of Radio Cops everywhere! Betcha I hear on 14.195 yelling "UP UP
UP" too, don't I?

73, Hans, K0HB

----- Posted via NewsOne.Net: Free (anonymous) Usenet News via the Web -----
http://newsone.net/ -- Free reading and anonymous posting to 60,000+ groups
NewsOne.Net prohibits users from posting spam. If this or other posts
made through NewsOne.Net violate posting guidelines, email abuse@newsone.net

838. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 19:14:45 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A6740A5.867F6FEB@uci.edu>
Source record: 1091

Cecil wrote:

> Why is no operating exam required for a bicycle?

Is it for the same reason that there's no operating exam required
for a train set?

ac6xg

839. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 19:23:00 UTC
From: xjim@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <947fq9$m9o$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1092

> What standards have been lowered? The existing "entry" level ticket
> material is so large and complex that it cannot be run away from.

The lowering of standards have been brought about by a combination of the VEC program that brings in large groups of unknown people who are "helped" into a license and the fully published question pool that short circuits the learning process, and focuses on rote memorization. That is, people can get a license so fast, you wind up with whole graduating classes that have no connection to the accumulated experience of amateur radio.

One way to get around this is to have an entry level ticket with greatly reduced priveliges, that is time limited. Further testing that reveals experience would be required to upgrade. It used to be that a novice couldn't upgrade without either turning in a log of at least 100 contacts or 100 QSL cards. Does Japan still have a system that requires SWL QSLs from Ham operators in order to upgrade from an SWL ticket?
>
> When I compare the technical
> > discussions and considerate behavior of those who knew full well
they
> > could be heard everywhere,
>
> My comments prior to the restructuring:
>
> What I fear most about the restructuring is a lack of enforcement.
And
> what I fear most about maintaining the status quo is a lack of
> enforcement.
>
> > giving way to Hate and Discontent
>
> Ex-Jim, much of the hate and discontent is coming from some OTs. The
> ones wha have been hams a long time. The ones who know and count on
> being heard everywhere.

The point is; These people are chasing the legitamate operators off of the air. What you have left over is people who are trying to get some enjoyment around these people and these people who get their jollies from this behavior. Yes there will be beligerant OTs left in this mess. There will also be beligerant OTs BORN of this mess. These people ARE PART OF THE PROBLEM and are easy to point to, but the way to deal with these people are to avoid giving away licenses in the first place.

I know I am guilty too. I assisted a novice once that turned out to be a jammer once he got a radio in his hands and even helped another jammer get his license. If I had only known, he would have gotten no help from anyone I knew. As it was we were able to prevent the further spread of this nonsense as they only could talk to each other and finally lost interest and lapsed without an upgrade. These days they might have a lot bigger circle of friends and a renewable 10 year license without FCC intervention.

There is an unavoidable 1st Amendment issue that says you can't enforce people to say what other people want to hear, any more than you can enforce people to listen to what they don't want to hear. The only enforcement that can be legitimately applied, is enforcement of the 1st Amendment by jailing and pulling the licences of willful interferers. You really don't want any more interference than that from the government because "behavior" is too subjective and nebulous.

Do you really want a "letter" because someone was offended? There's way too much of that nonsense going on in political arenas.

> in order
> > to impress a new group of listeners, who's going to want to (much
less
> > be savy enough to) save allocations in the future? I have seen Ham
> > Radio Magazine die off and QEX almost die off.
>
> Hey, AntenneX resurfaced on the web. Check it out.
>
> > We used to have to fill
> > out our own 610 forms, and we joked that it was a literacy test.
Now
> > that we don't have to do that, how many new hams won't even be able
to
> > read QST, much less give a S***?
>
> They'll have to be web savvy and take care of biddness via the FCC ULS
> page. It's complexity goes beyond a mere literacy test.

The problem with that is that the FCC isn't completely web savvy either, and again do you want them to be more of a presence in web communications? So far we have much more freedom to express ourselves here than with the "handbill" or letters to the editor or anything else under FCC jurisdiction. The MASS MEDIA only proves that the 1st amendment belongs to the highest bidder.

>
> > We have to stop allowing ourselves to be re-formed for the wishes
> > of "wanna bees".
> >
> > Jim, ac6tk
>
> Jim, I wish I could agree with you over the last 2/3 of your message,
> but I see things differently. I give a S***, yet I am dead set

against
> unnecessary government regulation and interference in my life. I am
for
> a simplified licensing structure, and have advocated ONE amateur radio
> license of about the level of General. I will support a simplified
> entry level license, with reduced privileges.
>
> Behavior problems should be met with a nice letter from Riley.
Followed
> by a big stick.
>
> 73, Brian
>
> Sent via Deja.com
> http://www.deja.com/
>

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

840. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 19:31:50 UTC
From: K0HB <k0hb@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <947gb6mkt1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1094

In article <93nntl$4ee$1@iac5.navix.net>,
"W4JLE" <Fred@w4jle.com> wrote:

> As politically incorrect as that is, tough noogies, work me on 75
> at 35 WPM and then argue against CW. At least I will respect your
> opinion even if different than mine. Those that can't meet the
> above, quit your crying!

Some of us believe in finding peaceable solutions to this situation,
but that doesn't mean we're timid, or wimpy, or "pc" freaks, or that
peaceable responses come naturally to us without conscious effort.
And if some other people like to growl, posture, and piss in all
the corners, it doesn't necessarily prove they're tough-minded
kings of the forest whose opinion is more valid because they say
they can send it at 35WPM: On the Internet, no one can tell you're
a chihuahua.

73, Hans, K0HB

--
Beware of the man who works hard to learn something,
learns it, and finds himself no wiser than before.

He is full of murderous resentment of people who
are ignorant without having come by their ignorance
the hard way.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

841. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 19:33:42 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A674516.2FD4375F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 1095
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

W4JLE wrote:
> It has been my experience that the biggest "radio Cops" turn out to be
> no-code techs that have had a licenses for a year or so. I had one start on
> me one morning when I used the term handle.
>
> He proceeded to tell me how "handle" was a CB term and not used on the
> repeater. Being the shrinking violet I am, I went on to explain I used
> "handle" on 11 meters when it was a ham band along with a dissertation about
> correcting people who may be new and somewhat hesitant such as your wife.

One time, at a hamfest in AZ, I said into my 2m simplex transceiver, "Hey
Harold, y'all got yore ears on?" One ham looked at me rather pathetically
and said, "We hams don't talk like that. How long have you been a ham?"
I replied, "45 years". :-)
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

842. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 19:35:08 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccoll@radiks.net>
Message-ID: <uxH96.5466$Tg1.523033@nntp3.onemain.com>
Source record: 1093
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nospam.spam> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.g7d6to0.pminews@ca.news.verio.net...
> On Thu, 18 Jan 2001 04:33:09 GMT, LRod wrote:
>
> >Anyone having to live somewhere besides Chicago (and the environs) is
> >comforted by the fact that they are available frozen in many other
areas
> >of the country.
>
> I subjected my stomach to White Castle's fare in NY long before I
> knew exactly where Chicago was.
>
> --
> 73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

Being something of a nite owl at the time, I got used to White Castles in St. Louis which is as far west as they went. Last time I was down there, out of nostalgia I stopped in on Hampton Av. Somehow they are not the same without the wino sleeping in the corner.

Dick NBK

843. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 19:35:57 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A67459D.A8006929@IEEE.org>
Source record: 1096

Aaron Jones wrote:
> If I said "W7xxx monitoring" on CW in order to get a contact, I think
> I might be thought of as an outsider...or worse... :-)

Listeners would assume you were engaged in a QSO if you sent that
many letters. :-)
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

844. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 20:03:53 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A674C29.1C31FD1D@uci.edu>
Source record: 1098

Cecil wrote:
> It's the Morse code *TEST* that I believe
> is without merit.

Don't you believe it's the Morse code *REQUIREMENT* that is without merit?
I can't recall ever having seen you claim the element 1A VE test itself is without merit. The relative merit of the test would depend on it's effectiveness in determining whether or not the test taker can copy some percentage of a Morse code message at the specified speed. Wouldn't it? ;-)

Larry is the one who says the test is without merit. I can't believe you agree with him on something related to amateur radio - Morse code in particular hack, spit, barf! ;-)

> When you say CW is as good
> as sex, everyone knows you're lying.

Might make a good bumper sticker. :-)

73, AC6XG

845. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 20:04:19 UTC
From: K0HB <k0hb@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <947i7somf1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1097
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <uxH96.5466$Tg1.523033@nntp3.onemain.com>,
"Richard McCollum" <rmccoll@radiks.net> wrote:

> Being something of a nite owl at the time, I got used to White
> Castles in St. Louis which is as far west as they went.

Nay, nay, nay! We have them and St. Louis is "out East" from here! :-)

73, Hans, K&#65533;HB

--
We are fellow travelers on a journey between two eternities,
and it's a trip far to short to worry about each others code speed.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

846. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 20:10:48 UTC
From: K0HB@USWEST.NET
Message-ID: <947ik8ukt1@news.netmar.com>
Source record: 1073

In article <3A67094E.17442697@IEEE.org>, Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
writes:

>The prices at Red Lobster are not too bad. How are you going to feel
>eating a steak while I'm having lobster? :-)

The seafood at Red Lobster does not come from the sea. It is strip-mined from
an ancient fossil-seabed somewhere in eastern Montana.

73, Hans, K0HB

----- Posted via NewsOne.Net: Free (anonymous) Usenet News via the Web -----
http://newsone.net/ -- Free reading and anonymous posting to 60,000+ groups
NewsOne.Net prohibits users from posting spam. If this or other posts
made through NewsOne.Net violate posting guidelines, email abuse@newsone.net

847. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 20:27:56 UTC
From: K0HB@USWEST.NET
Message-ID: <947jkcvhg1@news.netmar.com>
Source record: 1087

In article <20010118050553.05040.00002270@ng-ff1.aol.com>, W1RFI
<w1rfi@aol.com> writes:

> The FCC does not allocate us spectrum because we pass tests.

Ed, don't let Wexelbaum hear you say that!

Thanks for being there.

73, de Hans, K0HB
--
All reality is aspect dependent.

----- Posted via NewsOne.Net: Free (anonymous) Usenet News via the Web -----
http://newsone.net/ -- Free reading and anonymous posting to 60,000+ groups
NewsOne.Net prohibits users from posting spam. If this or other posts
made through NewsOne.Net violate posting guidelines, email abuse@newsone.net

848. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 20:35:37 UTC
From: K0HB@USWEST.NET
Message-ID: <947k2pvvu1@news.netmar.com>
Source record: 1090

In article <20010118045744.05040.00002267@ng-ff1.aol.com>, W1RFI
<w1rfi@aol.com> writes:

>Dick, refresh my memory; who here is in support of totally dropping code?

How 'bout Mastaka Noda? Where is Masa these days?

73, Hans, K0HB

----- Posted via NewsOne.Net: Free (anonymous) Usenet News via the Web -----
http://newsone.net/ -- Free reading and anonymous posting to 60,000+ groups
NewsOne.Net prohibits users from posting spam. If this or other posts
made through NewsOne.Net violate posting guidelines, email abuse@newsone.net

849. Re: CA power crisis caused by internet

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 20:36:16 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A6753C0.D5BB4E59@uci.edu>
Source record: 1099
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Brian Kelly wrote:
> It's a La-la land power industry scam from top to
> bottom, capitalism gone berserk.

It's the state beaurocracy gone berserk.

It's an experiment to see what happens when you require the sellers of electricity to sell-off their means of producing electricity, remove the limits of wholesale pricing, but keep the limits on consumer pricing. The power producers can limit supply so that the wholesale price will go as high as they want, and the guy selling it to the end user is stuck with the loss. It's as screwed up as anything could possibly be. Edison, the company that built practically everything we have out here, is getting totally screwed. Electricity has always been bargain priced out here. Our taxes will have to go up to pay for it now.

73, ac6xg

850. Re: CA power crisis caused by internet

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 20:42:25 UTC
From: Jon Johnson <Jon.Johnson@Telocity.com>
Message-ID: <3A675531.C0FCB3AD@Telocity.com>
Source record: 1100
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Cecil wrote:

> When a state doesn't build any power generating plants during the
> ten years the population is doubling, the result is 100% predictable.

Care to comment on groups promoted and which groups opposed the building
of additional generating capacity??

Which ones are now in the dark??

851. Re: CA power crisis caused by internet

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 21:37:00 UTC
From: W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com>
Message-ID: <947nn4rdb1@iac5.navix.net>
Source record: 1101
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Tree Huggers:
Hug that tree today! You were so busy protesting new nasty power plants, that may cause acid rain and could hurt the trees, you may have to burn it tomorrow to keep warm.

While other factors enter the picture, I have to grin a bit when I see the NIMBY folks, that fought the building of new power plants, cut off from their internet protest sites because they have no electricity.

The problem will be solved when the big one hits, and Nevada ocean front property becomes available.

"Cecil" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:3A67391A.7D3E9075@IEEE.org...
> Kerry King wrote:
> >
> > The California power crisis is not due to what we have been led to
> > believe. Instead, it is the fault of the internet.
>
> When a state doesn't build any power generating plants during the
> ten years the population is doubling, the result is 100% predictable.
> --
> http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

852. Re: Black list

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 21:39:09 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <4qJ96.951$e5.2423263@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 1103

Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com> wrote in message
news:3ode6tsrjsjltbcm6c6vjjnro6ll7skhii@4ax.com...

> w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:

> >Those stations who did not answer my QSL requests
> >from years past do not get my time for another contact.

> You keep a W1RFI preferred hams list?? :-)

I suppose I do, Aaron, but I have never felt is necessary to publish it on
the web.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

853. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 21:40:06 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <ZqJ96.952$e5.2423171@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 1104

W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com> wrote:

> You have to stop making such controversial statements Ed, their going to
> take away your love beads 8>)

Wasn't the 60s an era of great controversy? :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

854. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 21:41:18 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <4sJ96.954$e5.2423242@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 1105

Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote:

> > I think the biggest issue here is that some think of SS as a 'digital'
mode.

> The biggest issue, Ed? How so? I don't even know if it's true, let
> alone the biggest issue.

Let me clarify; by "here" I mean here in the conversation about SS.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

855. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 21:46:59 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <pxJ96.955$e5.2423633@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 1106

<xjim@my-deja.com> wrote:

> > The scope of the Technician exam is at least an order of magnitude
> > more than was the scope of the 1963 Novice exam I took.

> > How is this "lowering standards?"

> Because you don't have to do the homework anymore. All you have to do
> is take the test over and over until you get the answer right.

What are the odds of guessing correctly on a 35-question, 4-answer multiple choice test? If I did the math correctly, it is 1,180,000,000,000,000,000,000 to 1.

I still think it is easier to learn the material.

> If it takes 5 times to learn something you really want to learn, how
> many times does it take to learn something you don't feel like learning?

I don't think that people who do not feel like learning will bother taking the test at all. They wouldn't want to be hams.

> Sorry this is a trick question.

Did I pass? :-)

> Should you even be required to take a license test to be able to bitch
> someone out without getting your face slapped?

Why would I want to bitch someone out? I have done it a few times in my life, but it is not something I am particularly proud of.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

856. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 21:48:06 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <tyJ96.956$e5.2423867@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 1107

Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com> wrote in message
news:iode6tsi5706c3aua35odh2r5cjh4a2uc1@4ax.com...

> w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:

> >The FCC does not allocate us spectrum
> >because we pass tests. .

> If "us" means us humans that's exactly what the FCC does...

I guess I didn't think about how my words could be misinterpreted on an
Amateur Radio forum. Let me try again for you, Aaron.

The FCC does not allocate spectrum to the Amateur Radio Service only on the
basis of the fact that hams pass tests.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

857. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 21:55:53 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <MFJ96.957$e5.2424199@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 1108

<xjim@my-deja.com> wrote in message news:947fq9$m9o$1@nnrp1.deja.com...

> > What standards have been lowered? The existing "entry" level ticket
> > material is so large and complex that it cannot be run away from.

> The lowering of standards have been brought about by a combination of
> the VEC program that brings in large groups of unknown people who
> are "helped" into a license and the fully published question pool that
> short circuits the learning process, and focuses on rote memorization.

I do not believe that it easier to rote memorize over 1000 questions without learnign than it is to learn the concepts that are behind the tests.

> That is, people can get a license so fast, you wind up with whole
> graduating classes that have no connection to the accumulated
> experience of amateur radio.

They can't get licences as fast as I did when I studied 4 pages of study guide to get my Novice.

> It used to be that a novice couldn't upgrade without either turning in a
log of at least 100
> contacts or 100 QSL cards.

This requirement did not exist in 1963, when I was a Novice. In 1963, one could skip the Novice exam altogether and take the General. When was this rule in effect?

> The point is; These people are chasing the legitamate operators off of
> the air.

How? I have never been chased off the air, other than by the inevitable QRM that occurs to my station running +20 dBm of power or so.

> but the way to deal with these people are to avoid giving away licenses in
the first
> place.

Yes, I suppose if there are no licenses, there is no problem with operators misusing the airways.

Have not many of those who have received NALs been licensed a long time?

> I know I am guilty too. I assisted a novice once that turned out to be
> a jammer once he got a radio in his hands and even helped another
> jammer get his license. If I had only known, he would have gotten no
> help from anyone I knew.

I agree; jammers are scum. Most of those who have been given NALs for jamming are not Novices, or even recent licencees.

> There is an unavoidable 1st Amendment issue that says you can't enforce
> people to say what other people want to hear, any more than you can
> enforce people to listen to what they don't want to hear. The only
> enforcement that can be legitimately applied, is enforcement of the 1st
> Amendment by jailing and pulling the licences of willful interferers.

FCC enforcement is the correct solution.

> Do you really want a "letter" because someone was offended? There's
> way too much of that nonsense going on in political arenas.

I do not recall any of the NALs being issued because someone stated an opinion that someone else didn't like. Can you provide any examples?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

858. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 21:57:06 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <UGJ96.958$e5.2424410@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 1109

W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com> wrote:

> Probably the same moral outrage that causes all you Yankees to get your
> panties in a wad when you see a Confederate flag and scream KKK!

I think that most of the screaming about the confederate flag has been coming from south of the Mason-Dixon line. Most Yankees I know don't give it any thought at all.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

859. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 21:58:51 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <ylJ96.959$e5.2424444@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 1110
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in:

> I'll never forget my worst incident with a "radio cop." <snip>

> In the end, the "radio cop" did a good job of defending "proper"
> tradition on the radio. But in doing so, he ruined my wife's enjoyment
> of this hobby (and, for all practical purposes, ended her hobby before
> it even got started). And that is why I'll never forget that "radio cop."

And the really sad part is that the guy probably believes that it was worth
the price.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

860. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 22:02:36 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <3MJ96.960$e5.2424761@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 1111

Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com> wrote:

> I was just pointing out how the gaff could have been easily been
> avoided. The next time that you wear a bathing suit to church, will
> you get mad at those who laugh at you??

Some don't think that wearing a bathing suit to church is nearly as bad as saying "first personal" instead of "name" on a repeater. :-) I know you don't like me to ask questions, but I can't think of how to do so without a question mark, so I will just come out with it -- what do you think?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

861. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 22:04:34 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <VNJ96.961$e5.2424761@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 1112

Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com> wrote:

> In society most people are too polite to tell someone about his gaff.
> They just think of him poorly behind his back. At least hams are
> honest and straightforward... :-)

Whoever originated the phrase, "honesty is the best policy" clearly didn't envision this scenario. :-)

In some parts of society, most people are too polite to tell someone about their "gaff" at full quieting in front of a group of people the gaffer just met.

Others advocate that they do.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

862. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 22:25:51 UTC
From: W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com>
Message-ID: <947qig$sv1$1@iac5.navix.net>
Source record: 1113

That's a BIG 10-4...

"Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:3MJ96.960$e5.2424761@news.ntplx.net...
> Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com> wrote:
>
> > I was just pointing out how the gaff could have been easily been
> > avoided. The next time that you wear a bathing suit to church, will
> > you get mad at those who laugh at you??
>
> Some don't think that wearing a bathing suit to church is nearly as bad as
> saying "first personal" instead of "name" on a repeater. :-) I know you
> don't like me to ask questions, but I can't think of how to do so without
a
> question mark, so I will just come out with it -- what do you think?
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
>
>

863. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 22:39:30 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <947rb1$1hg$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1114

In article <944v9l$4nf$1@iac5.navix.net>,
"W4JLE" <Fred@w4jle.com> wrote:

> Probably the same moral outrage that causes all you Yankees
> to get your panties in a wad when you see a Confederate flag ...

Hell, you can fly whatever you want on your statehouse -- we got enuf
to worry about with Jesse Ventura hangin' 'round our statehouse.

73, Hans, K0HB

--
"We are fellow travelers on a journey between two
eternities, and it's a trip far too brief for me
to be concerned about your speed at the Code of
Morse."

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

864. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 22:50:59 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <947s0e$271$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1115

In article <3MJ96.960$e5.2424761@news.ntplx.net>,
"Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net> wrote:
> Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com> wrote:
>
> > I was just pointing out how the gaff could have been easily been
> > avoided. The next time that you wear a bathing suit to church, will
> > you get mad at those who laugh at you??
>
> Some don't think that wearing a bathing suit to church is nearly as
bad as
> saying "first personal" instead of "name" on a repeater. :-) I know
you
> don't like me to ask questions, but I can't think of how to do so
without a
> question mark, so I will just come out with it -- what do you think?
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

True story.

Just after the no-code Tech license was authorized, I heard a QSO in progress on the 146.85 machine in St Louis. An OT with a brand new NCT license/call was getting reamed by a 2x2 named Curtis. It appeared that the Tech had identified himself sayng "Oh" where the "Zero" should have been. The 2x2 was calling the new ham a stupid idiot.

The Tech explained that it was an "Oh" and not a zero because the instructor in his Tech class said in ham radio the sero is ALWAYS slashed. The sero on the license wasn't slashed.

Then a few other hams tried to intercede and change the subject, but NO. Curt just wouldn't let it go. It really got ugly and I was embarassed for ham radio and felt sorry that the new ham had to get that kind of greeting.

Now Dick will come on here and say that the new Tech should already know everything there is to know about ham radio and "should have known" that it couldn't have been an "Oh." After all, he passed a test.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

865. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 23:00:10 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <947shk$2nq$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1118

In article <20010118080025.26214.00000008@ng-fm1.aol.com>,
w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:
> >From: Brian brianburke@my-deja.com
>
> > I have lost my "cool" once or twice --
> >haven't you?
>
> >I not only have tired of hearing the OTs bitching, but I've begun
countering
> > they're insane accusations.
>
> On purpose?

No. Deliberately.

> >That should put some perspective on the situation.
>
> Yes, I think it did.

"Deliberately sending bad code" should have been challenged by more
readers than just me. It says a lot about where you stand as well.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

866. Re: CA power crisis caused by internet

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 23:00:54 UTC
From: K0HB@USWEST.NET
Message-ID: <947sj6$5l8$1@news.netmar.com>
Source record: 1102
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

In article <3A6753C0.D5BB4E59@uci.edu>, Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
writes:
>Brian Kelly wrote:
>> It's a La-la land power industry scam from top to
>> bottom, capitalism gone berserk.
>
>It's the state beaurocracy gone berserk.
>
>It's an experiment to see what happens when you require the sellers of
>electricity to sell-off their means of producing electricity, remove the
>limits of wholesale pricing, but keep the limits on consumer pricing.
>The power producers can limit supply so that the wholesale price will go
>as high as they want, and the guy selling it to the end user is stuck
>with the loss. It's as screwed up as anything could possibly be.
>Edison, the company that built practically everything we have out here,
>is getting totally screwed. Electricity has always been bargain priced
>out here. Our taxes will have to go up to pay for it now.

Despite what the feel-good politicians (in bed with corporate raiders) will
tell you, there are few things which are best left as regulated regional
monopolies.

73, Hans, K0HB

----- Posted via NewsOne.Net: Free (anonymous) Usenet News via the Web -----
http://newsone.net/ -- Free reading and anonymous posting to 60,000+ groups
NewsOne.Net prohibits users from posting spam. If this or other posts
made through NewsOne.Net violate posting guidelines, email abuse@newsone.net

867. Re: CA power crisis caused by internet

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 23:02:09 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccoll@radiks.net>
Message-ID: <fAK96.2852$AN.226390@nntp1.onemain.com>
Source record: 1116
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

<K0HB@USWEST.NET> wrote in message news:947sj6$5l8$1@news.netmar.com...
> In article <3A6753C0.D5BB4E59@uci.edu>, Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
> >out here. Our taxes will have to go up to pay for it now.
>
> Despite what the feel-good politicians (in bed with corporate raiders)
will
> tell you, there are few things which are best left as regulated regional
> monopolies.
>
> 73, Hans, K0HB

Why guarantee a profit? That is ultimately what regulation does and has to do. I believe you are on Northern States Power which as utilities go is a good one in a lot of respects. But if you called there I will bet that now and certainly the next cold snap you will be buying power from the Nebraska Public Power System via MidContinent Area Power Planners lines, a loop from NSP to Chicago to St Louis to KC to Omaha and back. You will pump it back next summer.
The history of consumer-owned power in Nebraska is a great one with rates about 20 percent lower than the national average. Right at the moment I am probably being supplied by the nuke at Fort Calhoun on time, on price, and reliable as sin.

Public power is one of the legacies of Senator George Norris. Norris Dam on the TVA is named for him, GW Bush is being inaugurated 20 Jan rather than March 4 because of him, and Nebraska has a one-house legislature because of him although the local 'conservatives' cum idiots limited the sessions making filibusters possible (Norris was in on a famous filibuster so one of the things he pushed was unlimited sessions). My water and gas come from a more local Metropolitan Utilities District that also does its job extremely well.

The trick -- and it is hard to do -- is to limit the scope of the utility's responsibilities and not to politicize everything. The TVA nearly foundered until David Lilianthal(?) firmly put them in the power business.

I am as much a fan of free enterprise as anyone but I just do not see where electric power should be free or particularly enterprising.

Dick N&#65533;BK

868. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 23:12:10 UTC
From: Jerry Oxendine <joxendi@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <3A67784A.504@bellsouth.net>
Source record: 1117
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

I agree that it may be better to allow a new ham to listen rather than jumping him on the air. He'll soon realize that we don't generally use certain terms. People generally try to fit into anything to which they are new and usually will come around to "doing as the Romans do" on their own.

Like you, I've had a couple of run-ins with "radio cops". I once used the local auto-patch, pounded it down, and made the usual announcement- "K4KWH clearing auto-patch after third party traffic with XXXX......." R-cop proceeded to lecture me that I was to do that BEFORE bringing down the patch. I didn't see the difference--still don't--just so I made the required statement. I was nice to the old codger, but I was seething. Some time went by--maybe several years--when one night I eased down to the local Dairy Queen for a huge cone of ice cream. The local club was having their usual Tuesday nite VHF net on the same repeater. All of a sudden, a pickup changed lanes and ran a Chrysler off the road onto the sidewalk. Poor guy (car) busted a tire, ruined a hubcap, bent a wheel, and missed a light pole by inches. Pickup kept going. I broke the net with my call, told the net control station I needed to call the police because of a hit and run, and he immediately yielded the repeater. I brought up the patch, started to dial 911 and somebody pounded it down right out from under me stating, "THAT IS NOT EMERGENCY TRAFFIC"! Guess who it was. The same old geezer that jumped me about the patch previously. It started something of an on-air debate/argument with this old fart trying to lecture ALL of us on what is an emergency or not. I didn't take kindly to this because the hit and run driver was long gone during this 3-4 minute debate. I finally spoke up: "JUST NEVER YOU MIND OLD MAN. THE HIT AND RUN TRUCK IS GONE AND I HOPE YOU'RE DURNED WELL SATISFIED!"

I wasn't the only one that got mad at him. The club was ready to expell him, but finally decided on a suspension. Trouble was, the old buzzard wouldn't let it die. He started talking about me on and off air to others, making most inappropriate suggestions about my qualifications as a ham. Completely out of line and unjustified. I had never done anything to him, nor had I actually met him in person. Of course, it got back to me. Fed up with this guy's attitude and antics, I finagled a personal introduction. Upon realizing who I was, he turned a little red! I then proceeded to inform him that if he did not cease and desist from his slander, that there would be legal action. If that didn't work? I think I remember putting it to him this way: Mr. ----, I have never met you before. I have never done anything to you. You have an "alligator" mouth and a "canary" a** and your mouth is fixin' to write a check yo' a** can't CASH! Do you understand me? You are not to speak

to me, call or correct me on the air, nor have any contact with me whatsoever!" That old man turned pale as a ghost, dropped his head and said, "yes, sir", like a scolded little boy. I haven't heard a peep from him in 5 years.

W4JLE wrote:
>
> It has been my experience that the biggest "radio Cops" turn out to be
> no-code techs that have had a licenses for a year or so. I had one start on
> me one morning when I used the term handle.
>
> He proceeded to tell me how "handle" was a CB term and not used on the
> repeater. Being the shrinking violet I am, I went on to explain I used
> "handle" on 11 meters when it was a ham band along with a dissertation about
> correcting people who may be new and somewhat hesitant such as your wife.
>

869. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 23:20:26 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <947tng$3ql$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1120

In article <947fq9$m9o$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
xjim@my-deja.com wrote:
>
> > What standards have been lowered? The existing "entry" level ticket
> > material is so large and complex that it cannot be run away from.
>
> The lowering of standards have been brought about by a combination of
> the VEC program that brings in large groups of unknown people

Perhaps we need to have them submit an application to test. Color photograph must be included. Then the VEC can review the apps and give a thumbs up to some and a thumbs down to the "ones that don't look right."

who
> are "helped" into a license and the fully published question pool

The old method almost required being inducted into the lodge by an existing lodge member in good standing.

that
> short circuits the learning process, and focuses on rote memorization.

I'll agree with you here. For someone with no background in electronics, the only viable method of passing the exams is some memorization and/or word associations.

> That is, people can get a license so fast, you wind up with whole
> graduating classes that have no connection to the accumulated
> experience of amateur radio.

After 40 years in amateur radio, they will be saying the same about the new crop.

> One way to get around this is to have an entry level ticket with
> greatly reduced priveliges, that is time limited. Further testing
that
> reveals experience would be required to upgrade. It used to be that a
> novice couldn't upgrade without either turning in a log of at least
100
> contacts or 100 QSL cards. Does Japan still have a system that
> requires SWL QSLs from Ham operators in order to upgrade from an SWL
> ticket?

Fine, but Soviet Russia required that.

> > When I compare the technical
> > > discussions and considerate behavior of those who knew full well
> they
> > > could be heard everywhere,
> >
> > My comments prior to the restructuring:
> >
> > What I fear most about the restructuring is a lack of enforcement.
> And
> > what I fear most about maintaining the status quo is a lack of
> > enforcement.
> >
> > > giving way to Hate and Discontent
> >
> > Ex-Jim, much of the hate and discontent is coming from some OTs.
The
> > ones wha have been hams a long time. The ones who know and count on
> > being heard everywhere.
>
> The point is; These people are chasing the legitamate operators off of
> the air. What you have left over is people who are trying to get some
> enjoyment around these people and these people who get their jollies
> from this behavior. Yes there will be beligerant OTs left in this
> mess. There will also be beligerant OTs BORN of this mess. These
> people ARE PART OF THE PROBLEM and are easy to point to, but the way
to
> deal with these people are to avoid giving away licenses in the first
> place.

The beligerants probably "earned" their licenses the hard way (whatever
that is). Each new crop recalls their learning to have been the
hardest.

> I know I am guilty too. I assisted a novice once that turned out to
be
> a jammer once he got a radio in his hands and even helped another
> jammer get his license.

Do you want a smoke before I tie the blindfold on?

> If I had only known, he would have gotten no
> help from anyone I knew.

You can't know.

> As it was we were able to prevent the further
> spread of this nonsense as they only could talk to each other and
> finally lost interest and lapsed without an upgrade. These days they
> might have a lot bigger circle of friends and a renewable 10 year
> license without FCC intervention.

Probably a good reason for me to stop talking to Dick.

> There is an unavoidable 1st Amendment issue that says you can't
enforce
> people to say what other people want to hear, any more than you can
> enforce people to listen to what they don't want to hear. The only
> enforcement that can be legitimately applied, is enforcement of the
1st
> Amendment by jailing and pulling the licences of willful interferers.
> You really don't want any more interference than that from the
> government because "behavior" is too subjective and nebulous.

Yet you want to deny people who otherwise qualify for licenses because
you want to screen them first and make sure...

> Do you really want a "letter" because someone was offended? There's
> way too much of that nonsense going on in political arenas.
>
> > in order
> > > to impress a new group of listeners, who's going to want to (much
> less
> > > be savy enough to) save allocations in the future? I have seen
Ham
> > > Radio Magazine die off and QEX almost die off.
> >
> > Hey, AntenneX resurfaced on the web. Check it out.
> >
> > > We used to have to fill
> > > out our own 610 forms, and we joked that it was a literacy test.
> Now
> > > that we don't have to do that, how many new hams won't even be
able
> to
> > > read QST, much less give a S***?
> >
> > They'll have to be web savvy and take care of biddness via the FCC
ULS
> > page. It's complexity goes beyond a mere literacy test.
>
> The problem with that is that the FCC isn't completely web savvy
> either, and again do you want them to be more of a presence in web
> communications? So far we have much more freedom to express ourselves
> here than with the "handbill" or letters to the editor or anything
else
> under FCC jurisdiction. The MASS MEDIA only proves that the 1st
> amendment belongs to the highest bidder.

Ding ding ding ding ding! I agree with that.

I'll support the learners license good for two years or age 18,
which ever is longest. Maybe 25W on 10M and 440, otherwise all modes,
no repeater trustee stuff.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

870. Re: 10 bucks buys a ham license.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-18 23:23:26 UTC
From: Steve Woodruff <sjwoodr.nospam@nospam.email.com>
Message-ID: <947tthelb1@flood.xnet.com>
Source record: 1119
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"LRod" <lr0d@my-deja.com> wrote in message
news:94599b$qv4$1@nnrp1.deja.com...
> Who was the VEC for your exam? I have my own suspicion, and if I'm
> correct it's further confirmation of why I will never have anything to
> do with him.

It was an ARRL VEC in Woodstock, IL ... put on by the
McHenry County Wireless Assocation. I could dig up the
names from the CSCE, but i don't think we want to put
anyone on trial here. :)

> Irrespective of who it is, it's an example of poor training of the VE
> team. That's one of the things that should have been basic in their
> instruction. I suggest you write a letter of complaint to the VEC.

I really don't have anything to complain about... i didn't pay the
additional fee -- i just didn't take the extra class exam after I
passed the general class one.

--steve

871. Re: CA power crisis caused by internet

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 00:25:16 UTC
From: Rickhit@worldnet.att.net
Message-ID: <3a6788eb.1082628@netnews.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 1121
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Thu, 18 Jan 2001 16:37:00 -0500, "W4JLE" <Fred@w4jle.com> wrote:

>
>The problem will be solved when the big one hits, and Nevada ocean front
>property becomes available.
>
>
So are you buying desert land like Lex Luther? :-)

Rick KC2ESD

872. Re: CA power crisis caused by internet

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 00:27:02 UTC
From: Rickhit@worldnet.att.net
Message-ID: <3a68897d.1228985@netnews.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 1122
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Thu, 18 Jan 2001 12:42:34 -0600, Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
wrote:

>
>When a state doesn't build any power generating plants during the
>ten years the population is doubling, the result is 100% predictable.

You are right on the Money! It's the simple case of supply and
demand.

Rick KC2ESD

873. Re: CA power crisis caused by internet

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 00:35:22 UTC
From: JR <jr@some.net>
Message-ID: <3A677CBF.762F0C9C@some.net>
Source record: 1123
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

California can thank the tree huggers for their current energy crisis.

Jim Kelley wrote:

> Brian Kelly wrote:
> > It's a La-la land power industry scam from top to
> > bottom, capitalism gone berserk.
>
> It's the state beaurocracy gone berserk.
>
> It's an experiment to see what happens when you require the sellers of
> electricity to sell-off their means of producing electricity, remove the
> limits of wholesale pricing, but keep the limits on consumer pricing.
> The power producers can limit supply so that the wholesale price will go
> as high as they want, and the guy selling it to the end user is stuck
> with the loss. It's as screwed up as anything could possibly be.
> Edison, the company that built practically everything we have out here,
> is getting totally screwed. Electricity has always been bargain priced
> out here. Our taxes will have to go up to pay for it now.
>
> 73, ac6xg

874. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 00:42:43 UTC
From: JR <jr@some.net>
Message-ID: <3A677E77.319F2AD6@some.net>
Source record: 1124
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Just proves it doesn't take all kinds to make a world, we just happen to have all kinds. Must really suck to be someone like this guy.

Jerry Oxendine wrote:

> I agree that it may be better to allow a new ham to listen rather than
> jumping him on the air. He'll soon realize that we don't generally use
> certain terms. People generally try to fit into anything to which they
> are new and usually will come around to "doing as the Romans do" on
> their own.
>
> Like you, I've had a couple of run-ins with "radio cops". I once used
> the local auto-patch, pounded it down, and made the usual announcement-
> "K4KWH clearing auto-patch after third party traffic with XXXX......."
> R-cop proceeded to lecture me that I was to do that BEFORE bringing down
> the patch. I didn't see the difference--still don't--just so I made the
> required statement. I was nice to the old codger, but I was seething.
> Some time went by--maybe several years--when one night I eased down to
> the local Dairy Queen for a huge cone of ice cream. The local club was
> having their usual Tuesday nite VHF net on the same repeater. All of a
> sudden, a pickup changed lanes and ran a Chrysler off the road onto the
> sidewalk. Poor guy (car) busted a tire, ruined a hubcap, bent a wheel,
> and missed a light pole by inches. Pickup kept going. I broke the net
> with my call, told the net control station I needed to call the police
> because of a hit and run, and he immediately yielded the repeater. I
> brought up the patch, started to dial 911 and somebody pounded it down
> right out from under me stating, "THAT IS NOT EMERGENCY TRAFFIC"! Guess
> who it was. The same old geezer that jumped me about the patch pre-
> viously. It started something of an on-air debate/argument with this
> old fart trying to lecture ALL of us on what is an emergency or not. I
> didn't take kindly to this because the hit and run driver was long gone
> during this 3-4 minute debate. I finally spoke up: "JUST NEVER YOU MIND
> OLD MAN. THE HIT AND RUN TRUCK IS GONE AND I HOPE YOU'RE DURNED WELL
> SATISFIED!"
>
> I wasn't the only one that got mad at him. The club was ready to expell
> him, but finally decided on a suspension. Trouble was, the old buzzard
> wouldn't let it die. He started talking about me on and off air to
> others, making most inappropriate suggestions about my qualifications as
> a ham. Completely out of line and unjustified. I had never done any-
> thing to him, nor had I actually met him in person. Of course, it got
> back to me. Fed up with this guy's attitude and antics, I finagled a
> personal introduction. Upon realizing who I was, he turned a little
> red! I then proceeded to inform him that if he did not cease and de-

> sist from his slander, that there would be legal action. If that didn't
> work? I think I remember putting it to him this way: Mr. ----, I have
> never met you before. I have never done anything to you. You have an
> "alligator" mouth and a "canary" a** and your mouth is fixin' to write
> a check yo' a** can't CASH! Do you understand me? You are not to speak
> to me, call or correct me on the air, nor have any contact with me
> whatsoever!" That old man turned pale as a ghost, dropped his head and
> said, "yes, sir", like a scolded little boy. I haven't heard a peep
> from him in 5 years.
>
> W4JLE wrote:

875. Re: CA power crisis caused by internet

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 01:05:46 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A6792EA.7AF4FD14@uci.edu>
Source record: 1125
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

JR wrote:

> California can thank the tree huggers for their current energy crisis.

Well, I don't like 'em either, but blaming them would shift the blame from where it justly belongs, and that is with the legislators. They deregulated the phone company federally. So the state thought they'd take a crack at the power industry. You ought to see all the fees, and surcharges, and taxes, and rebates on our electric bills now. Looks like it was designed by a committee, and nobody can figure out the damn things. The idea was to spur competition, but an unfortunate sequence of events, along with the help of some opportunistic and unscrupulous companys lead us to where we are now. It would have been difficult to foresee this particular outcome.

876. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 01:21:41 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A6796A5.8935309D@uci.edu>
Source record: 1126

"Ed Hare, W1RFI" wrote:

> Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote:

> > > I think the biggest issue here is that some think of SS as a 'digital'
> mode.

> > The biggest issue, Ed? How so? I don't even know if it's true, let
> > alone the biggest issue.

> Let me clarify; by "here" I mean here in the conversation about SS.

I thought that was perfectly clear, Ed.

So to whom do you refer, and why is it such a big issue?

73, Jim AC6XG

877. Re: CA power crisis caused by internet

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 02:07:34 UTC
From: kking@no-mail.com
Message-ID: <9487h6$70u$0@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 1127
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Thu, 18 Jan 2001 12:20:09 -0500, Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com> wrote:
:
: That's ten days old.

I see. Story posted by CNN on 1/17; your post was on 1/18. Yep, that's
10 days all right.

Looks as though you didn't even bother to read the story before
commenting on it.

878. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 02:08:36 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <518f6to0okmfm5o1ud663ialsfpdl75kii@4ax.com>
Source record: 1128

"Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net> wrote:

>Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com> wrote:
>
>> In society most people are too polite to tell someone about his gaff.
>> They just think of him poorly behind his back. At least hams are
>> honest and straightforward... :-)
>
>Whoever originated the phrase, "honesty is the best policy" clearly didn't
>envision this scenario. :-)

I suppose it's not much different than someone who is too polite to
tell his CW contact that he has a bad fist and lies that he is being
called to dinner to end the QSO early... :-)

879. Re: Black list

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 02:08:36 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <r08f6t41aghi3edb7bjjk32bvnha3vf756@4ax.com>
Source record: 1129

"Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net> wrote:
>I suppose I do, Aaron, but I have never felt
>is necessary to publish it on the web.

Wow. Ed keeps a ham blacklist. Who would have thunk it... :-)

880. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 02:08:37 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <a08f6t8i07a3qkerqfocd7r8o5depo54c2@4ax.com>
Source record: 1130

"Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net> wrote:
>The FCC does not allocate spectrum to the Amateur Radio
>Service only on the basis of the fact that hams pass tests.

Well then, that's certainly a good thing. Passing a ham test doesn't
show much about what hams know about radio and electronics... :-)

881. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 02:08:38 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <qm7f6tg9rrjip5mq77au0t22qj8ouptsjs@4ax.com>
Source record: 1131

"Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net> wrote:
>I know you don't like me to ask questions, but I can't
>think of how to do so without a question mark,
>so I will just come out with it -- what do you think?

I think that you have that backwards. You don't like *me* to ask questions. In a recent post you refused to answer my simple question: "Do you think that a test that allows people to pass without knowing the material is a good test?" because you said you didn't like my *debating style*... :-)

Here are 2 more questions you recently ignored. if you're going to ask questions, don't you think you should start answering some... :-)

(1) Do you think it was morally correct for Bash to circumvent the FCC tests by publishing the exact questions and answers, thus allowing hams to pass the test by cheating?

(2) Do you believe it would be OK for me to lawfully but clandestinely obtain a copy of an ARRL employment exam, say from an employee who owes me a favor, and print and sell it to those seeking employment at ARRL?

882. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 02:13:43 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9487sn$9b1$0@208.207.71.174>
Source record: 1132

"Ed Hare, W1RFI" wrote:
>
> W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com> wrote:
>
> > Probably the same moral outrage that causes all you Yankees to get your
> > panties in a wad when you see a Confederate flag and scream KKK!
>
> I think that most of the screaming about the confederate flag has been
> coming from south of the Mason-Dixon line. Most Yankees I know don't give
> it any thought at all.

Ed there are many degrees of yankeeness, begining at The Line and progresssing as you go further north. I'm a Yankee by about 35 miles. A Connecticut Yankee is about as Yankee as it gets.

883. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 02:19:25 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <94887d$a0o$0@208.207.71.174>
Source record: 1133

```
Brian Kelly wrote:
>
> Aaron Jones wrote:
>
> > "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nospam.spam> wrote:
> > > "10-20" has a honorable history in public-safety voice comms
> > > but the "mutilation" is to drop the "10" and just refer to your
> > > "twenty".
> >
> > Even cops often shorten the 10 codes to just the last number. It makes
> > sense if it takes less air time and the meaning is understood by all.
> > 10 codes, although codes, actually become words in the users minds,
> > and like words often evolve with use...
>
> >
> Ya mean like cw exchanges are a languge?

'zactly.
```

884. Re: 10 bucks buys a ham license.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 02:21:17 UTC
From: LRod <lr0d@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <9488ancrm1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1135
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <947tthelb1@flood.xnet.com>,
"Steve Woodruff" <sjwoodr.nospam@nospam.email.com> wrote:
> "LRod" <lr0d@my-deja.com> wrote in message
> news:94599b$qv4$1@nnrp1.deja.com...

> > Who was the VEC for your exam?

> It was an ARRL VEC in Woodstock, IL

Hmmm. I know a lot of those guys. I ran exams just down the river from them in Aurora. In fact, the guy that started the testing group up there years ago and I were both with DeVry VEC originally. I can't remember callsigns, since I've moved, but there must have been some turnover that leaves some uninformed VEs, because the guy I know wouldn't do that or train his people to do that. Sorry.

> I really don't have anything to complain about...

Yes you do. You were prepared for an exam and an incorrect interpretation by a team that should know better kept you from taking the exam when you were ready. Although you might not get any satisfaction, they need to be made aware of the problem so it doesn't happen again to someone else.

LRod

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

885. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 02:27:09 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9488ltbdu0@208.207.71.174>
Source record: 1134

W1RFI wrote:
>
> Frankly, Dick, I would much rather see new hams with sensitivities than those
> who are cold and insensitive to the feelings of others.

So there are no third categories?
You Political Correct mavens insist that your choices are all there is.
What would be the matter with some newcomers with an attitude of "I'm gonna get this and do it well, make my mistakes and get it right and to heck with the minor irritations, whatever they may be. Maybe I can learn something about it all from them, if I don't let the chip blow off my shoulder".
It must be in the water. NO one today seems to have anything but a fragile, easily destroyed ego. If I had been like that I'd have never made it into the teenage years, much less far beyond.

886. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 02:36:10 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <94896qbdu1@208.207.71.174>
Source record: 1136

Cecil wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > The poor kid is sure to have a rough life, what with being too ignorant
> > to grasp a new procedure in a new environment, then being put off so
> > easily when gently corrected. What *is* this new generation ever going
> > to amount to, anyway?
>
> Absolutely nothing as long as your generation keeps bullying them.
> Newness is something fragile that needs to be nurtured, not jumped
> on with golf shoes.

Bend over, Cecil....I've got my golf shoes on......

887. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 02:43:35 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9489kn$e1h$0@208.207.71.174>
Source record: 1137

"Ed Hare, W1RFI" wrote:
>
> Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com> wrote:
>
> > I was just pointing out how the gaff could have been easily been
> > avoided. The next time that you wear a bathing suit to church, will
> > you get mad at those who laugh at you??
>
> Some don't think that wearing a bathing suit to church is nearly as bad as
> saying "first personal" instead of "name" on a repeater. :-) I know you
> don't like me to ask questions, but I can't think of how to do so without a
> question mark, so I will just come out with it -- what do you think?
>

It still raises my hackles a notch to hear on the ham bands clone
conversation from CB where not much but the frequencies and (maybe)
callsigns are changed. It always seemed to me that people who adopt a
new environment might be interested in adopting its conventions also,
given a little time.

But so far I haven't called anyone down for doing it. Don't plan to
either. FCC has given the ham bands to the CBers, fair and square.

888. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 02:43:57 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <9489lcdrt1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1142

In article <20010118043435.05040.00002257@ng-ff1.aol.com>,
w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:
> >From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
>
> > The poor kid is sure to have a rough life, what with being too
ignorant
> >to grasp a new procedure in a new environment, then being put off so
> >easily when gently corrected. What *is* this new generation ever
going
> >to amount to, anyway?
>
> I sure hope no one told him he was "ignorant" when they "gently
corrected" him.

I don't think Dick knows what a gentle correction is, just boot camp mentality. Probably had the kid doing push ups or digging the base hole for a free standing tower with a spoon.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

889. Re: CA power crisis caused by internet

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 02:44:42 UTC
From: Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com>
Message-ID: <3A67AA1A.4A6F25A7@dvol.com>
Source record: 1138
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Jim Kelley wrote:

> Brian Kelly wrote:
> > It's a La-la land power industry scam from top to
> > bottom, capitalism gone berserk.
>
> It's the state beaurocracy gone berserk.

>
That's certainly where it started. It's a rather amazing combination of
bureaucratic stupidity and capitalist greed.
>

> It's an experiment

>
"Experiment"? With the power supply for most of the biggest state in the
Union? Makes huige sense to me . .
>

> to see what happens when you require the sellers of
> electricity to sell-off their means of producing electricity, remove the
> limits of wholesale pricing, but keep the limits on consumer pricing.

>
If it was elected officials who put that masterpiece together I think I'd
work very hard to make sure their current terms in office are their last.
>

> The power producers can limit supply so that the wholesale price will go
> as high as they want, and the guy selling it to the end user is stuck
> with the loss.

>
That's where my shot at capitalism came from. I noticed that some
disproportionate number of generating facilities are down for maintenance at
the same time. Random acts of course.
>

> It's as screwed up as anything could possibly be.
> Edison, the company that built practically everything we have out here,
> is getting totally screwed.

>
I agree, I've worked in the biz, both PG&E and Ed have a sterling
reputations. It ain't them and it ain't the Internet hubs.

>

> Electricity has always been bargain priced
> out here. Our taxes will have to go up to pay for it now.

>
Gotta be paid for one way or another. Chalk up one good example of the
limits to scatterbrained deregulation. I'm a hardcore open-market
free-enterpriser to the core but this disaster has set the clock back to
justification for socialism, this is bloody ridiculous.
>
Here in Philly we pay the second highest rates in the country second only to
what ConEd gouges out of their NYC customers and have been doing so for most
of the prior century. The net result is that we're conditioned to getting
pounded by our power bills. Folks moving into this region from other places
routinely come unglued when they get their first PECO (or whoever it is
these days) bill. But there is some spare capacity here with more coming.
Two-three years ago the new-wave generating companies were mothballing
capacity. Now every steam turbine and generator shop in this country is
suddenly completely booked for years ahead for the first time since I was a
kid and that was a LONG time ago.
>
This thing hasn't even started. I noticed in today's news that the lawyers
and prosecutors are rolling up their sleeves and diving into this fiasco.
>

> 73, ac6xg

>
w3rv

890. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 02:47:24 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9489rs$ek7$0@208.207.71.174>
Source record: 1139

Brian wrote:
>
> In article <3MJ96.960$e5.2424761@news.ntplx.net>,
> "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net> wrote:
> > Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com> wrote:
> >
> > > I was just pointing out how the gaff could have been easily been
> > > avoided. The next time that you wear a bathing suit to church, will
> > > you get mad at those who laugh at you??
> >
> > Some don't think that wearing a bathing suit to church is nearly as
> bad as
> > saying "first personal" instead of "name" on a repeater. :-) I know
> you
> > don't like me to ask questions, but I can't think of how to do so
> without a
> > question mark, so I will just come out with it -- what do you think?
> >
> > 73,
> > Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
> True story.
>
> Just after the no-code Tech license was authorized, I heard a QSO in
> progress on the 146.85 machine in St Louis. An OT with a brand new NCT
> license/call was getting reamed by a 2x2 named Curtis. It appeared that
> the Tech had identified himself sayng "Oh" where the "Zero" should have
> been. The 2x2 was calling the new ham a stupid idiot.
>
> The Tech explained that it was an "Oh" and not a zero because the
> instructor in his Tech class said in ham radio the sero is ALWAYS
> slashed. The sero on the license wasn't slashed.
>
> Then a few other hams tried to intercede and change the subject, but NO.
> Curt just wouldn't let it go. It really got ugly and I was embarassed
> for ham radio and felt sorry that the new ham had to get that kind of
> greeting.
>
> Now Dick will come on here and say that the new Tech should already
> know everything there is to know about ham radio and "should have known"
> that it couldn't have been an "Oh." After all, he passed a test.

Don't you ever get tired of being wrong, Gnat? As it happens I did have
a contact with a new ham where the very same thing came up, the zero

without the slash on it in his callsign. I mentioned to him that it actually was a zero but the FCC's computers stopped putting the slash in the zero years ago. Evidently the FCC doesn't know the difference, either.

891. Re: CA power crisis caused by internet

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 02:50:12 UTC
From: Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com>
Message-ID: <3A67AB64.5B06DD71@dvol.com>
Source record: 1140
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Kerry King wrote:

> On Thu, 18 Jan 2001 12:20:09 -0500, Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com> wrote:
> :
> : That's ten days old.
>
> I see. Story posted by CNN on 1/17; your post was on 1/18. Yep, that's
> 10 days all right.
>
> Looks as though you didn't even bother to read the story before
> commenting on it.

>
Yeah, I did read it and I also read it ten or so days ago in USAToday.

892. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 02:50:43 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <948a23$f4f$0@208.207.71.174>
Source record: 1141

Aaron Jones wrote:
>
> w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:
>
> >>From: Aaron Jones nomail@nomail.com
> > >
> > >>Every hobby has it's preferred lingo. If you use the wrong lingo you
> > >>immediately identify yourself as an outsider...
> > >
> > >You do mean "former" outsider, do you not? This fellow did get a ham license,
> > >so he is now one of us.
> >
> > I said "every hobby". Let me rephrase my sentence for ham radio:
> >
> > Ham radio has it's preferred repeater lingo. If you use the wrong
> > lingo you immediately identify yourself as an outsider (to repeater
> > operation)...
> >
> > If I said "W7xxx monitoring" on CW in order to get a contact, I think
> > I might be thought of as an outsider...or worse... :-)

I once knew an OT who had been off the air so long that he was new to
repeaters, and when he finally got a two meter rig he called CQ on the
repeater just as he would have on HF.
It isn't always the newcomers who miscue.

893. Re: CA power crisis caused by internet

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 02:57:00 UTC
From: Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com>
Message-ID: <3A67ACFC.D69389FA@dvol.com>
Source record: 1143
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

JR wrote:

> California can thank the tree huggers for their current energy crisis.
>

>
It's gonna get interesting everywhere when it becomes obvious that the only
way out is more nukes.
>
w3rv

894. Re: Anyone For An RRAP Meeting At Dayton?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 02:58:45 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <948ah1emn1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1144

In article <3A66D901.6B7D086A@dvol.com>,
Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com> wrote:
>
> Brian wrote:
>
> > In article <94464jpck1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
> > Steven J Robeson, K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com> wrote:
> > >
> > > > Hmmmmm??????
> > >
> > > Just as long as you's guys don't embarass me in front of my friends.
> >
> > >
> > You actually got friends? OK, that's easy. Don't bring your friends.
We
> want you all by yerself . . .

Just as I figgered, so we'll be packin (handi-tawkies)!

Hey, shrill Steve once offered to "introduce" me to the DX banquet.
Maybe we could crash that? Or at least show up at his flea-market BBQ.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

895. Re: It's like this....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 03:05:17 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <948at8$et1$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1147

In article <944612pbp1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
Steven J Robeson, K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com> wrote:
> In article <943otq$g55$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
> Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com> wrote:
>
> > > PS: The internet newsgroups are not amateur radio.
> >
> > PS: That 1x2 after your name is for what? Decoration? Rank?
> >
> > You're using the K3LT argument that since this isn't wireless,
you're
> > free to be a jerk.
>
> I'd say you're trolling for a reason to CALL someone a jerk,
> Burke...

Steve, you're my pet peve. Better than a pet rock.

> Kinda like your brother Lennie who denies initiating calling
> people names but has been calling Fred, W4JLE "Jelly" all week.

He's correct. -I- initiated (Jelly) in the Banana Boat wars.

> Birds of a flightless feather, I'd say......

Aim Higher, jarhead.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

896. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 03:13:27 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <948bcnifg0@208.207.71.174>
Source record: 1145

"Ed Hare, W1RFI" wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>
> > > Now, if all of these new hams can memorize over 1,100 questions in the
> > > question pool in a weekend of studying, I am sure they can memorize 26
> > > characters and a few punctuations "easily."
>
> > Replay #976.... They don't memorize the questions and answers, they
> > make word associations so that when they read a question they look for
> > the familiar choice among the possibles, and can pick it out often
> > enough to pass. That's after studying only a single test element, not
> > the whole question pool. Vast difference, but you already knew that.
>
> Like these?
>
> T6A02 @T6A12 (A)
> Which symbol of Figure T6-1 represents a fixed resistor?
> A. Symbol 2
> B. Symbol 3
> C. Symbol 4
> D. Symbol 5
>
> T6A04 @N6A10 (A)
> In Figure N6-2, which symbol represents a single-pole, single-throw
> switch?
> A. Symbol 1
> B. Symbol 2
> C. Symbol 3
> D. Symbol 4
>
> T6A06 @N6A08 (A)
> In Figure N6-1, which symbol represents a fuse?
> A. Symbol 1
> B. Symbol 3
> C. Symbol 5
> D. Symbol 7
>
> T6A08 @N6A09 (D)
> In Figure N6-1, which symbol represents a single-cell battery?
> A. Symbol 7
> B. Symbol 5
> C. Symbol 1
> D. Symbol 4

>
> T6B03 @N6B04 (D)
> In Figure N6-1, which symbol represents an earth ground?
> A. Symbol 2
> B. Symbol 5
> C. Symbol 6
> D. Symbol 8
>
> T6B04 @N6B06 (D)
> In Figure N6-1, which symbol represents an antenna?
> A. Symbol 2
> B. Symbol 3
> C. Symbol 6
> D. Symbol 7
>
> T6B05 @N6B07 (D)
> In Figure N6-3, which symbol represents an NPN transistor?
> A. Symbol 1
> B. Symbol 2
> C. Symbol 3
> D. Symbol 4
>
> T6B06 @T6B01 (A)
> Which symbol of Figure T6-2 represents a fixed-value capacitor?
> A. Symbol 1
> B. Symbol 2
> C. Symbol 3
> D. Symbol 4
>
> T6B07 @T6B06 (C)
> In Figure T6-2, which symbol represents a variable capacitor?
> A. Symbol 1
> B. Symbol 2
> C. Symbol 3
> D. Symbol 4
>

See? All the protestations from myself and others have had an impact.
You gotta wonder if there would have been any improvement in some of the
questions had we not sounded off so much about them. Whoever changes the
questions must have been paying *some* attention. I'llhave to sign into
the HQ website and check out the current question pool. If a majority
are written like those it represents a major change in things since I
was an active VE. Inded it would be easier to just learn the material on
those few. They would be hard to answer without knowing the material.
'Twas not alwas so.

897. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 03:17:38 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <948bkiifg1@208.207.71.174>
Source record: 1146

Brian wrote:

>who tought Orville Wright to fly?

Wilbur

>Who taught Sammy Morse the code?

Alfred Vail

>
> Either can be self-taught.

I sure hope you try to teach yourself to fly. You already blew the
code.

>Today it just depends on the gubmn't
> regulations.

Yeah, Right!

898. Re: It's like this....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 03:24:22 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <948c0vfpn1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1150

In article <945ranfep0@208.207.71.177>,
Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>
>
> Brian wrote:
> >
> >
> > You're using the K3LT argument that since this isn't wireless,
you're
> > free to be a jerk.
>
> So then you're the only one free to do that?

Dick, a better response would have been, "So then you're joining the crowd," but no, you insanely accuse me of being the ONLY ONE that does what Larry does. Well, if Larry does it, and I do it, then I couldn't possibly be the ONLY ONE.

Additionally, you excuse yourself, Hans, Kelly, Jelly (Fred), Bruce, Steve (shrill), GrayJL, and all the ANONs, from the cluster of people free to be jerks. The only way you're statement could be true is if you and your cronies were made to be jerks at gunpoint, thus not of your free will. For that many gunmen to be present at so many geographical locations to pull off such a feat would make it a conspiracy, which makes you crazy.

I really try to provide a rational argument. I'll usually give you at least 2 or 3 tries after your initial shitty response to say something rational. After that, all bets are off.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

899. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 03:25:09 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <948c2lifg2@208.207.71.174>
Source record: 1148

W1RFI wrote:
>
> >From: vlfiscus@mcn.net (Vince Fiscus, KB7ADL)
>
> >Ed, this wouldn't be a fair test. no-coders aren't smart enough to build
> >things, least of all their code speed.
>
> In what way do you think learning Morse code will improve their ability to
> construct equipment?
>

Maybe they could connect the dots? :-)

900. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 03:26:18 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <948c4qifg3@208.207.71.174>
Source record: 1149

W1RFI wrote:
>
> >From: Brian brianburke@my-deja.com
>
> >BTW, when you took the 13 and 20wpm exams in front of the FCC examiner,
> >did you dazzle him with your coconut boat swing?
>
> For the 13 wpm text, the examiner stopped me after about 2 words. For the 20
> wpm test, the FCC gave me only a receiving test.
>
> Then, as now, I did the best I could. If we ever have that CW QSO on the air,
> you can tell me if I have a coconut boat swing. :-)
>

He'll be up in the tree swinging by his tail, throwing cocoanuts at
you.

901. Re: CA power crisis caused by internet

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 03:32:19 UTC
From: Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com>
Message-ID: <3A67B543.ED1DFE6F@dvol.com>
Source record: 1151
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Richard McCollum wrote:

> Why guarantee a profit? That is ultimately what regulation does and has
> to do.

>
Galls the hell outta me but at least back when nobody ran outta volts & amps.
>

>
> The trick -- and it is hard to do -- is to limit the scope of the
> utility's responsibilities and not to politicize everything. The TVA
> nearly foundered until David Lilianthal(?) firmly put them in the power
> business.

>
Dunno when David did that but I was temporarily working in a small burg north
of Jackson TN, winter 1980 or so, the locals had been paying three cents per
kwh while I was paying eleven cents per kwh back home in Philly. I got there
just after the TVA underwent some kind of major reorganization or another and
the rates had just taken a huge jump upward. Everybody had unisulated homes
with straight electric basboard heat, etc. Talk about massive trauma . . I
couldn't muster a whole lot of sympathy for 'em.
>

>
>
> I am as much a fan of free enterprise as anyone but I just do not see
> where electric power should be free or particularly enterprising.

>
Deregulation hasn't done a damned thing for the consumers around here, the
trouble truck decals got changed and we've been flooded with doublespeak.
>

>
> Dick Nï¿½BK

>
w3rv

902. Re: 10 bucks buys a ham license.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 03:34:44 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <948ckk$l94$0@208.207.71.174>
Source record: 1152
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Steve Woodruff wrote:
>
> "LRod" <lr0d@my-deja.com> wrote in message
> news:943h9b$9s4$1@nnrp1.deja.com...
> > Unless the ARRL has changed, it's not quite a session fee. It is insofar
> > as you can take one of every element for one fee. Retakes of failed
> > elements are subject to another fee.
>
> Are all VE's subject to the same set of rules?

Yes,they are supposed to be.

These guys seemed pretty
> confident that they could charge $10 per exam

By the authorizing law they are not supposed to charge beyond recouping
their expenses, unless it has changed since I was active. I understand
that the FCC has stropped setting the mandatory fee, so the VEC under
which they operate should be doing it.

903. Re: 10 bucks buys a ham license.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 03:42:34 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <948d3amhd0@208.207.71.174>
Source record: 1153
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

K7MEM wrote:
>
> It's been a few years, but when I made General, I took the Tech,
> General, and 13 WPM code at the same time for one fee ($6.45).
> At another session I took the Extra and the 20 WPM code tests
> again for one fee ($6.45). At the time, I was under the impression
> that this fee went directly to the ARRL, to cover the cost
> of the testing materials that they supplied. That ment that the
> club, which was running the VE session, was really charging
> nothing for their time.
>
> Was I correct in my reasoning? Aren't they, the club, also allowed
> to charge a small fee to cover their expenses?

FCC never did stipulate nor specify what constituted an expense, they
just said that the expense must be related to the testing and that a
record of all monies received and disbursed be maintained.
The fee receipts were always split by the VEC (ARRL here) and the VE
team. The VEC sets the details of he split.

904. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 03:44:03 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <948d63mhg0@208.207.71.174>
Source record: 1154

FCC required a 30 day wait.

Cecil wrote:
>
> xjim@my-deja.com wrote:
> > In the 70's you had to wait a year to retake the test.
>
> That doesn't make sense. I believe it was a month, not a year.
> --
> http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

905. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 03:45:08 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <948d84mhg1@208.207.71.174>
Source record: 1155

Cecil wrote:
>
> Jim Kelley wrote:
> >
> > Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> > news:3A639E9F.304EE3D8@IEEE.org...
> > > The arguments are different. Jim says there is not one code-tested jammer
> > > using Morse code equipment. I say there is at least one and probably more.
> >
> > I'm enjoying your argument in the third person here, Cecil. Which Jim are
> > you claiming said these things? Quotes might better illustrate your point.
> > Or they might not.
>
> I redirect this thread from r.r.a.antenna where it doesn't belong.
> Jim, N2EY, is redirecting everything back to r.r.a.antenna where it
> doesn't belong. That's the reason for the disconnect. Jim will not
> admit that there ever has been a single code-tested ham using Morse
> equipment for the purpose of jamming. He refuses to condemn code-
> tested hams who use Morse equipment for the purpose of jamming since
> he says there never has been any. That's because any admission of
> such would violate the immaculate conception virginal religious
> aspect of Morse code to the PCTA.

And YOU are the guy who always requires proof.

906. Re: It's like this....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 03:49:12 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <948dfm$h3i$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1160

In article <9470hd$743$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
K0HB <k0hb@my-deja.com> wrote:
> In article <943otq$g55$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
> Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com> wrote:
> >
> > You're using the K3LT argument that since this isn't wireless,
you're
> > free to be a jerk.
> >
>
> Get a grip, Brian. For reasons known only to you, you have decided
> to treat me like Robeson treats Len Anderson, casting me in the role
> of some sort of radio-ogre. It was amusing for awhile, now it's just
> an annoyance sorta like when an excited but untrained puppy pees on
> the floor when he sees his master first time in the morning.
>
> 73, Hans, K0HB

Hans, apologies. I wasn't aware of your sensitive bladder. I'll avoid
early morning responses to your messages so you won't soil your pants.

I can't be held responsible if you peek at my responses to others.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

907. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 03:51:50 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <948dkk$h76$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1161

In article <948c2lifg2@208.207.71.174>,
Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>
>
> W1RFI wrote:
> >
> > >From: vlfiscus@mcn.net (Vince Fiscus, KB7ADL)
> >
> > > >Ed, this wouldn't be a fair test. no-coders aren't smart enough to
build
> > > >things, least of all their code speed.
> >
> > > In what way do you think learning Morse code will improve their
ability to
> > > construct equipment?
> >
>
> Maybe they could connect the dots? :-)

That would only result in Mega Dashes, which are completely useless in
construction.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

908. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 03:52:07 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccoll@radiks.net>
Message-ID: <_PO96.1507$ed.895875@nntp2.onemain.com>
Source record: 1156

"Brian" <brianburke@my-deja.com> wrote in message
news:947s0e$271$1@nnrp1.deja.com...
>
> True story.
>
> Just after the no-code Tech license was authorized, I heard a QSO in
> progress on the 146.85 machine in St Louis. An OT with a brand new NCT
> license/call was getting reamed by a 2x2 named Curtis. It appeared that
> the Tech had identified himself sayng "Oh" where the "Zero" should have
> been. The 2x2 was calling the new ham a stupid idiot.
>
> The Tech explained that it was an "Oh" and not a zero because the
> instructor in his Tech class said in ham radio the sero is ALWAYS
> slashed. The sero on the license wasn't slashed.
>
> Then a few other hams tried to intercede and change the subject, but NO.
> Curt just wouldn't let it go. It really got ugly and I was embarassed
> for ham radio and felt sorry that the new ham had to get that kind of
> greeting.
>
> Now Dick will come on here and say that the new Tech should already
> know everything there is to know about ham radio and "should have known"
> that it couldn't have been an "Oh." After all, he passed a test.

Sorry to see my old machine -- I built ABE 4 -- sink to this level. That
sort of BS is why we put it on in the first place. 'Youse vill march in
schtrait lines und youse vill like it' was certainly the motto of some of
the local machines; our's was 'if it don't get you in trouble with Sam, we
don't care'. Curtis would have been eating his meals off the stove after
some of us got done with him.
When a few docs and the Federal Venereal Disease Control Officer got
clinical on the air, you could hear the strak jaws tighten for miles.

Dick N&#65533;BK

909. Re: Buy a ham ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 03:55:29 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <948drhmhg2@208.207.71.174>
Source record: 1157

Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> K0HB@USWEST.NET wrote:
>
> > In article <3A660F19.1E88F782@uci.edu>, Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
> > writes:
>
> > >I really don't want to be drawn into your argument about how lovely
> > >someone swing is or isn't. I simply wanted to comment on your use of
> > >the word sterile. A lack of a swing is not sterile code. I would
> > >simply like to understand your negative attitude about properly timed
> > >code.
>
> > Jim,
> >
> > I don't know how much plainer I can make this! It sounds like robots
> > talking to robots.
>
> So it's more of a personal preference rather than an absolute kind of
> thing. I prefer code that is easy to copy to the mal-adjusted bug,
> non-robotic sound.
>
> > If you don't agree with that attitude, don't answer my CQ, because you
> > won't be treated to "properly timed" code.
>
> Well, practice makes perfect I always say. ;-)

Golly, Jim, that puts you in the same bracket with Brian Burke and
Larry Roll, who insist on machine perfect code! What an unlikely Three
Mousketeers!

910. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 03:56:06 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nospam.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.g7dwyf0.pminews@ca.news.verio.net>
Source record: 1158
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Thu, 18 Jan 2001 13:35:08 -0600, Richard McCollum wrote:

>Being something of a nite owl at the time, I got used to White Castles in
>St. Louis which is as far west as they went. Last time I was down there,
>out of nostalgia I stopped in on Hampton Av. Somehow they are not the
>same without the wino sleeping in the corner.

But is the grease - the causation of the term "slider" - the
same?

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

911. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 03:56:07 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nospam.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.g7dx6q1.pminews@ca.news.verio.net>
Source record: 1159

On Thu, 18 Jan 2001 18:48:39 GMT, Aaron Jones wrote:

>There is no "official list". Some codes seem universal (like "10-4")

Actually there is an "official" APCO list but its use is
voluntary. Just like most anything else in this life.

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

912. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 04:01:23 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <948e6fhmo1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1162

In article <948bkiifg1@208.207.71.174>,
Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>
>
> Brian wrote:
>
> >who tought Orville Wright to fly?
>
> Wilbur

The talking Mule? He was damn smart, wasn't he?

> >Who taught Sammy Morse the code?
>
> Alfred Vail

Oh yeh, thats why its called the "Vail Code."

> > Either can be self-taught.
>
> I sure hope you try to teach yourself to fly. You already blew the
> code.

FCC says I didn't. I'll let you know what the FAA says.

> >Today it just depends on the gubmn't
> > regulations.
>
> Yeah, Right!

There's that CBer attitude showing through.

Put any transmitter on the air or plane in the air and you are dealing
with gubmn't regulations.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

913. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 04:10:56 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <948eoc$i5j$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1163

In article <947gb6mkt1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
K0HB <k0hb@my-deja.com> wrote:
> In article <93nntl$4ee$1@iac5.navix.net>,
> "W4JLE" <Fred@w4jle.com> wrote:
>
> > As politically incorrect as that is, tough noogies, work me on 75
> > at 35 WPM and then argue against CW. At least I will respect your
> > opinion even if different than mine. Those that can't meet the
> > above, quit your crying!
>
> Some of us believe in finding peaceable solutions to this situation,
> but that doesn't mean we're timid, or wimpy, or "pc" freaks, or that
> peaceable responses come naturally to us without conscious effort.
> And if some other people like to growl, posture, and piss in all
> the corners, it doesn't necessarily prove they're tough-minded
> kings of the forest whose opinion is more valid because they say
> they can send it at 35WPM: On the Internet, no one can tell you're
> a chihuahua.
>
> 73, Hans, K0HB

Hans, there appears to be the hint of a counter-challenge in your reply to Fred. Anyway, I like the peacable solution part. Do you have any details?

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

914. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 04:21:52 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <948fd0rqj0@208.206.142.78>
Source record: 1164

W1RFI wrote:
>
> >From: xjim@my-deja.com
>
> >If you go no further, you have failed at Amateur Radio.
>
> I agree, Jim. I believe that your statement applies to the ham tests of any
> era. It applies to those who have a BSEE. I think it is expected that we will
> actually do something with our licences. The FCC does not allocate us spectrum
> because we pass tests. .

So without an effective test what assures that a licenesee ever did
anything at all???

915. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 04:27:10 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <948fmn$j0g$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1174

In article <9489rs$ek7$0@208.207.71.174>,
Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>
>
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > In article <3MJ96.960$e5.2424761@news.ntplx.net>,
> > "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net> wrote:
> > > Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com> wrote:
> > >
> > > > I was just pointing out how the gaff could have been easily been
> > > > avoided. The next time that you wear a bathing suit to church,
will
> > > > you get mad at those who laugh at you??
> > >
> > > Some don't think that wearing a bathing suit to church is nearly
as
> > bad as
> > > saying "first personal" instead of "name" on a repeater. :-) I
know
> > you
> > > don't like me to ask questions, but I can't think of how to do so
> > without a
> > > question mark, so I will just come out with it -- what do you
think?
> > >
> > > 73,
> > > Ed Hare, W1RFI
> >
> > True story.
> >
> > Just after the no-code Tech license was authorized, I heard a QSO in
> > progress on the 146.85 machine in St Louis. An OT with a brand new
NCT
> > license/call was getting reamed by a 2x2 named Curtis. It appeared
that
> > the Tech had identified himself sayng "Oh" where the "Zero" should
have
> > been. The 2x2 was calling the new ham a stupid idiot.
> >
> > The Tech explained that it was an "Oh" and not a zero because the
> > instructor in his Tech class said in ham radio the sero is ALWAYS
> > slashed. The sero on the license wasn't slashed.
> >

> > Then a few other hams tried to intercede and change the subject, but
NO.
> > Curt just wouldn't let it go. It really got ugly and I was
embarassed
> > for ham radio and felt sorry that the new ham had to get that kind
of
> > greeting.
> >
> > Now Dick will come on here and say that the new Tech should already
> > know everything there is to know about ham radio and "should have
known"
> > that it couldn't have been an "Oh." After all, he passed a test.
>
> Don't you ever get tired of being wrong, Gnat? As it happens I did
have
> a contact with a new ham where the very same thing came up, the zero
> without the slash on it in his callsign.

Is your name Curt? Did you have a 2x2 call? You're probably just
remembering my last retelling of the story a couple of years back.

> I mentioned to him that it
> actually was a zero but the FCC's computers stopped putting the slash
> in the zero years ago.

Then your St Louis buds should stop telling these old ham tales.

> Evidently the FCC doesn't know the difference, either.

What brings you to that conclusion?

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

916. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 04:28:27 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010118232827.09475.00000873@nso-fj.aol.com>
Source record: 1172

In article <944ukq$4cs$1@iac5.navix.net>, "W4JLE" <Fred@w4jle.com> writes:

>Len, I guess I can understand your resentment towards those that obtained a
>formal education.

"Resentment?!?" I had 11 years of college-level formal education at night while working full-time during the day for 15 years. My only "resentment" is towards the arrogant recycled log bundles who accumulate paper without the accumulation of knowledge.

>The fact is many have neither the ability or the self
>discipline to learn on their own.

I disagree. Did someone come along and inject you with your "superiority" knowledge or did you develop that all on your own?

>They are not blessed with your tenacity and innate intelligence.

Tenacity has no relation to intelligence.

>The problem with being self taught is you have someone as ignorant as you
>for a teacher.

Oh, my. Will you start using swear words next? :-)

>One wonders if a self taught instant extra has even considered the safety
>issues associated with high voltages and mechanical supports.

I wonder why some jelly-bellies want to get chewed on... :-)

The modern 1 KW final PA runs on about 50 VDC maximum ...roughly twice the voltage considered "safe" in the National Electric Code for residence wiring. Not exactly lethal unless one sticks 50 V wire ends into their chest.

Jelly, old bean, I broke into HF transmissions on 1 to 15 KW tube transmitters. In 1953. Rather high voltages there. Those PW-15s by Press Wireless had very sturdy mechanical supports. I don't recall any of the many non-Extras who worked at Army station ADA were fatally or even near-fatally harmed.

>I suffered through a formal education that pointed me in directions I would
>not have even considered.

"Suffered?!?" You didn't feel you were "superior" at the time? :-)

My college-level formal education was almost entirely elective since my "direction" was already made and in-progress. The formality of sitting in class listening to basic training in English and Math (when I had already used both on the job) was a requirement towards a piece of paper that said I was a Bachelor or something. I was already a bachelor, Jelly. :-)

I did "suffer" through my last English class since I intended to court the nice female instructor. Wouldn't have looked good to mess around with an instructor before finals and grading, would it? [we parted amicably a half year later in case you wondered]

>Things that I would have discounted on my own as
>being useless, I admit some where, but many came to be of valuable use in
>latter years.

Speaking of "suffering," I took a non-credit class in digital logic where the Japanese-American instructor had some kind of Prussian complex (strange ethnic cross-over). In this martinet's class an Exclusive-OR was not permitted. He wanted to "expel" me (from a non-credit class) when I brought in a standard TI Ex-OR quad chip. "Doesn't exist in my class!" he shouted. I've had required psychology classes where the instructors needed psych counseling worse than the students. I've had required history instructors who wanted to rewrite American history (in favor of the "south"). Bullshit most of them except for math...some of which I already knew and some of which I would never, ever use again.

Fred JLE, don't try to "lecture" me on college-level "directions." Try to "lecture" me on Extra class class distinction and your "superiority" of CW above and beyond every thing else in amateur radio.

Was it really "worth it" to sit night after night listening to some instructor-expert tell me what I had to know on my job when I was already doing my job successfully? Not really. Probably a third of my classes were attended by those who already knew what to do sucessfully but had to endure it all for some piece of paper "proving" they could do what they were already doing very well.

What does a student do during "homework?" Think about it. They SELF-TEACH by completing their assignment, showing their work. They only thing different between such self-teaching and self-techning from a text or informative article is that the instructor in a formal class will "grade" the student towards some achievement of a piece of paper.

Which do you consider the Most Important, Mr. W4JLE, actually having learned-and-accomplishing something on your own or having an accreditation certificate or diploma hanging on a wall? [I think everyone can see the preference but it

would be nice to see the words of rationaliz...oops,
justification as to which is "superior." :-)]

>While your opinions of my stances were read and enjoyed, as always I
>disagree with you.

Naturally. You are so much more "superior." [barf]

This is a bit like nailing jelly to a tree...

didit

917. Re: "They oughta require a license....blah, blah, blah"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 04:28:29 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010118232829.09475.00000874@nso-fj.aol.com>
Source record: 1169

In article <3A662EB5.79A21E16@dvol.com>, Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com> writes:

>> There is no time machine to go back to undo the past. There
>> is the possibility that the existing and future FCC can solve
>> some problems in US civil radio. Support the FCC in
>> regulation of radio...or become lawless vigilantes who are
>> outnumbered by others. There is no honor or respect in
>> vigilanteism.
>
>Indeed and agreed. Probable factoid: The FCC would much prefer dealing
>with some inane but basically harmless freebanders than they would a
>phlanx of amateur (in the more common sense) "helper" frequency cops up
>their butts.

A problem with any vigilante group of self-styled "cops" occurs
when they run into another vigilante group having different
ideas of what is "best." Nobody wins except the Real cops.

Remember that CB users outnumber radio amateurs by a
considerable ratio.

didit

918. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 04:28:30 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010118232830.09475.00000875@nso-fj.aol.com>
Source record: 1165

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.g7ba8x2.pminews@ca.news.verio.net>, "Phil Kane"
<Phil.Kane@nospam.spam> writes:

>>Roger that.
>
> ...good buddy and I'm gone.....

"Roger that" is current military parlance...off the radio.

Has the same meaning (sometimes) as "absolutely."

didit

919. Re: CA power crisis caused by internet

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 04:28:37 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010118232837.09475.00000876@nso-fj.aol.com>
Source record: 1170

In article <3A6725C9.21D00AE@dvol.com>, Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com> writes:

>Kerry King wrote:
>
>> The California power crisis is not due to what we have been led to
>> believe. Instead, it is the fault of the internet.
>>
>> You who are reading this helped cause the problem, as CNN has documented
>> at http://www.cnn.com/2001/TECH/computing/01/17/internet.energy.idg
>
>That's ten days old. It's a La-la land power industry scam from top to
>bottom, capitalism gone berserk.

No, just greed and inefficiency by some private electric power
providers. In the Real "La-La Land" (Los Angeles), the
municipal Department of Water and Power has NO electricity
shortage. In fact, the DWP is today (Thursday) selling electric
power to mid-California!

No rolling blackouts in Los Angeles, none expected. The
only one "going berserk" is the press trying to make a
Big Story out of it. Idiotic journalism.

>> Shame on all of you!
>
>I notice that you're still connected.

...he might be computing by candle light...to save power.

didit

920. Re: newbie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 04:28:37 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010118232837.09475.00000877@nso-fj.aol.com>
Source record: 1171

In article <94624leno1@nnrp1.deja.com>, 2obvious@my-deja.com writes:

>I'm an art student with no radio experience who needs to buy an FM
>transmitter for a project he's working on. I have this metal box with
>an FM radio inside it. It picks up all local stations fine, even
>inside the metal box. For my project, I'm trying to broadcast digital
>voice from my computer onto an FM frequency and into the box. I spent
>$30 on a transmitter from Radioshack, and it worked so poorly that I
>could barely pick up the signal even when the radio was outside of the
>metal box. I don't want to make this mistake again.

Do not use a metal box. Use a plastic box. Many kinds
available.

A metal box surrounding the FM receiver will shield it from
picking up anything but very strong signals...to strong to be
legal in a "wireless mike" type of application. Plastic is not
a shield to stop radio waves.

>Or if
>this isn't the best usenet group to post this in, can anyone point me
>to a more appropriate one?

The above answer to your problem is the quickest and cheapest.

If you want to have a very cheap cover for the FM receiver, go to
a supermarket and buy a plastic food container. Many different
sizes. Paint it whatever color you want with spray enamel.
Enamel works better than a lacquer paint on that type
of plastic.

I did that with a remote temperature sensing gauge that transmits
outside air temperature to an indoor indicator. The container
keeps rain out of the remote gauge. [Frequency is about 433
MHz, five times as high in frequency as the FM broadcast band]

Len Anderson
(former art-illustration student in the 1950s)

921. Re: Sound Familiar?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 04:28:38 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010118232838.09475.00000878@nso-fj.aol.com>
Source record: 1168

In article <20010118042143.05040.00002252@ng-ff1.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>>From: Brian Kelly kelly@dvol.com
>
>>> Political Editor - December 1934 Radio magazine
>
>>. . . and today we have greatly expanded HF privs vs. 1934 with more
>>coming, the old brawl has simply moved up the spectrum.
>
>And those threats did actually surface, again and again over the decades. It
>was only by addressing them at the international level that Amateur Radio
>retained its spectrum.
>
>Don't just look to VHF and up for spectrum threats. There are HF allocations
>on the plate now, both with new spectrum being sought and with spectrum under
>challenge. Even 40 meters is once again going to be considered.

The "40m problem" has been on-going since WARC '79. That's
going to be a 24 years old "once again" by WRC 2003. Is it "on
the table" in the USA agenda for WRC 2003? [No...]

didit

922. Re: It's like this....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 04:28:39 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010118232839.09475.00000879@nso-fj.aol.com>
Source record: 1166

In article <9470hd$743$1@nnrp1.deja.com>, K0HB <k0hb@my-deja.com> writes:

<on a "lecture" to Brian Burke...>

> It was amusing for awhile, now it's just
>an annoyance sorta like when an excited but untrained puppy pees on
>the floor when he sees his master first time in the morning.

If you would quit peeing on the floor the problem would go away...

Be nice or you won't get a doggie treat...

didit

923. Re: QCWA TELLS FCC TO END INCENTIVE LICENSING

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 04:28:40 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010118232840.09475.00000880@nso-fj.aol.com>
Source record: 1167

In article <20010118051156.05040.00002273@ng-ff1.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>>From: Bob Wex w2ilp
>
>>I believe it is also because ham radio, even without a Morse code
>>exam, is considered old hat by those who are already using cell-phones
>>and capable of brousing on the Internet.
>
>Why are there more hams now than there were before cell phones and internet
>became widespread?

A look at the stats of new licensees over the last decade (life of the Internet, now 10 years old...most of the life of cellular telephony, now about 14 years old) will show that the overwhelming majority are the no-code-test Technician class. QED.

didit

924. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 04:31:54 UTC
From: W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com>
Message-ID: <948fvu$e26$1@iac5.navix.net>
Source record: 1173

Ed is setting there in his dashiki ?) and love beads. In the 60's you had to espouse all that sensitivity crap if you wanted to get a little trim.

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:9488ltbdu0@208.207.71.174...
>
>
> W1RFI wrote:
> >
> > Frankly, Dick, I would much rather see new hams with sensitivities than those
> > who are cold and insensitive to the feelings of others.
>
> So there are no third categories?
> You Political Correct mavens insist that your choices are all there is.
> What would be the matter with some newcomers with an attitude of "I'm
> gonna get this and do it well, make my mistakes and get it right and to
> heck with the minor irritations, whatever they may be. Maybe I can learn
> something about it all from them, if I don't let the chip blow off my
> shoulder".
> It must be in the water. NO one today seems to have anything but a
> fragile, easily destroyed ego. If I had been like that I'd have never
> made it into the teenage years, much less far beyond.

925. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 04:43:07 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <948gkr$23t$0@208.206.142.78>
Source record: 1175

Brian wrote:
>
g the OTs bitching, but I've begun countering they're
> insane accusations. And as a 13 participant, I am a rank beginner in
> Ham Years.

Yeah, you sure have acted like a 13 year old participant...
>
> That should put some perspective on the situation.

Yep

926. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 04:59:05 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <948him$kd1$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1178

In article <948eoc$i5j$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com> wrote:

> Do you have any details?

Meet me on 40M at 7.030MHz at 0500Z on Jan 22. I'll share them with
you there.

73, Hans, K0HB

--
"We are fellow travelers on a journey between two
eternities, and it's a trip far too brief for me
to be concerned about your speed at the Code of
Morse."

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

927. Re: CA power crisis caused by internet

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 04:59:35 UTC
From: Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com>
Message-ID: <3A67C9B7.8A69684A@dvol.com>
Source record: 1176

Len Over 21 wrote:

> >That's ten days old. It's a La-la land power industry scam from top to
> >bottom, capitalism gone berserk.
>
> No, just greed and inefficiency by some private electric power
> providers.

>
I'm having a hard time believing that nobody saw this coming and decided let it flow in order to turn a dime on it.
>

> In the Real "La-La Land" (Los Angeles), the
> municipal Department of Water and Power has NO electricity
> shortage. In fact, the DWP is today (Thursday) selling electric
> power to mid-California!

>
Fortuntely for LA it has it's own system. Didn't know that until now.
>

> No rolling blackouts in Los Angeles, none expected. The
> only one "going berserk" is the press trying to make a
> Big Story out of it. Idiotic journalism.

>
No doubt there is a lot of that, there always is, but blackouts cost buckets of money for everybody involved and big outfits like Intel deciding to build somewhere else has real-world ramifications.
>
The silver lining should be that it's a wakeup call for other regions even if it is more hype than reality. The power execs around here are in the news answering pointed questions in a very defensive mode. A couple state reps are calling for formal independent reviews of the situation here. Works for me.
>
w3rv

928. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 05:05:52 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A67CB30.E3AD9D86@IEEE.org>
Source record: 1180

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Bend over, ...I've got my golf shoes on......

This is Dick's welcome to newcomers into amateur radio.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

929. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 05:09:50 UTC
From: W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com>
Message-ID: <948i74$fb6$1@iac5.navix.net>
Source record: 1177

I am sure that the Army put those people around 15KW transmitters with no training. At least we did not do that in the Navy.

Please explain your definition of the word Jelly, other than something to spread on bread with peanut butter, other definitions elude me.

As to your education, it certainly left me impressed.

I do have a problem following your train of thought sometimes, I am sure it is purely in my interpretation.

as ever

73 Fred W4JLE

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote
>
> Jelly, old bean, I broke into HF transmissions on 1 to 15 KW
> tube transmitters. In 1953. Rather high voltages there. Those
> PW-15s by Press Wireless had very sturdy mechanical
> supports. I don't recall any of the many non-Extras who
> worked at Army station ADA were fatally or even near-fatally
> harmed.
>
> >I suffered through a formal education that pointed me in directions I would
> >not have even considered.
>
> "Suffered?!?" You didn't feel you were "superior" at the time? :-)
>
> My college-level formal education was almost entirely elective
> since my "direction" was already made and in-progress. The
> formality of sitting in class listening to basic training in English
> and Math (when I had already used both on the job) was a
> requirement towards a piece of paper that said I was a Bachelor
> or something. I was already a bachelor, Jelly. :-)
>
> I did "suffer" through my last English class since I intended to
> court the nice female instructor. Wouldn't have looked good to
> mess around with an instructor before finals and grading, would
> it? [we parted amicably a half year later in case you wondered]
>
> >Things that I would have discounted on my own as
> >being useless, I admit some where, but many came to be of valuable use in
> >latter years.
>

> Speaking of "suffering," I took a non-credit class in digital logic
> where the Japanese-American instructor had some kind of
> Prussian complex (strange ethnic cross-over). In this martinet's
> class an Exclusive-OR was not permitted. He wanted to
> "expel" me (from a non-credit class) when I brought in a
> standard TI Ex-OR quad chip. "Doesn't exist in my class!"
> he shouted. I've had required psychology classes where the
> instructors needed psych counseling worse than the students.
> I've had required history instructors who wanted to rewrite
> American history (in favor of the "south"). Bullshit most of
> them except for math...some of which I already knew and
> some of which I would never, ever use again.
>
> Fred JLE, don't try to "lecture" me on college-level
> "directions." Try to "lecture" me on Extra class class
> distinction and your "superiority" of CW above and beyond
> every thing else in amateur radio.
>
> Was it really "worth it" to sit night after night listening to some
> instructor-expert tell me what I had to know on my job when I
> was already doing my job successfully? Not really. Probably
> a third of my classes were attended by those who already
> knew what to do sucessfully but had to endure it all for some
> piece of paper "proving" they could do what they were already
> doing very well.
>
> What does a student do during "homework?" Think about it.
> They SELF-TEACH by completing their assignment, showing
> their work. They only thing different between such self-
> teaching and self-techning from a text or informative article
> is that the instructor in a formal class will "grade" the student
> towards some achievement of a piece of paper.
>
> Which do you consider the Most Important, Mr. W4JLE,
> actually having learned-and-accomplishing something on your
> own or having an accreditation certificate or diploma hanging
> on a wall? [I think everyone can see the preference but it
> would be nice to see the words of rationaliz...oops,
> justification as to which is "superior." :-)]
>
> >While your opinions of my stances were read and enjoyed, as always I
> >disagree with you.
>
> Naturally. You are so much more "superior." [barf]
>
> This is a bit like nailing jelly to a tree...
>
> didit

930. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 05:11:31 UTC
From: Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com>
Message-ID: <3A67CC83.5DFD03BC@dvol.com>
Source record: 1179

Aaron Jones wrote:

> I mean that when a cop hears "10-20" he doesn't think "I must decode
> 10-20....decoded....it means location". In his mind he knows directly
> what "10-20" means and "10-20" has become a word in his vocabulary.
> It's the same with hams and common Q signals. When I hear "QTH" there
> is no mind decoding, I hear and think of it as a word. And yes the
> language *quality* of CW makes me think of code groups as words in my
> vocabulary, no separate mind decoding step needed.

>
What immediately comes to mind when you hear 10-18 or QSX?
>
w3rv.

931. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 05:28:09 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3A67D061.4442EB3C@sccoast.net>
Source record: 1181
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

W4JLE wrote:
>
> It has been my experience that the biggest
> "radio Cops" turn out to be no-code techs
> that have had a licenses for a year or so.

I have no idea what license class was involved - its hard to tell
these days with vanity calls.

> I had one start on me one morning when I
> used the term handle. He proceeded to tell
> me how "handle" was a CB term and not used
> on the repeater. Being the shrinking violet
> I am, I went on to explain I used "handle"
> on 11 meters when it was a ham band along
> with a dissertation about correcting people
> who may be new and somewhat hesitant such
> as your wife.

I wish my wife was only "somewhat hesitant" to talk on the radio. It
took me some time to convince her to get the license in the first place.
She doesn't even like talking on the telephone. Of course, in person,
once she gets to know you, she'll talk your head off. And I can't get
her to shut up (especially while my favorite tv shows are on).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net

932. Re: CA power crisis caused by internet

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 05:35:30 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <948jn2$9re$0@208.206.142.78>
Source record: 1182
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> Brian Kelly wrote:
> > It's a La-la land power industry scam from top to
> > bottom, capitalism gone berserk.
>
> It's the state beaurocracy gone berserk.
> It's an experiment to see what happens when you require the sellers of
> electricity to sell-off their means of producing electricity, remove the
> limits of wholesale pricing, but keep the limits on consumer pricing.
> The power producers can limit supply so that the wholesale price will go
> as high as they want, and the guy selling it to the end user is stuck
> with the loss. It's as screwed up as anything could possibly be.
>

It's a classic case of officials burying their heads in the sand. Any schoolchild soon learns that you can't buy high and sell low and avoid financial collapse.Sure looks like they just ignored the liklihood that this *would* happen.
This is not something that developed overnight, of course. From all accounts it came from price controls on the retailers of electrical power while no controls were (or could be) placed on wholesalers (after the in-state retailers were forced to divest themselves of their own generating facilities, which was a curious requirement at best, pure socialism at worst).
This is not a problem that just struck like lightning from the blue, it took a while to develolp. Meanwhile did the state officials believe the problem was just going to go away because the solution wasn't pleasant?
And then not a single new generating facility has been built in California in the past 20 years. Where did they think the supply for all the growth demand was coming from? Meanwhile, the state is loaded with environmental activitists who feel real good about locking away all the natural resources for "posterity" instead of meeting the environmental protection challenges headon with sensible protective requirements that are enforced.

> Edison, the company that built practically everything we have out here,
> is getting totally screwed.
> Electricity has always been bargain priced
> out here.

Now you know why. I saw on TV today that PG&E and So. Cal. Edison's stocks have been downgraded on Wall Street to junk bond status. Whew!

> Our taxes will have to go up to pay for it now.

You know what that means. It'll cost twice what it should.

933. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 05:43:41 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3A67D3FF.7EE67598@sccoast.net>
Source record: 1183
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Ed Hare, W1RFI" wrote:
>
> Dwight Stewart wrote in:
>
> > I'll never forget my worst incident with
> > a "radio cop." <snip>
>
> > In the end, the "radio cop" did a good job
> > of defending "proper" tradition on the radio.
> > But in doing so, he ruined my wife's enjoyment
> > of this hobby (and, for all practical purposes,
> > ended her hobby before it even got started).
> > And that is why I'll never forget that "radio cop."
>
> And the really sad part is that the guy probably
> believes that it was worth the price.

You're probably right, Ed. I'm still working to get my wife excited about radio again. And I've become the biggest advocate for new hams in my area. I like to be known as the ham anybody, including the newbee, can contact.

In fact, because of my friendly attitudes towards newbees, just about everyone in the area who is bringing a new person onto the radio for the first time almost always insures that I'm the first person they make contact with.

I've met a lot of interesting people that way. In fact, over a period of time, the numbers really add up and I'm never lacking of someone to talk to on the radio. Most of the time, I end up with too many people to talk to when I sign on (they know my normal on-air times, and are usually waiting).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net

934. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 05:47:42 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <948kdu$bj4$0@208.206.142.78>
Source record: 1184

Brian wrote:
>
> "Deliberately sending bad code" should have been challenged by more
> readers than just me. It says a lot about where you stand as well.

It just shows how uninformed you really are. Ed was being very polite
by not setting you straight. I got over that with you long ago.

935. The Real Bill Clinton Legacy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 06:12:52 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3A67DAD1.161C45F2@sccoast.net>
Source record: 1185
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

There has been much talk about the Clinton legacy. As William J. Clinton leaves office, lets take a look at a few things around the country to discover the real Clinton legacy.

Politics & Race Relations...

- A wider divide between Republicans and Democrats than anytime in recent memory.

- A wider divide between blacks and whites than anytime in recent memory.

- Massive expansion of executive power over almost all aspects of American life.

Energy...

- An energy crisis in California, complete with high prices and rolling blackouts.

- High home heating fuel, and vehicle gas, prices nationwide.

Economics...

- An ongoing loss of income for the often white middle class over the last eight years.

- An unwavering increase in the gap between rich and poor.

- An unstable stock market.

Crime Control...

- Youth violence, and other crimes by youth, higher than any other presidential period in history.

- The largest prison population in the world.

- A memory of a president impeached for lying under oath.

Civil Rights...

- Ongoing discrimination against whites in black-owned schools, organizations, and businesses.

- Continuing hiring discrimination against whites through affirmative action programs.

- Widest suppression of religious freedom in the history of this country.

- Significant loss of gun ownership rights.

- Failed program of allowing gays in the military.

Education...

- Strong emphasis on liberal political bias in classroom instruction at public schools.

- Government finance of private colleges and universities with extreme liberal political bias in classroom instruction, while at the same time refusing finance to conservative private schools.

- Emphasis on "feel good" teaching methods rather then on teaching methods which challenge students.

- Least well educated children during any period of nation's history.

Family...

- A historic record for divorces, single parent families, and children born out of wedlock.

- A wider divide between parents and children than anytime in recent memory.

- Diminished parental control over their own children due to endless government intervention.

- A historic record for children giving birth to children.

- A memory of an extramarital affair while president.

Sadly, I wish I could say that these things will improve after Clinton leaves office. But, as long as liberals continue to control so much of American life, these things are simply not likely to improve.

Like Clinton did, Bush also has an opportunity to influence each of these things, but he has not shown any indication so far that he intends to challenge the liberal stranglehold on this country.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net

936. Re: CA power crisis caused by internet

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 06:14:58 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010119011458.04061.00000523@nso-mh.aol.com>
Source record: 1188

In article <3a6788eb.1082628@netnews.worldnet.att.net>,
Rickhit@worldnet.att.net (Rick) writes:

>On Thu, 18 Jan 2001 16:37:00 -0500, "W4JLE" <Fred@w4jle.com> wrote:
>
>>The problem will be solved when the big one hits, and Nevada ocean front
>>property becomes available.
>>
> So are you buying desert land like Lex Luther? :-)
>
> Rick KC2ESD

Impossible. Fred Jelly *IS* Superman. Problem is, he sleeps on
a Kryptonite pillow...

didit

937. Re: Wayne Green was right after all

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 06:15:00 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net>
Message-ID: <3A67DB64.19FFC371@ovis.net>
Source record: 1186

Brian wrote:
>
> In article <3A5B90D5.E59BA292@ovis.net>,
> Dave Heil <K8MN@ovis.net> wrote:
> > Len Over 21 wrote:
> >
> > > I can debate civilly. Done it. Problem is, nearly all the pro-
> > > code-test advocates prior to April 15th, 2000, would NOT
> > > use civility. That too is in DejaNews archives. Licensees
> > > such as Kehler, Heil, Carroll, and others attempted to use
> > > humiliation and disrespect to contrary points of view.
> > > For those who like "living on the edge," that may appear as
> > > "sport." To those who wish to engage in civil debate it
> > > appears as the attempts at humiliation and disrespect it
> > > was. See DejaNews archives prior to April 15.
> >
> > I've seen very little evidence of you debating much less debating
> > civilly. If you've done it, not many have seen it. Your own posts
> are
> > filled with cutesy and not-so-cutesy name calling.
> >
> > You've never been denied your right to petition your government nor
> your
> > right to post here. You still seem to have trouble convincing anyone
> to
> > buy your views.
> >
> > Have a ticket yet?
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> Dave, whether cutesy or not, your debate(s) consist of simply putting
> down the "experience/license class" of your opponent, then dismissing
> them out of hand. Fortunately, the FCC didn't accept your approach.
>
> Welcome back. Are you in America? Retired?
>
> 73, Brian

Brian, I'm in West-By-God-Virginia on a full time basis now. The
suitcases have been stored in the barn.

My "opponent" doesn't have a license and has shown little evidence of
any class. He sits at the keyboard all day doing what he accuses others
of doing. He is a twelve year old trapped in a body which has been

shedding skin cells for about seven decades.

Don't get me wrong--I like a lot of older folks. I hope to be one someday.

Dave K8MN

938. Re: CA power crisis caused by internet

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 06:15:02 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010119011502.04061.00000524@nso-mh.aol.com>
Source record: 1191

In article <947sj6$5l8$1@news.netmar.com>, K0HB@USWEST.NET writes:

>>Edison, the company that built practically everything we have out here,
>>is getting totally screwed. Electricity has always been bargain priced
>>out here. Our taxes will have to go up to pay for it now.
>
>Despite what the feel-good politicians (in bed with corporate raiders) will
>tell you, there are few things which are best left as regulated regional
>monopolies.

I am in great agreement with you on that, Hans.

Incidentally, Southern California Edison Company (under its larger
umbrella corporation) did not "build everything 'we' have" here. It is
the largest private electric power supplier in this state, but not the
only one. 'Edison' has been buying power from other suppliers for
years...but got suckered into complacency by regulated rates for
such buying and selling among power suppliers. LA Department
of Water and Power did not. LA DWP presently charges about
10 1/2 cents per KWHR to residential subscribers. Washington
state power companies serving Puget Sound area charge about
6 1/2 cents per KWHR (source: residential billing from the two
named areas).

didit

939. Re: CA power crisis caused by internet

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 06:15:03 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010119011503.04061.00000525@nso-mh.aol.com>
Source record: 1192

In article <3A67391A.7D3E9075@IEEE.org>, Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Kerry King wrote:
>>
>> The California power crisis is not due to what we have been led to
>> believe. Instead, it is the fault of the internet.
>
>When a state doesn't build any power generating plants during the
>ten years the population is doubling, the result is 100% predictable.

Cecil, the only "unpredictability" is two things: Management of
private power companies; over-inflated rates now possible by
sellers of electric power.

The municipal Los Angeles electric power provider, the
Department of Water and Power, has no electric power
shortage. [will you agree that Los Angeles is a large city?]
The LA DWP is presently selling electric power to middle
California. There are no rolling blackouts in the LA DWP
service area, none expected for a long time.

I know that kinda spoils a good back-and-forth, but that's
the situation in Southern California now. :-)

didit

940. Re: Sound Familiar?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 06:15:05 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010119011505.04061.00000526@nso-mh.aol.com>
Source record: 1193

In article <cqde6tcfrv6jl9kah237qdn7ue47j6b3jc@4ax.com>, Aaron Jones
<nomail@nomail.com> writes:

>Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com> wrote:
>>I thought the ARRL handled the advisory role in 1934?
>
>Radio magazine, which was an established 17 year old publication in
>1934, appears to have had an anti-ARRL editorial policy. ARRL had just
>removed voting privileges from non-hams and that was causing quite a
>stir. I think Radio was trying to capitalize from the controversy.
>From time to time (when things bog down here) I'll scan and post
>excerpts from a few of these articles...

What is this glorious, religious connection to the past and
only the past of amateur radio?!?

We already have the self-proclaimed expert on morse code
over landline in Jeff the Herman.

If you want some cogent historical information on the history
of ALL radio in the first 30 years of its life, read "Continuous
Wave: Technology and American Radio, 1900 to 1930," by
Hugh G. J. Aitken, Princeton University Press, 1985, 588
pp (clothbound, ISBN 0-691-02390-5). Aitken is George D.
Olds Professor of Economics and American Studies at
Amherst College. Aitken also wrote "Syntony and Spark:
The Origins of Radio," ideal for those 'historians' who don't
know much about vacuum tube theory.

Yes, some doofus will jump in here and loudly proclaim
about "200 Meters and Down," by DeSoto. To those I
would direct to Aitken's book and the large footnote on
page 512 of the clothbound edition (Towards the end of
Chapter 10). Aitken is looking at the history of all radio,
not just the biased view of some amateurs. Amateur
radio must coexist with all other radio services and it
would serve all amateurs to consider such coexistance
on a realistic basis.

It is not fully realistic to get historical data from a few
biased sources and spend time in the lodge hall doing
high-fives without looking out the window and everyone
else. Open the window curtains, clean the glass, and
look out. You may not like the view but that's the rest
of the radio world, like it or not.

W6MJN loaned me his copy during a Wednesday lunch.
Fascinating history.

Okay, go back to your old 1934 ham magazine issues.
Be careful that those old acid-paper pages don't crackle
and break. :-)

didit

941. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 06:15:06 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010119011506.04061.00000527@nso-mh.aol.com>
Source record: 1187

In article <iode6tsi5706c3aua35odh2r5cjh4a2uc1@4ax.com>, Aaron Jones
<nomail@nomail.com> writes:

>w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:
>>The FCC does not allocate us spectrum
>>because we pass tests. .
>
>If "us" means us humans that's exactly what the FCC does...

I don't think so. The FCC allocates spectrum for amateur
radio use. That spectrum isn't allocated BECAUSE
someone passes any tests. Try to get it straight.

didit

942. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 06:15:07 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010119011507.04061.00000528@nso-mh.aol.com>
Source record: 1189

In article <uxH96.5466$Tg1.523033@nntp3.onemain.com>, "Richard McCollum"
<rmccoll@radiks.net> writes:

>> 73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP
>
>Being something of a nite owl at the time, I got used to White Castles in
>St. Louis which is as far west as they went. Last time I was down there,
>out of nostalgia I stopped in on Hampton Av. Somehow they are not the
>same without the wino sleeping in the corner.

White Castle hamburgers, lil bitty things, are available in
ten-packs at Ralphs Supermarkets here in Los Angeles.
Small and over-priced, haven't bothered with them.

Los Angeles is considerably farther west than St. Louis.

Have you tried Ripple?

didit

943. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 06:15:08 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010119011508.04061.00000529@nso-mh.aol.com>
Source record: 1190

In article <948bcnifg0@208.207.71.174>, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
writes:

> See? All the protestations from myself and others have had an impact.
>You gotta wonder if there would have been any improvement in some of the
>questions had we not sounded off so much about them. Whoever changes the
>questions must have been paying *some* attention. I'llhave to sign into
>the HQ website and check out the current question pool. If a majority
>are written like those it represents a major change in things since I
>was an active VE. Inded it would be easier to just learn the material on
>those few. They would be hard to answer without knowing the material.
>'Twas not alwas so.

Dickie, you've forgotten more than you ever knew...

didit

944. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 06:34:50 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <dnnf6t0h3ua56vbrd8iiol5f4vkqhju3ek@4ax.com>
Source record: 1194

Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
> I once knew an OT who had been off the air so long that he was new to
>repeaters, and when he finally got a two meter rig he called CQ on the
>repeater just as he would have on HF.
> It isn't always the newcomers who miscue.

Yep. Seniority makes little difference in making a gaff. And neither
"CQ" or "W7xxx monitoring" say in plain english what it is we really
want, namely a contact. Hobby jargon and knowing it's proper use is
important, and if you try to operate without knowing it, then let's
hope that you're not too sensitive of a person...
(Human nature being what it is.) :-)

945. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 06:34:53 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <9cnf6t0chl0kt5bbsrrqab4hun5gmu9hvo@4ax.com>
Source record: 1195

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nospam.spam> wrote:
> Actually there is an "official" APCO list

The first published 10-code was in an APCO bulletin in January of
1940, however they don't claim to have invented the code. They tried
to standardize it in 1973, but it never caught on and there are
hundreds of versions currently being used. Yes they call it "official"
but nobody seems to notice... (Like ARRL phonetics?)

946. Re: CA power crisis caused by internet

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 06:38:52 UTC
From: W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com>
Message-ID: <948ne1$i6t$1@iac5.navix.net>
Source record: 1196

Len, not one time have I made derogatory remarks towards you, nor have I made nasty remarks about your positions I disagree with.

Why do you feel that it is necessary to make smart remarks and idiotic childish repartee?

If you cannot afford me the same courtesy I extend to you, please find someone else to respond to.

Are you not capable of defending a position like an adult?

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message news:20010119011458.04061.00000523@nso-mh.aol.com...
> In article <3a6788eb.1082628@netnews.worldnet.att.net>,
> Rickhit@worldnet.att.net (Rick) writes:
>
> >On Thu, 18 Jan 2001 16:37:00 -0500, "W4JLE" <Fred@w4jle.com> wrote:
> >
> >>The problem will be solved when the big one hits, and Nevada ocean front
> >>property becomes available.
> >>
> > So are you buying desert land like Lex Luther? :-)
> >
> > Rick KC2ESD
>
> Impossible. Fred Jelly *IS* Superman. Problem is, he sleeps on
> a Kryptonite pillow...
>
> didit

947. FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 06:52:23 UTC
From: Stewart R Teaze <HORSESHOE7@prodigy.net>
Message-ID: <948o9h$4mg4$1@newssvr05-en0.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 1197
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,alt.radio.family,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc

The rapidly-expanding Family Radio Service has exposed millions of young people to the world
of radio communications. But now, where is a young kid to go who has is interested in experimenting
with radios and get more range than the typical 1/2 mile of FRS? MURS might help a bit(if Motorola doesn't
get their way), but you know that a growing mind is eventually going to want more than just this. GMRS
doesn't have the resources, and is not a service that was created to foster experimentation. Like it or not,
the typical young person ends up cutting his radio experimention teeth in the Citizen's Band service, because
there isn't a reasonable entry-level ham license for kids(it is even worse now after restructuring, what with the
elimination of the Novice Class).

Everyday now the USA is falling further and further behind Europe and Japan in the wireless communications
race. As hams, it is time we make an effort to insure that our young people are provided with the proper
environment, incentives, and role models to properly learn radio communications techniques and etiquette.
It is time for hams to stop complaining, step up to the plate, and take an active role in seeing that our bright,
young technical minds are being taught properly.

As a result of this, I have reworked the Communicator entry-level license proposal I submitted to the FCC last year,
and I will now be proposing a new entry-level Amateur Radio class known as the "Colt" class. I submit a draft
of the proposal for your review below. Please keep in mind that the future of American involvement in wireless
communications development depends on us to properly encourage and teach tomorrow's experimenters, operators,
technicians, and engineers...

****
Proposal to FCC to institute an introductory-level "Colt" license class in the Amateur Radio Service - REV A

In the late 1980's and early 1990's when the current Amateur Radio Service Technician Class license was conceived and implemented, it was
an appropriate alternate introductory license class. However, due to the recent elimination of the Novice Class license, and as a result of improving

technology; the Technician Class license no longer serves well as the only introductory license, as it is doing poorly in drawing young members into the Service. As a result of license restructuring, it is now actually harder for young people to obtain an Amateur license than it was before restructuring.

In this critical era of global competition, especially in the wireless communications arena, it is essential that we provide a means for properly educating our young people in RF communications operation and theory.

Today, technologies like the Family Radio Service, high-speed telephone & cable modems, the Internet, and inexpensive cellular telephones, have overshadowed the privileges of the Amateur Radio Service, and made the requirements for young beginners to obtain a Technician Class license out of date. Additionally, the Technician Class license has now evolved into a beginning and ending point for most modern day Amateurs, who are mostly interested in VHF/UHF communications, rather than HF communications. Incentive licensing has virtually been eliminated.

The need for a Service dedicated to the goal of teaching young radio users proper radio operation techniques and etiquette can clearly be seen in the disarray present on the 11 meter Citizen's Band Service frequencies. The fact is, the Citizen's Band has become the defacto introductory service for young people just beginning to learn to experiment with radio; yet the Citizen's Band is a very poor environment for young people to be learning in.

Therefore, it is recommended that a new "Colt Class" license be added to the Amateur Radio Service expressly to encourage young individuals to enter the Amateur Radio Service to improve their understanding of RF communications theory, provide a healthy learning environment, and encourage radio experimentation.

On the 70cm UHF band, Colt licensees would be restricted to voice communications on 5 simplex-only 20khz-spaced channels on 446.00, 446.02, 446.04, 446.06, and 446.08 Mhz; and digital communications up to 19,200bps on 1 simplex-only 60khz bandwidth channel on 446.14Mhz.

On the 1.25m VHF band, Colt licensees would be restricted to voice communications on 5 simplex-only 20khz-spaced channels on 223.42, 223.44, 223.46, 223.48, and 223.50 Mhz; and digital communications up to 19,200bps on 1 simplex-only 60khz bandwidth channel on 223.56Mhz.

To encourage experimentation/understanding of antenna and VHF/UHF RF propagation theory, Colt licensees would also be allowed to setup and/or operate through a VHF/UHF crossband, simplex user input/output, repeater station on two 20khz-bandwidth channels on 223.52Mhz and 446.10Mhz. This would allow them to setup an inexpensive repeater system by interconnecting the voice/mic connections via a resistive circuit on two simplex radios; and

would not require expensive, and difficult to understand, cavity and duplexer filtering at the repeater station site. User radio costs would be low, as they would only need a single simplex radio. As a result of the characteristics of this type of repeater, the repeater builders and users would learn to coordinate frequencies, and user groupings based on environmental conditions, so as to acheive optimal results.

Colt license users would also be subject to the following restrictions:

(1) Individuals applying for a Colt Class license must be under 19 years of age at the time of license application or renewal. The license is valid for 5 years.

(2) Fixed control station antennas will be no more than 6.1 meters (20 feet) above the ground or above the building or tree on which it is mounted.

(3) Transmissions limited to 5 watts ERP, or less.

The new license class would have the following goals:

1) Encourage more young people to enter the Amateur Radio Service, by providing an entry-level ARS license class that includes privileges allowing reliable short-range voice and data communications.

2) Not significantly impact existing users of the affected Amateur Radio Service frequency bands.

3) Encourage basic knowledge of radio, electronics, operating principles and etiquette among a wider segment of the general
population.

4) Take advantage of the success of the Family Radio Service, and provide a path for those young users interested in further radio experimentation.

The Colt license exam would consist of 25 fairly simple questions. Emphasis would be put on understanding the existing operational, safety, etiquette and emergency questions from theTechnician Class question pool that relate specifically to Colt Class license privileges. All questions containing calculations would contain small integer(whole-number) input values and have relatively small integer results. Colt licensees would be required to have a general understanding of Ohm's Law and Power relations. They should be required to have a general understanding of how antenna length relates to wavelength; and have a knowledge of transmitter power, antenna gain, transmission line loss, and the ability to perform a simple ERP calculation would be required. General knowledge of simple resistive circuits, and their power dissipation, would be required. Knowledge of capacitors and inductors would not be required.

Stewart Teaze - N0MHS

948. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 07:14:12 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <7bqf6tcdiqd8rnnvi0bj7m1ji5p2bh3b7n@4ax.com>
Source record: 1198

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
>I don't think so. The FCC allocates spectrum for amateur
>radio use. That spectrum isn't allocated BECAUSE
>someone passes any tests. Try to get it straight.

I didn't have any spectrum allocated to me until I passed my test and
got a license. That's pretty straight. But you knew that I was just
yanking Ed's chain didn't you? I didn't expect to get two fish with
only one hook... :-)

949. Re: Sound Familiar?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 07:14:14 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <1aqf6tkde82oj3bmlfmuttpdnj2835g8pa@4ax.com>
Source record: 1199

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
>What is this glorious, religious connection to the past and
>only the past of amateur radio?!?

Because this is an *amateur radio* newsgroup...

>If you want some cogent historical information on the history
>of ALL radio in the first 30 years of its life, read...

But I'm not interested in all radio history, just ham radio history,
which is why I collect old callbooks, ham magazines, license manuals,
ham databases, ect. And I scan and post old ham stuff from time to
time for discussions sake on this *ham* newsgroup...

950. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 07:14:16 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <f6qf6t8k2omsecik8uvq4a264t479n0o1h@4ax.com>
Source record: 1200

Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com> wrote:
>
>Aaron Jones wrote:
>
>> I mean that when a cop hears "10-20" he doesn't think "I must decode
>> 10-20....decoded....it means location". In his mind he knows directly
>> what "10-20" means and "10-20" has become a word in his vocabulary.
>> It's the same with hams and common Q signals. When I hear "QTH" there
>> is no mind decoding, I hear and think of it as a word. And yes the
>> language *quality* of CW makes me think of code groups as words in my
>> vocabulary, no separate mind decoding step needed.
>
>>
>What immediately comes to mind when you hear 10-18 or QSX?

That I need to go look them up... :-) Your point?

951. Re: CA power crisis caused by internet

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 07:15:22 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010119021522.17176.00000433@nso-ba.aol.com>
Source record: 1202

In article <3A67C9B7.8A69684A@dvol.com>, Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com> writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>
>> >That's ten days old. It's a La-la land power industry scam from top to
>> >bottom, capitalism gone berserk.
>>
>> No, just greed and inefficiency by some private electric power
>> providers.
>
>I'm having a hard time believing that nobody saw this coming and decided let
>it flow in order to turn a dime on it.

At one time here, roughly two weeks ago, some electric
power brokers were charging FORTY times per KWHR
versus the same rates of 1999. I don't think anyone saw
that kind of greed.

>> In the Real "La-La Land" (Los Angeles), the
>> municipal Department of Water and Power has NO electricity
>> shortage. In fact, the DWP is today (Thursday) selling electric
>> power to mid-California!
>
>Fortuntely for LA it has it's own system. Didn't know that until now.

The LA DWP is not perfect. It has been involved in some
management-politics scandals in regards to water, the W
of DWP. Since they are a municipal organization, the
county supervisors got a new manager. The result is
enough electric power for this service area plus the
capacity to help out other areas in California.

>No doubt there is a lot of that, there always is, but blackouts cost buckets
>of money for everybody involved and big outfits like Intel deciding to build
>somewhere else has real-world ramifications.

Agreed. Every zone-refining boat going slowly through the
furnaces has to be re-melted and started over again if the
RF zone heater goes off-line. There's a whole heaping glob
of semiconductor makers up in Silicon Gulch...and a few
of them down here in nearby Riverside County.

The state of California is not perfect. The state Congress
learns rather slowly (a semi big rig suicider might have
shaken them up a bit, heh heh). Between the state and
the city of Burbank, Lockheed called it quits here and went

to a kindler, gentler Georgia. Not on power, but on taxes
and other regulations. Burbank = Lockheed used to be an
equation. No more. The last Lockheed building has been
levelled. End of an aviation era for the locality.

My wife and I were in Burbank this morning. Burbank has
their own powerplant and independent about it. The stores
in Burbank have cut back severely on lighting to avoid having
to buy electricity from elsewhere...such as the LA DWP. :-)

>The silver lining should be that it's a wakeup call for other regions even if
>it is more hype than reality. The power execs around here are in the news
>answering
>pointed questions in a very defensive mode. A couple state reps are calling
>for formal independent reviews of the situation here. Works for me.

Absolutely. Roger that. 10-4. Affirmative. :-)

It's not the "tree huggers" doing it. It's not the municipal power
companies doing it. It's not the "fault" of free enterprise. It's the
fault of BAD MANAGEMENT of private electricity providers still
operating in a monopoly service area. It's partly a fault of bad
thinking that a utility service is "just like" the free enterprise
selling of goods. It isn't. None of us can go to any store and
pick out a bargain on electric power. There are no plugs and
jacks on the utility poles that allow us to change connections
to "another" electric power company based on personal
preferences or KWHR rates. Utilities do NOT have "goods"
that can be handled in any conventional free-enterprise
system.

Imagine a situation where this pseudo-free-enterprise system
was carried to sewer services. [don't want to think of it!]

didit

952. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 07:15:23 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010119021523.17176.00000434@nso-ba.aol.com>
Source record: 1201

In article <948i74$fb6$1@iac5.navix.net>, "W4JLE" <Fred@w4jle.com> writes:

>I am sure that the Army put those people around 15KW transmitters with no
>training. At least we did not do that in the Navy.

I'm sure that your military experience is marginal at best.
Did you really reef those sails or weren't you really the
cook's helper in the galley? Did you learn morse code
by banging on pots and pans or practicing with a spark
rig? Were you able to find the sweet spot on the galena
crystal?

Yes, US Army signalmen got training. Most of the MOSs
at ADA were Field Radio types. A few like myself had
different radio MOSs and adapted, learned on the job.

>As to your education, it certainly left me impressed.

I doubt that. Nobody can beat the "superiority" of an
expert CW op, can they?

Did you think my education "stopped" after 11 years of
formal classroom courses? Certainly not. Myself and
colleagues in engineering kept on with self-education just
to keep reasonably up-to-date in electronics and radio.
Some for no other reason than to keep a job. Most of us
for the reason that it was all, repeat ALL, so damn
interesting!

>I do have a problem following your train of thought sometimes, I am sure it
>is purely in my interpretation.

Maybe next time I will "send" in morse code dots and dashes so
that your "superiority" in code will let you understand it.

No, I think not. If you can't learn to read properly, there isn't much
hope left for you to self-educate yourself in radio on up to 1960 or
1970s level. I might have suggested a subscription to QEX to learn
the cutting edge in US amateur radio...but you might have cut
yourself. No Band-Aids from me.

37,
didit

953. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 07:37:53 UTC
From: W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com>
Message-ID: <948qsm$jj8$1@iac5.navix.net>
Source record: 1203

I should know better than to communicate with someone that is my inferior...

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20010119021523.17176.00000434@nso-ba.aol.com...
> In article <948i74$fb6$1@iac5.navix.net>, "W4JLE" <Fred@w4jle.com> writes:
>
> >I am sure that the Army put those people around 15KW transmitters with no
> >training. At least we did not do that in the Navy.
>
> I'm sure that your military experience is marginal at best.
> Did you really reef those sails or weren't you really the
> cook's helper in the galley? Did you learn morse code
> by banging on pots and pans or practicing with a spark
> rig? Were you able to find the sweet spot on the galena
> crystal?
>
> Yes, US Army signalmen got training. Most of the MOSs
> at ADA were Field Radio types. A few like myself had
> different radio MOSs and adapted, learned on the job.
>
> >As to your education, it certainly left me impressed.
>
> I doubt that. Nobody can beat the "superiority" of an
> expert CW op, can they?
>
> Did you think my education "stopped" after 11 years of
> formal classroom courses? Certainly not. Myself and
> colleagues in engineering kept on with self-education just
> to keep reasonably up-to-date in electronics and radio.
> Some for no other reason than to keep a job. Most of us
> for the reason that it was all, repeat ALL, so damn
> interesting!
>
> >I do have a problem following your train of thought sometimes, I am sure
it
> >is purely in my interpretation.
>
> Maybe next time I will "send" in morse code dots and dashes so
> that your "superiority" in code will let you understand it.
>
> No, I think not. If you can't learn to read properly, there isn't much
> hope left for you to self-educate yourself in radio on up to 1960 or
> 1970s level. I might have suggested a subscription to QEX to learn
> the cutting edge in US amateur radio...but you might have cut

> yourself. No Band-Aids from me.
>
> 37,
> didit
>
>

954. Re: It's like this....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 08:28:08 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010119032808.02315.00002698@nso-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 1205

In article <943otq$g55$1@nnrp1.deja.com>, Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
writes:

>> 73, de Hans, K0HB
>> --
>>
>> PS: The internet newsgroups are not amateur radio.
>
>PS: That 1x2 after your name is for what? Decoration? Rank?
>
>You're using the K3LT argument that since this isn't wireless, you're
>free to be a jerk.
>

Brian:

Where did Hansl say that? He made a true statement, that
Usenet newsgroups are *not* amateur radio. This traffic does not
travel on any amateur radio frequencies, unless someone is
porting it over to packet, which I strongly doubt. That aside,
are you saying that people on the ham phone bands *never*
behave like "jerks?" That there are no jerks at all in the whole
of amateur radio? If that's what you think, then I think (notice I
didn't say "methinks" -- a true sign of a Usenet jerk!) you'd
better follow Mr. Hollingsworth around for a week!

73 de Larry, K3LT

955. Re: Will you let them take away your guns?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 08:28:08 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010119032808.02315.00002699@nso-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 1209

In article <944j3fljo1@news.service.uci.edu>, "Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu>
writes:

>
>I'd like to know how you feel about 10,000 armed abortion rights activists,
>or 10,000 armed environmentalists, or 10,000 convicted felons, or 10,000
>armed Klu Klux Klansmen standing on the Capitol steps threatening to shoot
>your elected Congressman and Senators - acting on these Consitutional
>rights.
>
>That's different, right?
>
>73, Jim AC6XG

Jim:

In such a situation, an armed response by law-abiding citizens would
definitely be in order to prevent the armed environmentalists, convicted
felons, abortion rights activists, and Ku Klux Klansmen from *actually*
shooting our elected Congressmen and Senators. The responsibilities
of lawfully-armed citizens are a two-way street. We have a responsibility
to be ready to defend freedom with our lives, our fortunes, and our
sacred honor. People such as you describe are probably not as
committed to their cause as those of us who are just ordinary, decent
citizens who believe in and support our Second Amendment rights.

What causes are you willing to fight and die for, Jim? Are you willing
to die for baby killers, tree-huggers, and violent racists? Our high-
sounding ideals don't stand for much unless we are people who
believe in highly moral principles. The environmental issue aside
(I consider myself to be an "environmentalist" also), the people you
mention above are just amoral, self-serving criminals. People such
as that are usually cowards, and are not willing to risk their lives to
defend their beliefs.

73 de Larry, K3LT

956. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 08:28:09 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010119032809.02315.00002701@nso-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 1206

In article <20010117073245.05313.00001001@ng-cd1.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>
>>Your argument that the other modes require equal testing status
>>doesn't hold water, since using them doesn't require the user to be
>>able to employ the same kind of conditioned response to external
>>stimulation that is the essence of Morse/CW operation.
>
>And that is exactly how I suggest that the mode be tested. As part of the
>exam, a 5-minute code segment should be sent and the applicant should be
>required to answer questions about its content, just as is done now.
>
>What would equalize the testing with the way other modes are tested would be
>to
>include those questions in the overall exam, and require an overall pass rate
>of 75%.
>
>73,
>Ed Hare, W1RFI

Ed:

I see. That way, you get to dumb-down *both* the code and theory tests with one stroke! Makes perfect sense, from the point-of-view of an ARRL HQ employee, who is worried sick about keeping his job and is desperate to do ANYTHING to get a few more people interested in getting a ham ticket and perhaps joining the League! Desperate times call for desperate measures, I guess.

73 de Larry, K3LT

957. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 08:28:09 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010119032809.02315.00002700@nso-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 1207

In article <20010117072049.05313.00000991@ng-cd1.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>
>>>There's absolutely no reason to require the skill if the equipment is
>>>not also required. How can one use CW for emergencies without any
>>>equipment?
>
>>Uh, don't look now, but people who know the Morse code and use
>>the CW mode on-the-air usually have the equipment to do so.
>
>I think he missed the point, Cecil.
>
>73,
>Ed Hare, W1RFI

Ed:

I didn't miss the point. The requirement motivates the learning; the learning motivates the need to acquire the equipment. Those who learn the Morse code well enough to effectively employ the CW mode on-the-air will also have the equipment to do so; therefore, they will be equipped to use that mode in the event of any sort of emergency where it would be practical to do so.

73 de Larry, K3LT

958. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 08:28:10 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010119032810.02315.00002703@nso-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 1204

In article <947aafogo1@news.netmar.com>, K0HB@USWEST.NET writes:

>
>> I became an Extra-class licensee under the "old" system with
>> virtually no one-on-one "Elmering" whatsoever.
>
>It shows Larry, it shows.

Hansl:

Thanks, OM -- I'll take that as a compliment!

73 de Larry, K3LT

959. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 08:28:10 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010119032810.02315.00002702@nso-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 1208

In article <3A65B4F1.11CC9CDE@IEEE.org>, Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>> Uh, don't look now, but people who know the Morse code and use
>> the CW mode on-the-air usually have the equipment to do so.
>
>Many hams don't even own an HF transceiver. When I moved
>to CA in 1971, I didn't take an HF rig with me. All I had
>was VHF access. I was without CW capability for 15 years.

Cecil:

Omygosh! Well, that would explain a lot -- namely why you've
developed such a strong need for spoiled grape juice!

By the way, I've been putting away some of my favorite spoiled
grape juice lately. Try some Schmitt-Sohnne Riesling Auslase.
You won't regret it!

73 de Larry, K3LT

960. Before responding to the Colt thread.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 11:25:19 UTC
From: qrm2000@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010119062519.13114.00000138@ng-mh1.aol.com>
Source record: 1210

If you respond to the Colt License Proposal thread, please drop
alt.radio.family from the header. The majority of FRS users are simply
American families using these low-powered radios as short-range "intercoms".
They are not radio hobbists. Thanks.

961. Re: It's like this....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 12:00:36 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <949a92$6rk$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1211

In article <20010119032808.02315.00002698@nso-fi.aol.com>,
yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote:
> In article <943otq$g55$1@nnrp1.deja.com>, Brian
<brianburke@my-deja.com>
> writes:
>
> >> 73, de Hans, K0HB
> >> --
> >>
> >> PS: The internet newsgroups are not amateur radio.
> >
> >PS: That 1x2 after your name is for what? Decoration? Rank?
> >
> >You're using the K3LT argument that since this isn't wireless, you're
> >free to be a jerk.
> >
>
> Brian:
>
> Where did Hansl say that? He made a true statement, that
> Usenet newsgroups are *not* amateur radio. This traffic does not
> travel on any amateur radio frequencies, unless someone is
> porting it over to packet, which I strongly doubt. That aside,
> are you saying that people on the ham phone bands *never*
> behave like "jerks?" That there are no jerks at all in the whole
> of amateur radio? If that's what you think, then I think (notice I
> didn't say "methinks" -- a true sign of a Usenet jerk!) you'd
> better follow Mr. Hollingsworth around for a week!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

True, he did not -say- that. True, Riley gets to deal with the few
jerks in amateur radio who violate the regulations while on the air.

However, taken in the context of the Clint DeSoto thread where I
highlighted the idea of an amateur radio brotherhood, he implied that
hams talking to hams OVER THE INTERNET have no need to share in any ham
brotherhood.

Such an idea spouted from your mouth in years gone by. You appear to
have a loyal following.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

962. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 12:10:54 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <949asb$78v$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1212

In article <948kdu$bj4$0@208.206.142.78>,
Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>
>
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > "Deliberately sending bad code" should have been challenged by more
> > readers than just me. It says a lot about where you stand as well.
>
> It just shows how uninformed you really are. Ed was being very polite
> by not setting you straight. I got over that with you long ago.

Dick, I find you Extraness incredibly ineffective and unmotivating
because I still believe that intentionally sending bad code is wrong.

Go send your bad code.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

963. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 12:31:37 UTC
From: Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com>
Message-ID: <3A6833A9.8D060530@dvol.com>
Source record: 1213

Aaron Jones wrote:

> >>
> >What immediately comes to mind when you hear 10-18 or QSX?
>
> That I need to go look them up... :-) Your point?

>
My point is that there are very few of these codes are in general use,
having to look them up defeats the whole intended purpose of the things.
>
w3rv

964. Re: CA power crisis caused by internet

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 12:37:00 UTC
From: "Steven J Robeson", K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <949cdd$875$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1215

In article <20010118232837.09475.00000876@nso-fj.aol.com>,
lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:

> No rolling blackouts in Los Angeles, none expected. The
> only one "going berserk" is the press trying to make a
> Big Story out of it. Idiotic journalism.

It sure is. I find very little about "journalism" in SoCal's
media to be anything BUT sensationalist. Not that it isn't anywhere
else.

Kinda like the 30MPH "pursuit" with 100 crusiers "chasing" two
men..?!?!

73

Steve, K4YZ

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

965. Re: 10 bucks buys a ham license.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 12:41:00 UTC
From: Keith Casey <kc7kc@bigfoot.com>
Message-ID: <949e70$dk0$1@news.bewellnet.com>
Source record: 1214
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

The VE's were incorrect to ask for another fee to take the extra. That should have been covered under the one fee.

Also, the VE group can keep a part of the fee, but only enough to cover their expenses. Their time cannot be charged. The rules did just change on keeping records of expenses incurred.

Keith, KC7KC

"K7MEM" <jda@rupert.tds-az.lmco.com> wrote in message news:3A65DD87.3F54BC7E@rupert.tds-az.lmco.com...
> John Passaneau wrote:
> >
> > The ARRL VE book, said, 1 fee for each test session, and it covered
> > as many elements as the test taker wanted to take, or the VE have.
> > But it is a new fee to retake a failed element. So as long as you
> > keep passing you can do as many elements as you can pass for 1 fee.
> > Remember though that most VE sessions have only 2 or 3 versions
> > of a test element available and if you flunk all that they have,
> > your done for that session.
> >
> > Dick Carroll"wrote:
> > >
> > > Steve Woodruff wrote:
> > > >
> > > > ..but i was suprised tonight to learn that i had to
> > > > pay the $10 fee for EACH exam i took. I upgraded to general,
> > > > and had intentions of attempting the extra class exam....
> > > > but when i found out it would cost me an additional $10
> > > > i figured i'd wait until next month when i could be
> > > > reasonably sure that i'd pass with ease.
> > >
> > > If that is permissable evidently they have changed the rules. When I
> > > ran a VE team ('85 thru '93) the rules said one fee for all tests
taken
> > > at that session. Later it was deemed permissable to charge an
additional
> > > fee for a retest of a failed element at the same session, but we never
> > > did.
>
> It's been a few years, but when I made General, I took the Tech,
> General, and 13 WPM code at the same time for one fee ($6.45).
> At another session I took the Extra and the 20 WPM code tests
> again for one fee ($6.45). At the time, I was under the impression

> that this fee went directly to the ARRL, to cover the cost
> of the testing materials that they supplied. That ment that the
> club, which was running the VE session, was really charging
> nothing for their time.
>
> Was I correct in my reasoning? Aren't they, the club, also allowed
> to charge a small fee to cover their expenses?
>
> Martin K7MEM
>
> --
> Martin E. Meserve K7MEM
> martin.e.meserve AT lmco.com
>
> I respond to news groups and E-Mail on my own time and therefore
> my responses may not be as timely as you, or I, would like them to
> be. If I seem to be ignoring you, send me another E-Mail to jog my
> memory. Opinions are my own and do not reflect the opinions of my
> employer.

966. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 13:09:59 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A683CA7.62CCB689@IEEE.org>
Source record: 1216

Aaron Jones wrote:
> Seniority makes little difference in making a gaff. And neither
> "CQ" or "W7xxx monitoring" say in plain english what it is we really
> want, namely a contact.

Yeah, "Anybody got yur ears on?" says it all. :-)
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

967. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 13:15:53 UTC
From: "Steven J Robeson", K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <949em4$a2a$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1218
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,alt.radio.family,rec.radio.cb

In article <948o9h$4mg4$1@newssvr05-en0.news.prodigy.com>,
"Stewart R Teaze" <HORSESHOE7@prodigy.net> wrote:

>As a result of this, I have reworked the Communicator entry-level
>license proposal I submitted to the FCC last year, and I will now be
>proposing a new entry-level Amateur Radio class known as the "Colt"
>class

Oh nooooooooo....NOT again!

Stewart, I think this "new" license class was the RESULT of one
too many "Colt's".....Colt 45 Laager's, that is......

The FCC MAY assign another RM, but I bet a Happy Meal that they
just say "Been There, Done That".....

They just got done paring down the number of classes...They did
NOT do that just to make room for NEW licenses.

There are already NUMEROUS stories of YOUNG kids (7-8-9) passing
the PRESENT Technician license, so I really doubt they will predisposed
to creating something "new".

If you REALLY want to make an impact on kids in Amateur Radio, try
writing a text FOR kids...THAT will help them along the way. Trying to
wrangle a "new" Amateur Radio license out of the FCC for posterity's
sake isn't it.

73

Steve, K4YZ

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

968. Re: CA power crisis caused by internet

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 13:17:24 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A683E64.BA8A34AE@IEEE.org>
Source record: 1217
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Meanwhile, the state is loaded with
> environmental activitists who feel real good about locking away all the
> natural resources for "posterity" instead of meeting the environmental
> protection challenges headon with sensible protective requirements that
> are enforced.

I hope they enjoy sitting around in the dark in the cold. KE6AJH was
sitting at his computer in Santa Cruz yesterday when the blackout hit.
Imagine a day trader being without power for a couple of hours while
IBM is rising 12 points.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

969. Re: CA power crisis caused by internet

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 13:22:20 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A683F8C.95FF965@IEEE.org>
Source record: 1219

Len Over 21 wrote:
> I know that kinda spoils a good back-and-forth, but that's
> the situation in Southern California now. :-)

Would you say most of the rabid CA environmentalists are
in the middle and Northern parts of CA?
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

970. Re: The Real Bill Clinton Legacy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 13:28:12 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A6840EC.7722AC5F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 1220
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Dwight Stewart wrote:
> There has been much talk about the Clinton legacy. As William J.
> Clinton leaves office, lets take a look at a few things around the
> country to discover the real Clinton legacy.

Dwight, you deliberately omitted the educational things BJ (Billy Jefferson)
did - like a months long discussion of oral sex on nationwide TV. :-)
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

971. Re: Before responding to the Colt thread.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 13:28:44 UTC
From: "Steven J Robeson", K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <949fe6$aj5$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1221
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.radio.family

In article <20010119062519.13114.00000138@ng-mh1.aol.com>,
qrm2000@aol.com (Qrm2000) wrote:

>If you respond to the Colt License Proposal thread, please drop
>alt.radio.family from the header. The majority of FRS users are simply
>American families using these low-powered radios as short
>range "intercoms". They are not radio hobbists. Thanks.

You're welcome...but hang on........

WHAT poll did you conduct that has determined that "the majority
of FRS users" are "not radio hobbyists..."...???

Furthermore, as much as I disdain Stewart's attempts to again
create something the FCC (and the commenting public in general) has
determined to be unnecessary, it is still directly aimed at FRS users
who might otherwise wish to expand beyond FRS use. "alt.radio.family"
IS a valid forum for his ideas, as irrelevant as they may be.

Lastly, unless you can show me where you are the "listowner" or
the charter holder for "alt.radio.family", I am hard pressed to accept
any of your admonitions to NOT post to that NG. Last I checked, it IS
an OPEN forum.

73

Steve, K4YZ
Ham, CBer, FRS user

--
"The Measure Of A Man Is Not In The Way He Touches A Woman, But In How
He Touches A Woman's Heart".

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

972. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 13:40:51 UTC
From: "Leland C. Scott" <no-spam@junk-mail.net>
Message-ID: <t6ggvbjn6da91c@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 1222
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,alt.radio.family,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc

"Stewart R Teaze" <HORSESHOE7@prodigy.net> wrote in message
news:948o9h$4mg4$1@newssvr05-en0.news.prodigy.com...
> Like it or not,
> the typical young person ends up cutting his radio experimention teeth in
> the Citizen's Band service, because
> there isn't a reasonable entry-level ham license for kids(it is even worse
> now after restructuring, what with the
> elimination of the Novice Class).

The Technician Class license is so easy to get now it's not even funny. You sure you are not being a little jaded in your view when you think every kid wants to work DX on H.F., hence starting out on CB Radio shooting skip?

--
Leland C. Scott
KC8LDO

973. Re: 10 bucks buys a ham license.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 13:58:45 UTC
From: KC8JBO <roger_kc8jbo@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <949h6h$c3m$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1223
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <949e70$dk0$1@news.bewellnet.com>,
"Keith Casey" <kc7kc@bigfoot.com> wrote:
> The VE's were incorrect to ask for another fee to take the extra.
That
> should have been covered under the one fee.
>
> Also, the VE group can keep a part of the fee, but only enough to
cover
> their expenses. Their time cannot be charged. The rules did just
change on
> keeping records of expenses incurred.
>
> Keith, KC7KC

According to the ARRL VE Manual , Eith Ed. , 2000, p. 50,
under "Retesting,"
"An applicant who fails an element at an ARRL/VEC-coordinated session
may retake that element at the same session, if (1) the administering
VE team has a different version of that element, which the applicant
hasn't taken (section 97.509), (2) the VE team has the time and
resources and is willing to readminister the additional version; and
(3) the applicant pays an ADDITIONAL (emphasis mine) TEST FEE (because
the candidate is then considered a walk-in candidate who just arrived,
even if he or she arrived at the beginning of the session). Again, a
retest fee charge is only required if an element is retaken, after
being failed at your session."

The W5YI VE manual has the same thing .

The reimbursement fee (test fee) is the only fee that may be charged at
a test session. Now, if the test session occurs at a hamfest,
instruction class, or other gathering, an admission fee may be charged
and it has to be kept seperate from the test fee. If you're just going
to the test sesion at a hamfest, you shouldn't be charged a fee.

> "K7MEM" <jda@rupert.tds-az.lmco.com> wrote in message
> news:3A65DD87.3F54BC7E@rupert.tds-az.lmco.com...
> > John Passaneau wrote:
> > >
> > > The ARRL VE book, said, 1 fee for each test session, and it
covered
> > > as many elements as the test taker wanted to take, or the VE have.
> > > But it is a new fee to retake a failed element. So as long as you
> > > keep passing you can do as many elements as you can pass for 1

fee.
> > > Remember though that most VE sessions have only 2 or 3 versions
> > > of a test element available and if you flunk all that they have,
> > > your done for that session.
> > >
> > > Dick Carroll"wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Steve Woodruff wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > ..but i was suprised tonight to learn that i had to
> > > > > pay the $10 fee for EACH exam i took. I upgraded to general,
> > > > > and had intentions of attempting the extra class exam....
> > > > > but when i found out it would cost me an additional $10
> > > > > i figured i'd wait until next month when i could be
> > > > > reasonably sure that i'd pass with ease.
> > > >
> > > > If that is permissable evidently they have changed the rules.
When I
> > > > ran a VE team ('85 thru '93) the rules said one fee for all
tests
> taken
> > > > at that session. Later it was deemed permissable to charge an
> additional
> > > > fee for a retest of a failed element at the same session, but
we never
> > > > did.
> >
> > It's been a few years, but when I made General, I took the Tech,
> > General, and 13 WPM code at the same time for one fee ($6.45).
> > At another session I took the Extra and the 20 WPM code tests
> > again for one fee ($6.45). At the time, I was under the impression
> > that this fee went directly to the ARRL, to cover the cost
> > of the testing materials that they supplied. That ment that the
> > club, which was running the VE session, was really charging
> > nothing for their time.
> >
> > Was I correct in my reasoning? Aren't they, the club, also allowed
> > to charge a small fee to cover their expenses?
> >
> > Martin K7MEM
> >
> > --
> > Martin E. Meserve K7MEM
> > martin.e.meserve AT lmco.com
> >
> > I respond to news groups and E-Mail on my own time and therefore
> > my responses may not be as timely as you, or I, would like them to
> > be. If I seem to be ignoring you, send me another E-Mail to jog my
> > memory. Opinions are my own and do not reflect the opinions of my
> > employer.

>
>

--
73 de Roger, KC8JBO
EM99 |ARRL|VE [ARRL & W5YI]|ARES |RACES
Yaesu FT-920 |Inverted Vee @ 40 ft.
Yaesu FT-90R

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

974. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 14:38:33 UTC
From: darryl_NOSPAM@shecora.com
Message-ID: <902E6B6B4darrylNOSPAMshecorac@207.126.101.100>
Source record: 1224

Fred@w4jle.com (W4JLE) wrote in <93nntl$4ee$1@iac5.navix.net>:

Well Fred things have changed in your 62 years. Some for the
better, some for the worst. As many things as you can come
up with that are bad, I can come up with that is good. Things
change!

I have been reading this groups for a good while now. Whe
I started I was very much a pro-coder. I listen to what
the no coders had to say as well as the pro-coders. Hint:
If you really want to learn listen closely to the side
your disagree with. I did that! Thank you all the
no-coders that posted. There is at least one (ex) pro-coder
that listened.

Here is the things I learned:

1. the code requirement doesn't improve the character of the
hams joining the ranks.

2. It is just a tool/mode. Sure it tugs at the heart strings,
but it is just a tool/mode. A tool that requires a lot of study
to use. Modern digital modes get thur just as well, without
the years of study that is required for CW.

3. I never heard a no code person every suggest CW should go
away. They just believe it shouldn't be a requirement.

4. Pro coder aguments are either emotionally based and/or false.

I have never heard a good reason for keeping the code requirement.
I don't believe that you can either. I can only think of one,
that is it might spark an interest in CW by someone that didn't
have it before.

73
WA1GON

975. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 14:56:46 UTC
From: 'Doc <w5lz@oio.net>
Message-ID: <3A6855AE.962E878D@oio.net>
Source record: 1225
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,alt.radio.family,rec.radio.cb

Stewart,
Why are you wasting your time and ours with this? There
is already an 'entry level' license. It sounds like you
are advocating another 'junk' license. Give it a rest.
'Doc

976. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 14:58:50 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <949kn5fcb1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1227
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

In article <948o9h$4mg4$1@newssvr05-en0.news.prodigy.com>,
"Stewart R Teaze" <HORSESHOE7@prodigy.net> wrote:

> Please keep in mind that the future of American involvement in
> wireless communications development depends on us to properly
> encourage and teach tomorrow's experimenters, operators,
> technicians, and engineers...

The current mainstream Technician license class is easily attained
by young people and meets these goals perfectly; your proposed Barbie
Doll class would establish a channelized CB-like ghetto separate from
mainstream amateur radio, creating additional "we vs. them" divisions
in the Amateur Radio service. Personally, I think this is just another
spin on your attempt to establish a defacto expansion of FRS and MURS.

73, de Hans, K0HB
--
"We are fellow travelers on a journey between two
eternities, and it's a trip far too brief for me
to be concerned about your speed at the Code of
Morse."

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

977. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 15:04:15 UTC
From: "Steven J Robeson", K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <949l18fqa1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1228

In article <20010118232827.09475.00000873@nso-fj.aol.com>,
lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:

> "Resentment?!?" I had 11 years of college-level formal
> education at night while working full-time during the day for
> 15 years. My only "resentment" is towards the arrogant
> recycled log bundles who accumulate paper without the
> accumulation of knowledge.

Maybe if you had paid more attention in class it wouldn't have
taken 15 years?

>>The fact is many have neither the ability or the self
>>discipline to learn on their own.

> I disagree. Did someone come along and inject you with your
> "superiority" knowledge or did you develop that all on your own?

You disagree that "many" people don't have the ability or self-
discipline to study on thier own?

There's NO controversy here, Len. It's a fact. Many people DON'T
have EITHER self-discipline OR ability (ie skills on HOW to study...)
to do it "on thier own".

>>They are not blessed with your tenacity and innate intelligence.

> Tenacity has no relation to intelligence.

In YOUR case, this is true. But people with a greater tenacity
to "stick with it" generally ARE more intelligent, simply because they
have applied them selves more aptly.

> I wonder why some jelly-bellies want to get chewed on...

Kinda the same reason SOME people post in newsgroups for which
they has expressed the intent to NOT be involved in, yet feel compelled
to tell others how THEY should be doing things.

> Jelly, old bean,.....

More of those "names" that you insist you don't tease and taunt
people with until they return same in kind, thereby giving you reason
to claim "VICTIM!!! VICTIM!!!"

>....I broke into HF transmissions on 1 to 15 KW tube transmitters..."

Oh geez...more of the "There I was at 30,000 feet" stories. Of
course as soon as a licnesed HAM does that, we are "resting on our

laurels", or otherwise stuck in some time warp of technology.

Try again, Lennie.

>The formality of sitting in class listening to basic training in
>English and Math (when I had already used both on the job) was a
>requirement towards a piece of paper that said I was a Bachelor
>or something......

Some of us were smart enough to "CLEP" out of those, Lennie,
saving money AND time.

>I was already a bachelor, Jelly.

More "endearments" that he denies using....WHY does Lennie lie?

> Fred JLE, don't try to "lecture" me on college-level
> "directions." Try to "lecture" me on Extra class class
> distinction and your "superiority" of CW above and beyond
> every thing else in amateur radio.

Of course YOU being the "all-knowing" about Amateur Radio of ANY
class...???

> Was it really "worth it" to sit night after night listening to some
> instructor-expert tell me what I had to know on my job when I
> was already doing my job successfully?

CLEP...DANTE....ACT-PEP.... You DIDN'T have to do it "that way"
(classroom and night school), however you DID do it because everyone
else TOLD you you HAD to do it THAT way because THAT was the way THEY
did it. And you believed them, or were too ignorant to investigate non-
traditional educational opportunities.

Thankfully, Ham Radio allows you to "do it" in numerous forms and
functions. Contrary to YOUR opinion.

> What does a student do during "homework?" Think about it.
> They SELF-TEACH by completing their assignment, showing
> their work.

Which is ASSIGNED by the instructor in a STRUCTURED teaching
enviroment, NOT one in which the "student" must attempt to glean that
which is "important". The instructor STILL "tells" the student what to
study.

> They only thing different between such self-
> teaching and self-techning from a text or informative article
> is that the instructor in a formal class will "grade" the student
> towards some achievement of a piece of paper.

Obviously you have never been an instructor or teacher, and have
no concept of the group-paced versus self-paced instructional
techniques, Lennie.

And as much as you decry the accumulation of "paper", it IS a societal necessity. Whether it is an FCC license, EMS certification or college degree..."Because I SAY I know it..." is NOT sufficient in our society.

> Which do you consider the Most Important, Mr. W4JLE,
> actually having learned-and-accomplishing something on your
> own or having an accreditation certificate or diploma hanging
> on a wall?

Hmmmm.....I did both. Did it on my own AND have a diploma and NUMEROUS certificates to validate accomplishments, learning, etc. Oh...SOME class room in there too....and it didn't take me 15 years.

> [I think everyone can see the preference but it
> would be nice to see the words of rationaliz...oops,
> justification as to which is "superior."

One need not be "superior" to the other...only appropriate to the circumstances of the "student" and the subject matter.

>>While your opinions of my stances were read and enjoyed, as always I
>>disagree with you.

> Naturally. You are so much more "superior." [barf]

More "tolerance and civil debate" from the Maximally Engineered, Non-Licensed Buffoon.

> This is a bit like nailing jelly to a tree...

And even furthermore denigration and antagonizing of someone who is NOT doing it to you.....kinda like what you dished out to me until I had enough of it.

The trailer says it all.

--
"If You're Not A Ham....You're SPAM!"

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

978. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 15:06:57 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <c0mg6t87nmd1m7o92nad7em98oq5igmf63@4ax.com>
Source record: 1226

Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com> wrote:
>My point is that there are very few of these codes are in general use,
>having to look them up defeats the whole intended purpose of the things.

I don't completely disagree with that. In fact many public service agencies have gone to plain English for just that reason. I think that the intended purpose of the 10-codes and the Q codes is to save radio time. To be effective they must be learned, that's true. But once learned, they do serve the intended purpose...

979. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 15:14:23 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <949lk6gca1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1230

In article <3A67CC83.5DFD03BC@dvol.com>,
Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com> wrote:

> What immediately comes to mind when you hear 10-18 or QSX?

If I hear "10-18" it immediately comes to mind that my VFO is
probably *way* out of the 17-meter band.

If I hear "QSX" it immediately comes to mind that I'd better split my
VFO's if I wanna work this guy.

Sebenty Tree, de Hans, K0HB
--
"We are fellow travelers on a journey between two
eternities, and it's a trip far too brief for me
to be concerned about your speed at the Code of
Morse."

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

980. Re: The Real Bill Clinton Legacy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 15:15:47 UTC
From: 'Doc <w5lz@oio.net>
Message-ID: <3A685A23.908FE8C0@oio.net>
Source record: 1229
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Dwight,
As Mr. Clinton leaves the White House, all I can say is, "Don't let the door-knob hit'ya where the good Lord split'ya!".
'Doc

981. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 15:51:10 UTC
From: curious_dan@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <949np9ilh1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1231
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,alt.radio.family,rec.radio.cb

In article <948o9h$4mg4$1@newssvr05-en0.news.prodigy.com>,
"Stewart R Teaze" <HORSESHOE7@prodigy.net> wrote:
> The rapidly-expanding Family Radio Service has exposed millions of
young
> people to the world
> of radio communications. But now, where is a young kid to go who has
is
> interested in experimenting
> with radios and get more range than the typical 1/2 mile of FRS?
MURS might
> help a bit(if Motorola doesn't
> get their way), but you know that a growing mind is eventually going
to want
> more than just this. GMRS
> doesn't have the resources, and is not a service that was created to
foster
> experimentation. Like it or not,
> the typical young person ends up cutting his radio experimention
teeth in
> the Citizen's Band service, because
> there isn't a reasonable entry-level ham license for kids(it is even
worse
> now after restructuring, what with the
> elimination of the Novice Class).
>
> Everyday now the USA is falling further and further behind Europe and
Japan
> in the wireless communications
> race. As hams, it is time we make an effort to insure that our young
people
> are provided with the proper
> environment, incentives, and role models to properly learn radio
> communications techniques and etiquette.
> It is time for hams to stop complaining, step up to the plate, and
take an
> active role in seeing that our bright,
> young technical minds are being taught properly.
>
> As a result of this, I have reworked the Communicator entry-level
license
> proposal I submitted to the FCC last year,
> and I will now be proposing a new entry-level Amateur Radio class
known as

> the "Colt" class. I submit a draft
> of the proposal for your review below. Please keep in mind that the
future
> of American involvement in wireless
> communications development depends on us to properly encourage and
teach
> tomorrow's experimenters, operators,
> technicians, and engineers...
>
> **********
> Proposal to FCC to institute an introductory-level "Colt" license
> class in the Amateur Radio Service - REV A
>
> In the late 1980's and early 1990's when the current Amateur Radio
Service
> Technician Class license was conceived and implemented, it was
> an appropriate alternate introductory license class. However, due to
the
> recent elimination of the Novice Class license, and as a result of
improving
> technology; the Technician Class license no longer serves well as the
only
> introductory license, as it is doing poorly in drawing young members
into
> the Service. As a result of license restructuring, it is now actually
> harder for young people to obtain an Amateur license than it was
before
> restructuring.
>
> In this critical era of global competition, especially in the wireless
> communications arena, it is essential that we provide a means for
properly
> educating our young people in RF communications operation and theory.
>
> Today, technologies like the Family Radio Service, high-speed
telephone &
> cable modems, the Internet, and inexpensive cellular
> telephones, have overshadowed the privileges of the Amateur Radio
Service,
> and made the requirements for young beginners to obtain a
> Technician Class license out of date. Additionally, the Technician
Class
> license has now evolved into a beginning and ending point for
> most modern day Amateurs, who are mostly interested in VHF/UHF
> communications, rather than HF communications. Incentive licensing
has
> virtually been eliminated.
>
> The need for a Service dedicated to the goal of teaching young radio
users

> proper radio operation techniques and etiquette can clearly be seen
in the
> disarray present on the 11 meter Citizen's Band Service frequencies.
The
> fact is, the Citizen's Band has become the defacto introductory
service for
> young people just beginning to learn to experiment with radio; yet the
> Citizen's Band is a very poor environment for young people to be
learning
> in.
>
> Therefore, it is recommended that a new "Colt Class" license be added
to the
> Amateur Radio Service expressly to encourage young
> individuals to enter the Amateur Radio Service to improve their
> understanding of RF communications theory, provide a healthy learning
> environment, and encourage radio experimentation.
>
> On the 70cm UHF band, Colt licensees would be restricted to voice
> communications on 5 simplex-only 20khz-spaced channels
> on 446.00, 446.02, 446.04, 446.06, and 446.08 Mhz; and digital
> communications up to 19,200bps on 1 simplex-only 60khz bandwidth
channel on
> 446.14Mhz.
>
> On the 1.25m VHF band, Colt licensees would be restricted to voice
> communications on 5 simplex-only 20khz-spaced channels
> on 223.42, 223.44, 223.46, 223.48, and 223.50 Mhz; and digital
> communications up to 19,200bps on 1 simplex-only 60khz bandwidth
channel on
> 223.56Mhz.
>
> To encourage experimentation/understanding of antenna and VHF/UHF RF
> propagation theory, Colt licensees would also be allowed to setup
and/or
> operate through a VHF/UHF crossband, simplex user input/output,
repeater
> station on two 20khz-bandwidth channels on 223.52Mhz and 446.10Mhz.
This
> would allow them to setup an inexpensive repeater system by
interconnecting
> the voice/mic connections via a resistive circuit on two simplex
radios; and
> would not require expensive, and difficult to understand, cavity and
> duplexer filtering at the repeater station site. User radio costs
would be
> low, as they would only need a single simplex radio. As a result of
the
> characteristics of this type of repeater, the repeater builders and
users

> would learn to coordinate frequencies, and user groupings based on
> environmental conditions, so as to acheive optimal results.
>
> Colt license users would also be subject to the following
restrictions:
>
> (1) Individuals applying for a Colt Class license must be under 19
years of
> age at the time of license application or renewal. The license is
valid for
> 5 years.
>
> (2) Fixed control station antennas will be no more than 6.1 meters (20
> feet) above the ground or above the building or tree on which it is
> mounted.
>
> (3) Transmissions limited to 5 watts ERP, or less.
>
> The new license class would have the following goals:
>
> 1) Encourage more young people to enter the Amateur Radio Service, by
> providing an entry-level ARS license class that includes privileges
> allowing reliable short-range voice and data communications.
>
> 2) Not significantly impact existing users of the affected Amateur
Radio
> Service frequency bands.
>
> 3) Encourage basic knowledge of radio, electronics, operating
principles and
> etiquette among a wider segment of the general
> population.
>
> 4) Take advantage of the success of the Family Radio Service, and
provide a
> path for those young users interested in further radio
experimentation.
>
> The Colt license exam would consist of 25 fairly simple questions.
Emphasis
> would be put on understanding the existing operational, safety,
etiquette
> and emergency questions from theTechnician Class question pool that
relate
> specifically to Colt Class license privileges. All questions
containing
> calculations would contain small integer(whole-number) input values
and have
> relatively small integer results. Colt licensees would be required
to have

> a general understanding of Ohm's Law and Power relations. They
should be
> required to have a general understanding of how antenna length
relates to
> wavelength; and have a knowledge of transmitter power, antenna gain,
> transmission line loss, and the ability to perform a simple ERP
calculation
> would be required. General knowledge of simple resistive circuits,
and
> their power dissipation, would be required. Knowledge of capacitors
and
> inductors would not be required.
>
> Stewart Teaze - N0MHS
>
>

yeh real cool, it is exposing kids to radio alright. what does 900 mhz
do to brain waves good buddy?,.......cd is out......

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

982. Re: The Real Bill Clinton Legacy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 16:25:20 UTC
From: darrell earnshaw <Darrell.Earnshaw@eng.Sun.COM>
Message-ID: <3A686A70.856B9CEB@eng.Sun.COM>
Source record: 1232
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
> There has been much talk about the Clinton legacy. As William J.
> Clinton leaves office, lets take a look at a few things around the
> country to discover the real Clinton legacy.
>
> Politics & Race Relations...
[...snip...]

>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net

Dwight,

Of course you are entitled to your own interpretations and views.
However, this newsgroup is about amateur radio, not politics, relgion,
or other unrelated issues, and it is an inappropriate forum for personal
soapboxes on issues unrelated to amateur radio. I also suspect that most
subscribers to the NG probably couldn't care less about US politics or
domestic issues -- newsgroups are not just for domestic US consumption -
they're international. I'm sure there's a
"US.politics.domestic.anti-liberals" or something newsgroup somewhere
out there which is more appropriate.

No disrespect intended.

73, Darrell
nr3y.

983. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 17:19:27 UTC
From: Lamar Owen <lamar.owen@wgcr.org>
Message-ID: <3A68771F.ED7B32E0@wgcr.org>
Source record: 1233
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna

Steven, J, Robeson, K4YZ wrote:
> There are already NUMEROUS stories of YOUNG kids (7-8-9) passing
> the PRESENT Technician license, so I really doubt they will predisposed
> to creating something "new".

I personally know an eleven-year-old Extra. 20-wpm-code-test Extra, at
that. He was 10 when he passed the 20wpm. He was 8, IIRC, when he
passed the Tech exam.
--
Lamar Owen
WGCR Internet Radio
1 Peter 4:11

984. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 17:29:43 UTC
From: Gene <webmaster@zylay.com>
Message-ID: <3A687987.6CC68AA6@zylay.com>
Source record: 1234
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna

> Steven, J, Robeson, K4YZ wrote:
> > There are already NUMEROUS stories of YOUNG kids (7-8-9) passing
> > the PRESENT Technician license, so I really doubt they will predisposed
> > to creating something "new".
>
> I personally know an eleven-year-old Extra. 20-wpm-code-test Extra, at
> that. He was 10 when he passed the 20wpm. He was 8, IIRC, when he
> passed the Tech exam.

Sounds believable to me. My 10 and 11 YOs are studying. They want to
pass the 5 WPM in time for field day.

985. Re: CA power crisis caused by internet

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 17:35:33 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nospam.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.g7exwa1.pminews@ca.news.verio.net>
Source record: 1236

On Thu, 18 Jan 2001 23:59:35 -0500, Brian Kelly wrote:

>No doubt there is a lot of that, there always is, but blackouts cost buckets of
>money for everybody involved and big outfits like Intel deciding to build
>somewhere else has real-world ramifications.

Intel has been building "elsewhere" for many years. My wife
works for the company (IDC) that designs and builds Intel's
plants, and they currently have expansion projects going on for
existing plants in Oregon, China, Ireland, and Israel (those
that she talks about) as well as a lot more countries.

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

986. Re: CA power crisis caused by internet

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 17:35:34 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nospam.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.g7ey6t2.pminews@ca.news.verio.net>
Source record: 1237

On 19 Jan 2001 06:15:03 GMT, Len Over 21 wrote:

>The municipal Los Angeles electric power provider, the
>Department of Water and Power, has no electric power
>shortage. [will you agree that Los Angeles is a large city?]
>The LA DWP is presently selling electric power to middle
>California. There are no rolling blackouts in the LA DWP
>service area, none expected for a long time.

IIRC the DWP was exempt from the CPUC's fiat that production
facilities be sold. If SCE, SDGE, and PG&E were allowed to
keep their dynamos as well, would there have been a "shortage"?
Doubtful.

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

987. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 17:35:35 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nospam.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.g7eygt3.pminews@ca.news.verio.net>
Source record: 1235

On Thu, 18 Jan 2001 21:52:07 -0600, Richard McCollum wrote:

>When a few docs and the Federal Venereal Disease Control Officer got
>clinical on the air, you could hear the strak jaws tighten for miles.

But how many of the latter understood the clinical medical
terms wh\ich probably were being used?

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

988. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 17:36:00 UTC
From: vlfiscus@mcn.net
Message-ID: <t6guo0p3ejll62@news.supernews.com>
Source record: 1238

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in
<20010118063646.07593.00002570@nso-ch.aol.com>:

>
>Watch out, Vince! Now Ed's gonna ask you several questions, each
>ending with: How is a multi-level code test going to help?
>
>Naturally, you're correct. Ham radio is heading down the drain,
>particularly with regard to it's attractiveness to young people.
Dittos Larry,

The League uses phrases like: "We're protecting the service and your spectrum from external threats.", but they won't lift a finger and have no problems with watching the service rot from within.

Ed, there was already CB for those that didn't want to learn. Why did the ARRL push to dumb things down? The losers already have a radio service, why'd the League push to let them destroy my hobby?

989. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 18:03:31 UTC
From: vlfiscus@mcn.net
Message-ID: <t6h0bj1fdtc170@news.supernews.com>
Source record: 1239

w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote in
<20010117072842.05313.00000998@ng-cd1.aol.com>:

>
>I think, Vince, that my professional work, as opposed to my
>personal-time posts, has very much improved ham radio.

Employees chalk up bonus retirement points if they spread corprate policy during their off-hours(or at least a pat on the back at the weekly office meeting). With you in the newgroup Ed, I don't need to get QST, I can get the latest policy B.S. at the click of a mouse on one of your posts.

I know you don't agree, but the proposal was a dumbing down proposal.

990. Roger doesnt use foul mouth !

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 18:08:05 UTC
From: frg9600 <frg9600@home.com>
Message-ID: <9o%96.833$t5.75684@news1.frmt1.sfba.home.com>
Source record: 1240
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

KC8JBO <roger_kc8jbo@my-deja.com> wrote in message
news:949h6h$c3m$1@nnrp1.deja.com...
> In article <949e70$dk0$1@news.bewellnet.com>,
> "Keith Casey" <kc7kc@bigfoot.com> wrote:
> > The VE's were incorrect to ask for another fee to take the extra.
> That
> > should have been covered under the one fee.
> >
> > Also, the VE group can keep a part of the fee, but only enough to
> cover
> > their expenses. Their time cannot be charged. The rules did just
> change on
> > keeping records of expenses incurred.
> >
> > Keith, KC7KC
>
> According to the ARRL VE Manual , Eith Ed. , 2000, p. 50,
> under "Retesting,"
> "An applicant who fails an element at an ARRL/VEC-coordinated session
> may retake that element at the same session, if (1) the administering
> VE team has a different version of that element, which the applicant
> hasn't taken (section 97.509), (2) the VE team has the time and
> resources and is willing to readminister the additional version; and
> (3) the applicant pays an ADDITIONAL (emphasis mine) TEST FEE (because
> the candidate is then considered a walk-in candidate who just arrived,
> even if he or she arrived at the beginning of the session). Again, a
> retest fee charge is only required if an element is retaken, after
> being failed at your session."
>
> The W5YI VE manual has the same thing .
>
> The reimbursement fee (test fee) is the only fee that may be charged at
> a test session. Now, if the test session occurs at a hamfest,
> instruction class, or other gathering, an admission fee may be charged
> and it has to be kept seperate from the test fee. If you're just going
> to the test sesion at a hamfest, you shouldn't be charged a fee.
>
>
>
> > "K7MEM" <jda@rupert.tds-az.lmco.com> wrote in message
> > news:3A65DD87.3F54BC7E@rupert.tds-az.lmco.com...
> > > John Passaneau wrote:
> > > >

> > > > The ARRL VE book, said, 1 fee for each test session, and it
> covered
> > > > as many elements as the test taker wanted to take, or the VE have.
> > > > But it is a new fee to retake a failed element. So as long as you
> > > > keep passing you can do as many elements as you can pass for 1
> fee.
> > > > Remember though that most VE sessions have only 2 or 3 versions
> > > > of a test element available and if you flunk all that they have,
> > > > your done for that session.
> > > >
> > > > Dick Carroll"wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > Steve Woodruff wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > ..but i was suprised tonight to learn that i had to
> > > > > > pay the $10 fee for EACH exam i took. I upgraded to general,
> > > > > > and had intentions of attempting the extra class exam....
> > > > > > but when i found out it would cost me an additional $10
> > > > > > i figured i'd wait until next month when i could be
> > > > > > reasonably sure that i'd pass with ease.
> > > > >
> > > > > If that is permissable evidently they have changed the rules.
> When I
> > > > > ran a VE team ('85 thru '93) the rules said one fee for all
> tests
> > taken
> > > > > at that session. Later it was deemed permissable to charge an
> > additional
> > > > > fee for a retest of a failed element at the same session, but
> we never
> > > > > did.
> > >
> > > It's been a few years, but when I made General, I took the Tech,
> > > General, and 13 WPM code at the same time for one fee ($6.45).
> > > At another session I took the Extra and the 20 WPM code tests
> > > again for one fee ($6.45). At the time, I was under the impression
> > > that this fee went directly to the ARRL, to cover the cost
> > > of the testing materials that they supplied. That ment that the
> > > club, which was running the VE session, was really charging
> > > nothing for their time.
> > >
> > > Was I correct in my reasoning? Aren't they, the club, also allowed
> > > to charge a small fee to cover their expenses?
> > >
> > > Martin K7MEM
> > >
> > > --
> > > Martin E. Meserve K7MEM
> > > martin.e.meserve AT lmco.com
> > >

> > > I respond to news groups and E-Mail on my own time and therefore
> > > my responses may not be as timely as you, or I, would like them to
> > > be. If I seem to be ignoring you, send me another E-Mail to jog my
> > > memory. Opinions are my own and do not reflect the opinions of my
> > > employer.
> >
> >
>
> --
> 73 de Roger, KC8JBO
> EM99 |ARRL|VE [ARRL & W5YI]|ARES |RACES
> Yaesu FT-920 |Inverted Vee @ 40 ft.
> Yaesu FT-90R
>
>
> Sent via Deja.com
> http://www.deja.com/

991. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 18:25:19 UTC
From: "Dr. Conrad Connie" <coontail@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <94a0q1$ri6$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1243
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,alt.radio.family,rec.radio.cb

In article <948o9h$4mg4$1@newssvr05-en0.news.prodigy.com>,
"Stewart R Teaze" <HORSESHOE7@prodigy.net> wrote:
>young kid to go who has
Like it or not,

> the typical young person ends up cutting his radio experimention teeth
in
> the Citizen's Band service, because
> there isn't a reasonable entry-level ham license for kids(it is even
worse
> now after restructuring, what with the
> elimination of the Novice Class).

Hey, why don't we just finger print them and give them a license. If a
young person cannot pass the tech exams today they are:

1. really NOT that interested in radio anyway
2. retarded and illiterate (I know lots of extras that fall into that
category)
3. Wanting to simply sign on dotted line for radio frequencies access.
(To my knowledge this is still a violation of ITU standards)

There are five and six year olds who have passed the EXTRA class test.
That's how easy it is to pass a ham exam with very relaxed exam
requirements.

--

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

992. Re: CA power crisis caused by internet

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 18:34:21 UTC
From: Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com>
Message-ID: <3A6888AD.D7FD7241@dvol.com>
Source record: 1241

Len Over 21 wrote:

> At one time here, roughly two weeks ago, some electric
> power brokers were charging FORTY times per KWHR
> versus the same rates of 1999. I don't think anyone saw
> that kind of greed.

>
Hindsight always being 20-20 the potential was there and should have been recognized. It's not exactly the first time greed became a monster. There isn't a corporate entity out there which won't commit economic rape if it can legally get away with it.
>

>
> county supervisors got a new manager. The result is
> enough electric power for this service area plus the
> capacity to help out other areas in California.

>
Is DWP exempt from spinning off it's generating capacity?
>

> The state of California is not perfect. The state Congress
> learns rather slowly (a semi big rig suicider might have
> shaken them up a bit, heh heh). Between the state and
> the city of Burbank, Lockheed called it quits here and went
> to a kindler, gentler Georgia. Not on power, but on taxes
> and other regulations. Burbank = Lockheed used to be an
> equation. No more. The last Lockheed building has been
> levelled. End of an aviation era for the locality.

>
Been there, huge complex. Must have moved into the old Martin-Marietta complex. That's exactly how cities fall into decay like the most of the Northeast Corridor cities have, the smokestackers here all bailed out for the sunbelt to a large extent get away from the unions, outrageous taxes and other expenses. Unstable power availability has to be a hot topic in the Silicon Valley board rooms.
>

> It's not the "tree huggers" doing it. It's not the municipal power
> companies doing it. It's not the "fault" of free enterprise. It's the
> fault of BAD MANAGEMENT of private electricity providers still
> operating in a monopoly service area. It's partly a fault of bad
> thinking that a utility service is "just like" the free enterprise
> selling of goods. It isn't. None of us can go to any store and

> pick out a bargain on electric power. There are no plugs and
> jacks on the utility poles that allow us to change connections
> to "another" electric power company based on personal
> preferences or KWHR rates. Utilities do NOT have "goods"
> that can be handled in any conventional free-enterprise
> system.

>
I have to agree. As Kelley put it it's been an "experiment". A bloody failed experiment. I noticed that yesterday that Davis signed a bill which dropped the generating station spinoff requirement. The state has already dumped $1.4 billion into the fray and this is only the opening gun. Yeah, I expect there will be some steps taken back to a more viable blend of reality vs. deregulation.
>

> Imagine a situation where this pseudo-free-enterprise system
> was carried to sewer services. [don't want to think of it!]

>
Loverly thought. We already have a form of that, sewer taxes and regional self-supporting sewer authorities. They're non-profits so far and we don't have sewage meters in the basements. Yet.
>

> didit

>
w3rv

993. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 18:40:04 UTC
From: xjim@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <94a1m3sam1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1244

There you go again making assumptions about what other people would want. It is the fallacy that has spawned all of the failures of well intentioned efforts.

The fact remains that there are people out there who rob banks every day, even though it is far easier to just go to work every day.

How do you explain that? Or does it not exist because it doesn't make sense?

The entire state of California is on a self-inflicted stage III power emergency. Most probably so that The State can scare the people into a government takeover of the grid (California Nationalists?). It appears we prefer to complain and react to symptoms rather than address the causes. The stories in the news don't make sense either, because all we're hearing right now is finger pointing and panic. It's very hard for me to beleive that this calamity couldn't have been averted at any point on a time line if only someone would have acknowledged it.

It only reinforces my observation of social calamity in spite of well intentioned assumptions.

Also, please re-read my posts in this thread. I take it you aren't getting it, or are avoiding my points.

Obsession is holding on to the belief that the train needs to go faster, even though you know in the back of your mind the tracks aren't going together as planned.

> > > The scope of the Technician exam is at least an order of magnitude
> > > more than was the scope of the 1963 Novice exam I took.
>
> > > How is this "lowering standards?"
>
> > Because you don't have to do the homework anymore. All you have to
do
> > is take the test over and over until you get the answer right.
>
> What are the odds of guessing correctly on a 35-question, 4-answer
multiple
> choice test? If I did the math correctly, it is
> 1,180,000,000,000,000,000,000,000 to 1.
>
> I still think it is easier to learn the material.

It is easiest to simply learn how to figure out the specific question from a Q&A book or use a given formula than it is to learn about how

things work and how to apply knowledge to unique problems. But then I already stated that I preferred to see an entry level ticket that requires one to gain experience before being entrusted with expanded and more permanent privileges. The Novice ticket instilled much pride in the service, and I beleive most of us that had one (pre-VE) recall a great fondness of the experience and find more respect for those who did too. If you didn't, you missed out and might never "get it".

> > If it takes 5 times to learn something you really want to learn, how
> > many times does it take to learn something you don't feel like learning?
>
> I don't think that people who do not feel like learning will bother taking
> the test at all. They wouldn't want to be hams.
>
> > Sorry this is a trick question.
>
> Did I pass? :-)
>
> > Should you even be required to take a license test to be able to bitch
> > someone out without getting your face slapped?
>
> Why would I want to bitch someone out? I have done it a few times in my
> life, but it is not something I am particularly proud of.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
>

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

994. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 18:53:59 UTC
From: horseshoestew@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <94a2g1$t8l$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1245
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

In article <949kn5fcb1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org> wrote:
> In article <948o9h$4mg4$1@newssvr05-en0.news.prodigy.com>,
> "Stewart R Teaze" <HORSESHOE7@prodigy.net> wrote:
>
> > Please keep in mind that the future of American involvement in
> > wireless communications development depends on us to properly
> > encourage and teach tomorrow's experimenters, operators,
> > technicians, and engineers...
>
> The current mainstream Technician license class is easily attained
> by young people and meets these goals perfectly; your proposed Barbie
> Doll class would establish a channelized CB-like ghetto separate from
> mainstream amateur radio, creating additional "we vs. them" divisions
> in the Amateur Radio service.

Indeed it would be a somewhat segregated area for younger people to get started in ham radio. But that is a big part of what could make this work, as the main idea is to set up a small, less intimidating environment for young beginners, where they can work primarily among their peers, and those willing to help them learn. I have thought about what you are saying about a "we vs. them" division, such as what used to exist with the code/nocode divide(and I suppose still persists); however, I think the difference between a Colt and a Technician would be akin to the difference between a General and an Extra, and not like the old difference between a Nocode Tech and a 13wpmGeneral/20wpmExtra that was so devisive.

> Personally, I think this is just another
> spin on your attempt to establish a defacto expansion of FRS and MURS.

Well, I suppose you are right there. If something can't be done to create a better environment for kids to experiment on the virtually unused VHF/UHF bands(with the noted exception of a few high-profile repeaters), then nature will take its course, and water will follow a path of least resistance. I'm just trying to create a small area of "lower resistance" and "higher potential" for young experimenters on the ham bands, where I think it deserves to belong - rather than in the Personal Radio Services.

I look at the current "communications gap" situation that is developing between the United States and Japan/Europe in the same vein as the "missle gap" that started to develop between the USA and USSR in 1958. However, today's problem is probably more real and dangerous,

yet less obvious, and more insidious than the problem of 1958. There will be no "Sputnik" to help immediately shock us back to our senses, and therefore no equivelant to the National Defense Education Act will be forthcoming anytime soon.

I am curious - are there any hams that remember what the policy of the ARRL, FCC, and hams in general was in 1958, in regards to the issue of Sputnik? Were there any pushes back then to get more young people interested in Amateur Radio? From what I can tell, Sputnik does seem to HAVE been a factor behind the push for implementation of incentive licensing during the late 50's and early 60's. However, as is usual in the Amateur community, change occurred very slowly and painfully - with the the first real change taking 10 years to even be started to be implemented.

> 73, de Hans, K0HB

------- Stewart - N0MHS --------
Wireless Entertainment/Communication Devices, Networks, and
Public Radio Services Information(MURS,FRS,GMRS,ARS,CB):
http://www.pubcel.com

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

995. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 19:00:25 UTC
From: horseshoestew@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <94a2s4thk1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1247
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

In article <94a2g1$t8l$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
horseshoestew@my-deja.com wrote:
> I look at the current "communications gap" situation that is
developing
> between the United States and Japan/Europe in the same vein as
> the "missle gap" that started to develop between the USA and USSR in
> 1958. However, today's problem is probably more real and dangerous,
> yet less obvious, and more insidious than the problem of 1958. There
> will be no "Sputnik" to help immediately shock us back to our senses,
> and therefore no equivelant to the National Defense Education Act will
> be forthcoming anytime soon.
>
> I am curious - are there any hams that remember what the policy of the
> ARRL, FCC, and hams in general was in 1958, in regards to the issue of
> Sputnik? Were there any pushes back then to get more young people
> interested in Amateur Radio? From what I can tell, Sputnik does seem
> to HAVE been a factor behind the push for implementation of incentive
> licensing during the late 50's and early 60's. However, as is usual
in
> the Amateur community, change occurred very slowly and painfully -
with
> the the first real change taking 10 years to even be started to be
> implemented.

Interestingly enough, I found the following on the ARRL web site:

http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/2000/10/04/2/

It mentions how Sputnik spurred the creation of the NDEA and NASA(and
eventually our trip to the moon), but it doesn't mention anything about
hams, or what hams thought or did about this significant event.

--
------- Stewart - N0MHS --------
Wireless Entertainment/Communication Devices, Networks, and
Public Radio Services Information(MURS,FRS,GMRS,ARS,CB):
http://www.pubcel.com

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

996. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 19:02:44 UTC
From: horseshoestew@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <94a30e$tr0$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1246
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna

In article <3A687987.6CC68AA6@zylay.com>,
Gene <webmaster@zylay.com> wrote:
> > Steven, J, Robeson, K4YZ wrote:
> > > There are already NUMEROUS stories of YOUNG kids (7-8-9)
passing
> > > the PRESENT Technician license, so I really doubt they will
predisposed
> > > to creating something "new".
> >
> > I personally know an eleven-year-old Extra. 20-wpm-code-test
Extra, at
> > that. He was 10 when he passed the 20wpm. He was 8, IIRC, when he
> > passed the Tech exam.
>
> Sounds believable to me. My 10 and 11 YOs are studying. They want to
> pass the 5 WPM in time for field day.

Do you and your 10 and 11 YOs have FRS radios? Do they want them so
that they can talk with their friends?

--
------- Stewart - N0MHS --------
Wireless Entertainment/Communication Devices, Networks, and
Public Radio Services Information(MURS,FRS,GMRS,ARS,CB):
http://www.pubcel.com

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

997. Re: Sound Familiar?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 19:12:35 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010119141235.01651.00000061@nso-fp.aol.com>
Source record: 1249

In article <1aqf6tkde82oj3bmlfmuttpdnj2835g8pa@4ax.com>, Aaron Jones
<nomail@nomail.com> writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
>>What is this glorious, religious connection to the past and
>>only the past of amateur radio?!?
>
>Because this is an *amateur radio* newsgroup...
>
>>If you want some cogent historical information on the history
>>of ALL radio in the first 30 years of its life, read...
>
>But I'm not interested in all radio history, just ham radio history,
>which is why I collect old callbooks, ham magazines, license manuals,
>ham databases, ect. And I scan and post old ham stuff from time to
>time for discussions sake on this *ham* newsgroup...

You cannot escape the coexistance of the amateur radio
service with dozens of other radio services...not in spectrum,
not in service to other citizens, not in physical laws involving
radio, not in the state of the technological art of radio...and
certainly not in federal regulations.

It is one thing to be interested solely in amateur radio
history, to collect memorabilia, but it is quite another to
discuss policy on regulations which have effects with other
radio services. Insularity to the outside world is an insidious
malady which can cloud rational thought. A fascination with
the past and dedication to nostalgia can draw curtains
showing vistas of the future. Insularity to the point of walling
off all thought to the rest of the radio world can be considered
an irrational act, even terminal in extremes.

The FCC cannot be insular but must consider service to all
citizens of the US. The re-posting of the 1958 statements
on part of US Citizens Band Radio Service is proof of that.
There is some doubt that "political statements" by amateurs,
solely for amateurs is effective in changing much policy on
changes in radio regulations. The amateur media, chiefly the
largest US membership organization, must admit to coloring
issues at times.

A case in point is the "Little LEO" controversy of a few years
past. To read only the ARRL reportage, one would believe
that only the ARRL allies were commenting. As a matter of
public record by the FCC the number of Comments from

other interested parties outnumbered those of the ARRL and allies by a considerable ratio. When challenged by this, amateurs have a number of rationalizations, chiefly that it is "uninteresting, boring, or not strictly an amateur radio subject." Such rationalizations are insular in the extreme and only serve as internal boosterism that has a negative effect on the opinions of non-amateur radio services.

At WARC 1979 the controversy of Region use of the 40m band by SW broadcasters versus radio amateurs first surfaced. That controversy has been handed-off to future WARCs and WRCs time and time again. Meanwhile, amateurs have continued to complain and wave their own virtual flags of glory as some kind of "service to the community" among themselves. Not to the community, just among themselves. Insularity in action. There is no listed item in the present FCC-State-NTIA agenda for any action on this 40m controversy at any WRC. There could be...but no one seems to want to jump out of their warm cocoon of insularity to promote such an agenda.

Not too long ago the FCC invited Comments on an NPRM to restructure US amateur radio regulations. The response from the PCTAs was predictable...preserve the status quo, keep the morse code test unchanged, preserve the "incentive plan" of class distinction in licenses. Keep things exactly as they were...because that is how the PCTAs achieved their rank, status, and privileges that they hold so dear...largely achievements of their youth which were seldom augmented by further personal achievements in later life. To support their claims of "correct thought" they waved their virtual flags of glory by citing achievements of past amateurs done before they themselves were licensed. Many of those "achievements" have been biased by a few writers and a few organizations until they have achieved an Urban Myth status within the "amateur community."

One of the classics is the amateur Urban Myth is that amateurs "discovered and pioneered" the HF spectrum for worldwide radio communications. In the US that is based largely on Clinton DeSoto's 1935 book highlighting amateur radio. Later historical texts will show that commercial firms were there ahead of amateurs (not by much, to be fair). Not because of some controversy with broadcasters on MF but rather on the basis of radio technology, the state of the radio art of 1920. The Legend persists that amateurs did pioneering and later amateurs insist on grabbing whatever glory existed in the past to justify their own rationalizations of their later "superiority." Smoke dreams. Smoking is bad for the mental heatlth.

What happened in the past concerning amateur radio is just part of a progression to a future activity by amateurs. The past has stepping stones to a future struction. It is not any sort of bedrock to build a strong future upon, just an old foundation to support old materials connected in old ways when all other "buildings" are stronger, larger, and better looking. The past is prologue, not the final act.

The future of everyone begins after reading this. Embrace it, welcome it, rejoice in it, feel the excitement of new things just arrived and yet to come. Or sit back in a cocoon wrapped in virtual bunting of legendary accomplishments by others, do nothing but mumble about how inconsiderate others are about not worshiping the glorious ideals of themselves.

didit

998. Re: CA power crisis caused by internet

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 19:12:36 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010119141236.01651.00000062@nso-fp.aol.com>
Source record: 1248

In article <948ne1$i6t$1@iac5.navix.net>, "W4JLE" <Fred@w4jle.com> writes:

>Len, not one time have I made derogatory remarks towards you, nor have I
>made nasty remarks about your positions I disagree with.

Sorry, sport, not true.

>Why do you feel that it is necessary to make smart remarks and idiotic
>childish repartee?

Such seems to be the only thing you understand. If you jump
in with the idea of "superiority" in all radio by virtue of morse
code ability, then you've made a smart-ass remark and idiotic
repartee.

When you come back with accusations of "ignorance" insofar
as self-teching, you made a smart-ass remark and repartee.

When you come back with accusations that the US Army
never trained its signalmen, then you made a smart-ass
remark and idiotic repartee.

When you mouth off about a California state power
situation being the acts of "tree huggers" you are way out
of line and begging to be nailed to a tree.

When you make a lot of statements of intolerant morals of
generations younger than you, all the time waving some kind
of moral-ethical flag of righteousness, then you made some
smart-ass remarks and idiotic repartee.

...and that was just last week or so...

>If you cannot afford me the same courtesy I extend to you, please find
>someone else to respond to.

Nobody put a gun to your head and forced you to write a single
thing in this newsgroup. Nor does your amateur radio status
give you droit de seigneur wherein you can denigrate anyone
anywhere and expect some courtesy in return.

DOS Tip: Everybody in a newsgroup is a target. Learn that.

>Are you not capable of defending a position like an adult?

Yes, but why must anyone be defensive against patently
offensive "superior" beings?

I'm adjustable. Act adult and I can respond in kind. Act childish and I can out-write you three ways from Sunday. Some neo-militarists like to shoot at others and then complain about being shot at in return. I return fire when shot at, even if not the exact target.

If you want to parade around like only You Have All The Answers and you can Talk Down to others who don't share your personal viewpoint, TS. You are a Target waiting to be shot at by anyone. That's newsgroup Rules of Engagement. Live with it.

didit

999. Re: "They oughta require a license....blah, blah, blah"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 19:19:51 UTC
From: Jerry Oxendine <joxendi@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <3A689357.3A2A@bellsouth.net>
Source record: 1250

Len,

I don't know about "officially" requiring a license, but I have asked
for licenses at hamfests on transceivers and amplifiers. Yes, some of
'em got mad, but, knowing that Riley H. and company were roaming the
premises, I wouldn't take the risk of selling to a CBer (found that out
because the person{s} told me so).

I DO think that cash or equivilent prizes should be substituted to non-
hams at hamfests instead of handing out IC706MKIIGs to the general pub-
lic. Some of these items are sure to end up being used illegally. Some
hamfests do this, others don't---but I wish they would. Could be the
source of that "mysterious" kerchunker on 2M is a handheld won by a per-
son without a clue as to the laws governing its use.

Jerr
K4KWH

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3A662EB5.79A21E16@dvol.com>, Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com> writes:
>
> >> There is no time machine to go back to undo the past. There
> >> is the possibility that the existing and future FCC can solve
> >> some problems in US civil radio. Support the FCC in
> >> regulation of radio...or become lawless vigilantes who are
> >> outnumbered by others. There is no honor or respect in
> >> vigilanteism.
> >
> >Indeed and agreed. Probable factoid: The FCC would much prefer dealing
> >with some inane but basically harmless freebanders than they would a
> >phlanx of amateur (in the more common sense) "helper" frequency cops up
> >their butts.
>
> A problem with any vigilante group of self-styled "cops" occurs
> when they run into another vigilante group having different
> ideas of what is "best." Nobody wins except the Real cops.
>
> Remember that CB users outnumber radio amateurs by a
> considerable ratio.
>
> didit

1000. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 19:23:50 UTC
From: Gene <webmaster@zylay.com>
Message-ID: <3A689446.56D6CB1C@zylay.com>
Source record: 1251
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna

horseshoestew@my-deja.com wrote:
>
> In article <3A687987.6CC68AA6@zylay.com>,
> Gene <webmaster@zylay.com> wrote:
> > > Steven, J, Robeson, K4YZ wrote:
> > > > There are already NUMEROUS stories of YOUNG kids (7-8-9)
> passing
> > > > the PRESENT Technician license, so I really doubt they will
> predisposed
> > > > to creating something "new".
> > >
> > > I personally know an eleven-year-old Extra. 20-wpm-code-test
> Extra, at
> > > that. He was 10 when he passed the 20wpm. He was 8, IIRC, when he
> > > passed the Tech exam.
> >
> > Sounds believable to me. My 10 and 11 YOs are studying. They want to
> > pass the 5 WPM in time for field day.
>
> Do you and your 10 and 11 YOs have FRS radios? Do they want them so
> that they can talk with their friends?

Can't afford them right now as handy as they would be for our charity bike rides that we like to do (got into that through the ham club). Between them and their 3 brothers, it's tricky just trying to keep them in bikes plus save up for a an extra pair of 2M rigs and eventually an HF rig. Luckily they do neighborhood handywork and pay for half of their own hobby stuff, otherwise I'd never be able to afford it.

You can see them at http://www.tfn.net/~gfloyd7/cmn/

1001. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 19:31:22 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A68960A.E0285924@IEEE.org>
Source record: 1252
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,alt.radio.family,rec.radio.cb

"Dr. Conrad Connie" wrote:
> There are five and six year olds who have passed the EXTRA class test.
> That's how easy it is to pass a ham exam with very relaxed exam
> requirements.

I'll bet every one of those five and six year olds have an IQ in
excess of 120 and you certainly cannot say that for every adult ham.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

1002. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 19:38:02 UTC
From: "Steven J Robeson", K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <94a52pvnn1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1254
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

In article <94a2g1$t8l$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
horseshoestew@my-deja.com wrote:

> Indeed it would be a somewhat segregated area for younger people to
> get started in ham radio. But that is a big part of what could make
> this work, as the main idea is to set up a small, less intimidating
> environment for young beginners, where they can work primarily among
> their peers, and those willing to help them learn.

Wrong...wrong...wrong...What you need to do is have these "kids"
(as you would ANY newcomer) IN THE MAINSTREAM. They don't need to be
off in some netherworld of their own.

Part of the problem with the now defunct Novice license was that
mmany people didn't want to go up to the Novice subbands. Take a
listen there lately? THERE is your "Colt" class license right now.

In Chattanooga we have quite a few under-21 operators, and EVERY
person I hear "working" them takes extraordinary steps to be
accomodation and helpful. These "kids" are at Field Day, ARES
activities, and occassional club meetings. And I CAN'T believe that we
are the only club/community that is so disposed to do so.

My suggestion...?!?! If you haven't sent this "proposal" off to
the FCC yet, DON'T. They are going to get used to seeing your name
attached to frivolous RM's and may, in the future, automatically turn
their collective noses up on any subsequent submissions you may make,
regardless of how truly beneficial it may be.

73

Steve, K4YZ

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1003. Re: Sound Familiar?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 19:45:44 UTC
From: "Steven J Robeson", K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <94a5h6$8t$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1255

In article <20010119011505.04061.00000526@nso-mh.aol.com>,
lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:

> What is this glorious, religious connection to the past and
> only the past of amateur radio?!?

Snippage of usual anti-Ham ranting.

The point, Oh Witless One, is that there is NOTHING NEW about
any "anti-ARRL" editorials, YOUR rhetoric notwithstanding.

Of course, a HAM made a reference to an past event, and we get the
usual "Why are you Hams stuck in the 30's" rant, yet it's OK for YOU to
dive in to one of your "There I was with 15KW tube transmitters in
1953..." stories and we are supposed to be grateful for the retelling
of the usual LHA-BS.

More Andersonian crap.

--
"If You're Not A Ham....You're SPAM!"

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1004. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 19:45:47 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <PQ0a6.986$e5.2492970@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 1253

K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org> wrote:

> Meet me on 40M at 7.030MHz at 0500Z on Jan 22. I'll share them with
> you there.

You picked the frequency. I think he should be allowed to pick the mode.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1005. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 19:57:14 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <94a66lsm1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1260
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

In article <94a2g1$t8l$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
horseshoestew@my-deja.com wrote:

> Indeed it would be a somewhat segregated area for younger people
> to get started in ham radio. But that is a big part of what could
> make this work, ...

Quite the opposite would be true!

That segregation absolutely guarantees that the concept would fail!

The channelized "childrens band" would be held in disdain by mainstream amateurs, the participants would be insulated from mainstream amateur practices and procedures loosing the benefits of exposure to more experienced and skilled operators, and they would be barred from participating the host of activities which would occur outside their cozy little ghetto.

> I look at the current "communications gap" situation that is
> developing between the United States and Japan/Europe in the
> same vein as the "missle gap" that started to develop between
> the USA and USSR in 1958.

> General knowledge of simple resistive circuits, and their
> power dissipation, would be required. Knowledge of capacitors
> and inductors would not be required.

Most telling, however, is the stupendous chasm between your stated concern about the "communications gap" and your incredibly minimilistic proposed technical requirements! Since radio today is all about digital circuitry and RF, I'd expect the tests to emphasize those areas. Instead the theory you'd require is hardly sufficient to design a flashlight! There is no mention of digital principles, and worse yet, a specific prohibition of material on capacitors and inductors (components which are the heart and soul of radio technology)! This dichotomy discredits your stated goals of "encourage basic knowledge of radio, electronics" and "provide a path......interested in further radio experimentation".

This whole thing is a non-starter, dead on arrival.

73, Hans, K0HB
--
"We are fellow travelers on a journey between two
eternities, and it's a trip far too brief for me
to be concerned about your speed at the Code of

Morse."

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1006. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 20:00:31 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <D21a6.987$e5.2494060@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 1256

Vince Fiscus, KB7ADL <vlfiscus@mcn.net> wrote:

> >I think, Vince, that my professional work, as opposed to my
> >personal-time posts, has very much improved ham radio.

> Employees chalk up bonus retirement points if they spread corprate policy
> during their off-hours(or at least a pat on the back at the weekly office
> meeting). With you in the newgroup Ed, I don't need to get QST, I can get
> the latest policy B.S. at the click of a mouse on one of your posts.

You are welcome to your delusions, Vince. I will clarify for those that don't hear that steady whoosh-whoosh of the black helicopter blades that my "retirement" points are set by ARRL employment policy and are not affected by the number of posts I make to rrap. I will clarify that my boss would probably prefer that I not post, but that what I do with my own time is my business (for the time police, I am taking an afternoon coffee break). I will clarify that what I post is my own personal opinion, and although I will not post to undermine ARRL policy, those things that I say are things that I believe. My salary is determined by the nature of the work I do wrt RFI, RF safety, spectrum, engineering studies, and supervising the ARRL Lab. Disagreeing with the doom-and-gloom folks on rrap is not on my annual performance appraisal. And, for the record, I do not go to the weekly office meeting. And last, it is the ARRL Board that sets ARRL policy, not Ed Hare in the ARRL Lab. Perhaps if you read QST more, you would better understand that. :-) Actually, I suggest that you not rely on rrap for your views of ARRL policy. There is a lot more authoratative and complete information about that on many places on the ARRL web page.

> I know you don't agree, but the proposal was a dumbing down proposal.

You are welcome to your opinion, as well, Vince. And I mean that sincerely. I agree that the requirements of going from the 6 classes of license to 4, as ARRL recommended, and the proposal to go from 0-5-5-13-13-20 wpm to 0-5-12-12 did result in a lowering of code speed standards. IMHO, although the ARRL went on record as asking that the written exams be improved so the overall level of accomplishment was the same, that proposal was general enough that I don't think anyone could really say what it meant.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1007. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 20:02:37 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <B41a6.988$e5.2494144@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 1257

Vince Fiscus, KB7ADL <vlfiscus@mcn.net> wrote:

> The losers already have a radio service, why'd the League push to let them destroy my hobby?

I do not see that the hobby is destroyed. I can still do everything within ham radio that I could do on April 14, 2000. I do not believe that the problems I hear on the air are related to the recent changes in testing and license structure; they existed long before April 14.

In what way has your use of Amateur Radio been diminished?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1008. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 20:07:01 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <J81a6.989$e5.2494284@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 1258

Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com> wrote:

> I think that you have that backwards. You don't like *me* to ask
> questions. In a recent post you refused to answer my simple question:
> "Do you think that a test that allows people to pass without knowing
> the material is a good test?" because you said you didn't like my
> *debating style*... :-)

Aaron, I answered that question with volumes, and continued until I realized that you really would only accept a "yes" or "no" answer for a subject that I believe could foster a very diverse discussion. It was at that point I concluded you were just yanking my chain and I chose to end a discussion I didn't believe you were taking seriously.

From your recent post bragging about yanking my chain, I don't think I was very far off the mark.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1009. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 20:07:51 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <v91a6.990$e5.2494206@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 1259

Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

> Ed there are many degrees of yankeeness, begining at The Line and
> progresssing as you go further north. I'm a Yankee by about 35 miles. A
> Connecticut Yankee is about as Yankee as it gets.

Then I am safe. I am a citizen of the state of West Virginia.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1010. Re: The Real Bill Clinton Legacy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 20:08:11 UTC
From: vk4lld@netinc.au
Message-ID: <94a6rb$n7r$1@news.netmar.com>
Source record: 1242
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Dwight Stewart wrote:

> There has been much talk about the Clinton legacy. As William J.
> Clinton leaves office, lets take a look at a few things around the
> country to discover the real Clinton legacy.

///// C L I P /////

Please take your American politics to alt.bloody.sleazy.washington newsgroup.
This one is an international forum about amateur radio and not about
second-rate governments in north america.

In other words, bugger off mate.

Graeme

----- Posted via NewsOne.Net: Free (anonymous) Usenet News via the Web -----
http://newsone.net/ -- Free reading and anonymous posting to 60,000+ groups
NewsOne.Net prohibits users from posting spam. If this or other posts
made through NewsOne.Net violate posting guidelines, email abuse@newsone.net

1011. Re: Sound Familiar?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 20:10:24 UTC
From: "Steven J Robeson", K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <94a6va$1ik$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1261

In article <20010118232838.09475.00000878@nso-fj.aol.com>,
lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:

>Is it "on the table" in the USA agenda for WRC 2003? [No...]

Wrong...again....

--
"If You're Not A Ham....You're SPAM!"

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1012. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 20:19:23 UTC
From: horseshoestew@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <94a7g1$220$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1262
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna

In article <3A689446.56D6CB1C@zylay.com>,
Gene <webmaster@zylay.com> wrote:
> horseshoestew@my-deja.com wrote:
> >
> > In article <3A687987.6CC68AA6@zylay.com>,
> > Gene <webmaster@zylay.com> wrote:
> > > > Steven, J, Robeson, K4YZ wrote:
> > > > > > There are already NUMEROUS stories of YOUNG kids (7-8-9)
> > passing
> > > > > > the PRESENT Technician license, so I really doubt they will
> > predisposed
> > > > > > to creating something "new".
> > > > >
> > > > > I personally know an eleven-year-old Extra. 20-wpm-code-test
> > Extra, at
> > > > > that. He was 10 when he passed the 20wpm. He was 8, IIRC,
when he
> > > > > passed the Tech exam.
> > > >
> > > > Sounds believable to me. My 10 and 11 YOs are studying. They want
to
> > > > pass the 5 WPM in time for field day.
> > >
> > > Do you and your 10 and 11 YOs have FRS radios? Do they want them so
> > > that they can talk with their friends?
> >
> > Can't afford them right now as handy as they would be for our charity
> > bike rides that we like to do (got into that through the ham club).
> > Between them and their 3 brothers, it's tricky just trying to keep
them
> > in bikes plus save up for a an extra pair of 2M rigs and eventually an
> > HF rig. Luckily they do neighborhood handywork and pay for half of
their
> > own hobby stuff, otherwise I'd never be able to afford it.

They do neigborhood handywork? Man - now that is really a dying breed.

I remember I used to have a paper route when I was a kid. Nowadays the
newspapers are all delivered by adults in cars, because(I assume) there
aren't enough kids that are interested in doing it anymore.

As much as I respect your kid's work ethic, the reality is that in
today's society, the notion of having to actually work for something
has been virtually lost. I'm attempting to return to some kind

of "reward for work" ethic that reflects today's reality. The thing is - most kids aren't interested in getting on HF nowadays - because they can just get on the telephone or Internet and communicate more reliably around the world. Also, kids want to be able to communicate with their own peers(who have the same general interests). The idea is to create a critical mass of kids to make the whole thing feasible - provide a big enough carrot, and a small enough hill to climb to get to it. Obviously, we shouldn't just let anyone on who just signs their name on a piece of paper; but requiring all youngsters to have to learn about inductors is a little bit overboard, when all they want to start out with is to learn to communicate a little further than their 500mW fixed-antenna UHF rigs allow them. I want to teach them the right way to get there, and give them enough rewards that they are going to want to learn the right way to get there. This is an entryway to the Service - hopefully many will go on to get their Technician and higher licences.

I think MURS could be somewhat of a help in getting kids educated about radios - but the fastest digital speed possible on MURS will be about 4800bps(in reality 1200bps). This is not enough of an incentive. 19,200bps can be cheaply and easily done on the 1.25m/70cm ham bands, and I think that would be a VERY big incentive.

> You can see them at http://www.tfn.net/~gfloyd7/cmn/

--
------- Stewart - N0MHS --------
Wireless Entertainment/Communication Devices, Networks, and
Public Radio Services Information(MURS,FRS,GMRS,ARS,CB):
http://www.pubcel.com

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1013. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 20:20:25 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A68A189.186C7DBC@IEEE.org>
Source record: 1263

"Ed Hare, W1RFI" wrote:
> In what way has your use of Amateur Radio been diminished?

His tension, anxiety, and rage levels are so high because of
the restructuring that his hand shakes so badly that he can't
properly key his transmitter anymore. :-)
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

1014. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 20:26:50 UTC
From: horseshoestew@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <94a7tu$2i7$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1266
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

In article <94a66lsm1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org> wrote:

> Since radio today
> is all about digital circuitry and RF, I'd expect the tests to
> emphasize those areas.... There is no mention of digital
> principles

Yes, you are right, that is definately an oversight. I will correct
that.

> and worse yet, a specific prohibition of material on
> capacitors and inductors (components which are the heart and soul
> of radio technology)!

I believe these areas were also left out of the old Novice exam.

> This whole thing is a non-starter, dead on arrival.

Do you think it was a good idea to get rid of the Novice class?
Shouldn't there have been something done to keep it and update it for
today's world?

> 73, Hans, K0HB

--
------- Stewart - N0MHS --------
Wireless Entertainment/Communication Devices, Networks, and
Public Radio Services Information(MURS,FRS,GMRS,ARS,CB):
http://www.pubcel.com

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1015. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 20:30:31 UTC
From: W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com>
Message-ID: <94a85rdcb1@iac5.navix.net>
Source record: 1264

And where did you cast your ballot for Gore?

"Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:v91a6.990$e5.2494206@news.ntplx.net...
> Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>
> > Ed there are many degrees of yankeeness, begining at The Line and
> > progresssing as you go further north. I'm a Yankee by about 35 miles. A
> > Connecticut Yankee is about as Yankee as it gets.
>
> Then I am safe. I am a citizen of the state of West Virginia.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
>

1016. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 20:33:30 UTC
From: Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com>
Message-ID: <3A68A49A.379C13B2@dvol.com>
Source record: 1265
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

> Were there any pushes back then to get more young people
> interested in Amateur Radio?

>
There was no lack of young people then, I was one. Kids flooded into the hobby. The creation of the Novice license in 1951 was extremely successful in luring kids into ham radio. The availability and readily accesibile dirt-cheap military surplus radios and parts was another huge boosting factor. Any kid could and many did get on HF for well under a hundred bucks in 2001 dollars. Srounging was an artform and part of a perenially-broke kid becoming a ham and a lot of fun in itself.
>
Just about all large high schools had school-supported ham clubs and club stations. The 80 & 40m Novice bands crawled with other kids. A kid could actually understand the circuitry and get a soldering iron into the radios. The VHF & UHF bands were for experimentation for the most part. There were very few antenna and tower restrictions, "real people" didn't live in apartments. If you were a kid interested in electronics the customary gateway to an EE was a ham ticket. Got ya points with admissions officers.
>
Life in general was also very different from today. The overall pace of life was slower and simpler, people had more spare time. Ya didn't mess with girls until you were 16-17. There were no home computers. There were ham stores in every populated area. There was no horde of CBers, no cell phones, no Internet, endless list.
>
It's all changed and I have my doubts about how much "better off " ham radio is today vs. 1958 even though the number of hams then was some small fraction of today's license count.
>

>
> ------- Stewart - N0MHS --------

>
w3rv

1017. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 20:38:07 UTC
From: xjim@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <94a8je$36g$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1270

> The old method almost required being inducted into the lodge by an
> existing lodge member in good standing.
>

I like that idea. Actually it was a well balanced approach to the situation. I never recall any Elmer putting off a prospective ham unless that person was an outright embarassement. I recall a Black kid and a Mexican kid who got their Novices about the same time. The Mexican kid burned up his radio and lost interest (probably became a professional) and the Black kid went on to General and even cobbled up a completely homebrew CW mobile on his bicycle! Another kid got his Extra and DXCC by his Senior year! But even if you were a complete outcast, you could maybe find someone else to give the test, And in 1973 you could still study and practice on your own and go to the FCC office and take the Extra Class test. I would have preferred the Elmer-Novice was the only entry.

In my case, I knew hams for several years before one asked me why I wasn't one. I had already dabbled with morse code with some of them and had some electronics experience. Actually my major stumbling block was learning the subband allocations. The Novice ticket was extremely easy if you has someone to to work with on it. Several months later I went down to the FCC office 100 miles away and took the Extra Class Exam. I flunked the code test but recieved credit for lower elements and settled for the Advanced. It wasn't till 20 years later that I upgraded to Extra. Now I don't have to sweat the subbands so much.

So why would anyone fight that? I think some people fear being rejected and so do not want to try! It also seems to me that the well meaning ARRL bunch got so hungry for bodies and subscribers that they engineered the changes on the premise that if licensing were extremely simple, then everyone would want to "join the club". The problem is, that if you go dragging the CB bands for converts and giving out licenses, Why would they want to be hams? The difference was in people getting licenses because they were hams as opposed to people getting licenses to find out if they were hams or worse, finding out that since they now have the bands, what are the use of hams.

I submit that if you go looking on Skid Row for employees, you will find a lot of people to go along for awhile, but in the end there will be quite a few that have no good use for it getting in the way of a few gems that could have, but the business failed.

Furthermore, I feel that by short circuiting the Elmer-Novice entry, a great many people have been cheated out of a foundation experience. And if you look hard at the operation of the no-coders, I bet you find that

some of them just have useless 10 year licences, and there are not many more than there were when we had 4 year licenses and non-renewable 1 year Novice tickets.

Jim, ac6tk

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1018. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 20:38:34 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <94a8k9$36s$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1269
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna

N0MHS.... (In discussing a proposed Amateur Radio license whose purposes would be to "Encourage basic knowledge of radio, electronics.." and "provide a path for ... further radio experimentation")

...said:

> ....to have to learn about inductors is a little bit overboard....

Can _ANYONE_ take this proposal seriously?

73, Hans, K0HB
Lord High Liberator of the Electric Smoke

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1019. Re: CA power crisis caused by internet

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 20:43:29 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010119154329.25659.00000927@nso-fk.aol.com>
Source record: 1268

In article <3A6888AD.D7FD7241@dvol.com>, Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com> writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>
>> At one time here, roughly two weeks ago, some electric
>> power brokers were charging FORTY times per KWHR
>> versus the same rates of 1999. I don't think anyone saw
>> that kind of greed.
>
>Hindsight always being 20-20 the potential was there and should have been
>recognized. It's not exactly the first time greed became a monster. There
>isn't a
>corporate entity out there which won't commit economic rape if it can legally
>get away with it.

Perhaps true, but FORTY times increase in KWHR rate in
one year?!?

>> county supervisors got a new manager. The result is
>> enough electric power for this service area plus the
>> capacity to help out other areas in California.
>
>Is DWP exempt from spinning off it's generating capacity?

As a municipal agency, it can't spin off its facilities without
a lot more legal hassle than with a private electricity
provider. Right now the DWP is not only able to supply
electricity to 3.8 million customers but is also selling
nearly 9000 KWe to the outside.

One of the political idiocies going on is the LA Mayor angry
at the DWP general manager for not charging enough on
outside sale (about 6 cents per KWHR, roughly nominal
in current trading charges). It's nonsense. Mayor Riordan
is still involved in a rivalry with the Bay Area, insisting on
"showing no mercy." :-)

>> and other regulations. Burbank = Lockheed used to be an
>> equation. No more. The last Lockheed building has been
>> levelled. End of an aviation era for the locality.
>
>Been there, huge complex. Must have moved into the old Martin-Marietta
>complex.
>That's exactly how cities fall into decay like the most of the Northeast
>Corridor
>cities have, the smokestackers here all bailed out for the sunbelt to a large

>extent get away from the unions, outrageous taxes and other expenses.

Lots of former Lockheed employees who stayed here insist
that Lockheed got the shaft from the state and from the
incorporated city of Burbank, Lockheed's home since 1930
or so. In one way, environmentalists were responsible for
Lockheed having had to spend an enormous sum for a water
treatement plant at the tin-bending complex off Buena Vista
(a half dozen or so large buildings, now all razed). After
completion the city wasn't satisfied with test results, wanted
much more not stated originally. Coupled with excessive
state taxes, Lockheed called it quits for corporate HQ and
moved.

>Unstable
>power availability has to be a hot topic in the Silicon Valley board rooms.

Many places large and small. Today's paper carried a story
about a store specializing in black leather clothing...rather
hard to display such wares without lighting. :-)

>I have to agree. As Kelley put it it's been an "experiment". A bloody failed
>experiment. I noticed that yesterday that Davis signed a bill which dropped
>the
>generating station spinoff requirement. The state has already dumped $1.4
>billion
>into the fray and this is only the opening gun. Yeah, I expect there will be
>some
>steps taken back to a more viable blend of reality vs. deregulation.

...and some elected state politicians are going to face
rather severe problems in trying to get re-elected.

All of California's budget surplus just disappeared...got trans-
ported to a bunch of overcharging electric power suppliers.

Legalized greed is my term for it. :-(

didit

1020. Re: CA power crisis caused by internet

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 20:43:30 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010119154330.25659.00000928@nso-fk.aol.com>
Source record: 1267

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.g7ey6t2.pminews@ca.news.verio.net>, "Phil Kane"
<Phil.Kane@nospam.spam> writes:

>On 19 Jan 2001 06:15:03 GMT, Len Over 21 wrote:
>
>>The municipal Los Angeles electric power provider, the
>>Department of Water and Power, has no electric power
>>shortage. [will you agree that Los Angeles is a large city?]
>>The LA DWP is presently selling electric power to middle
>>California. There are no rolling blackouts in the LA DWP
>>service area, none expected for a long time.
>
> IIRC the DWP was exempt from the CPUC's fiat that production
> facilities be sold. If SCE, SDGE, and PG&E were allowed to
> keep their dynamos as well, would there have been a "shortage"?
> Doubtful.

Phil, the LA Department of Water and Power is a municipal
agency. "Selling" production facilities of the DWP was not,
is not, part of any plan by any California Public Utilities
Commission...or any other state group.

As of today, Friday, the DWP is selling close to 9 GWatts
of electric power outside the DWP part of the local grid.
The rest of us in the DWP service area aren't subject to
any blackouts or power restrictions.

Weirdness has surfaced politically. The DWP general
manager, hand-picked by LA Mayor Richard Riordan,
is now being criticized by the Mayor for selling at
"nominal" prices rather than raking in all they can get. :-)

I'm not familiar with details of management of SCE,
SDGE, or PG&E since those utilities were never in any
area I've lived in down here. In general, the management
of those private utilities simply failed to handle the de-
regulation of electric power trading. They seemed to be
doing okay prior to electric deregulation. No rolling
blackouts then, no "shortage," no state action needed,
was there?

All I can see is a 3.8 million subscriber municipal
agency not only supplying enough electric power for all
its customers but also selling electric power to other
power utilities. Seems to me that is a sign that DWP
management is able to deal with a situation while the

private electric utilities management were not able.

In radio terms the above is called "Proof of Performance."

didit

1021. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 20:56:30 UTC
From: Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com>
Message-ID: <3A68A9FE.9DC604B3@dvol.com>
Source record: 1271
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

> It mentions how Sputnik spurred the creation of the NDEA and NASA(and
> eventually our trip to the moon), but it doesn't mention anything about
> hams, or what hams thought or did about this significant event.

>
It wasn't particulary relevant to ham radio much beyond a few hams becoming "Sputnik Chasers" because they knew how to use HF radios and had the equipment. The launch of Sputnik I really caught the aerospace industry with it's rado pants down and hams jumped into the vacuum for the first few days after Sputnik popped up on 15m. Beyond that the space race was pretty much a ho-hum as far as it's impact specifically on ham radio went until hams got into the game with the Oscars much later.
>--

> ------- Stewart - N0MHS --------

>
w3rv

1022. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 21:09:46 UTC
From: horseshoestew@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <94aaeg$4vm$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1275
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna

In article <94a8k9$36s$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org> wrote:
> N0MHS.... (In discussing a proposed Amateur Radio license whose
> purposes would be to "Encourage basic knowledge of radio,
> electronics.." and "provide a path for ... further radio
> experimentation")
>
> ...said:
>
> > ....to have to learn about inductors is a little bit overboard....
>
> Can _ANYONE_ take this proposal seriously?

I suppose you didn't take the Novice exam seriously either, eh? The last version(intended to be used up to June, 2001!) contained no mention of inductors, and contained zero questions that involved a correct answer involving a capacitor.

Also, please note that this new "Novice" license does not involve any HF privileges - where the possibility of widespread interference was a possibility.

> 73, Hans, K0HB
> Lord High Liberator of the Electric Smoke

------- Stewart - N0MHS --------
Wireless Entertainment/Communication Devices, Networks, and
Public Radio Services Information(MURS,FRS,GMRS,ARS,CB):
http://www.pubcel.com

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1023. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 21:10:08 UTC
From: W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com>
Message-ID: <94aagaese1@iac5.navix.net>
Source record: 1273
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna

This sounds like a right wing, jackbooted, Nazi attempt to make someone work to obtain a license. We can not allow this to happen!

We should issue a license to anyone who shows an interest.

We need to be sensitive to the desires of today's youth. Are none of you able to fathom the deep loss to a young persons self esteem were they to try and fail for what ever reason.

Only a group of insensitive old hams that want to feel superior because they expended some amount of effort is keeping this from reality.

As of today I am forming NHI (No Hassle International) A group dedicated to remove the artificial barriers keeping young people from what they have a "right" to and deserve.

To fight this fight against the narrow minded ego driven old hams that are holding us down will require substantial funds.

Please send $10, $20, or what ever you can afford to my address as listed on QRZ. You can be sure the money will be put to the best possible use as determined by the Board of Directors of NHI. (Me)

Yours to rid the bands of any incentives

3's and 8's
Fred W4JLE

<horseshoestew@my-deja.com> wrote in message
news:94a7g1$220$1@nnrp1.deja.com...
> In article <3A689446.56D6CB1C@zylay.com>,
> Gene <webmaster@zylay.com> wrote:
> > horseshoestew@my-deja.com wrote:
> > >
> > > In article <3A687987.6CC68AA6@zylay.com>,
> > > Gene <webmaster@zylay.com> wrote:
> > > > > Steven, J, Robeson, K4YZ wrote:
> > > > > > There are already NUMEROUS stories of YOUNG kids (7-8-9)
> > > passing
> > > > > > the PRESENT Technician license, so I really doubt they will
> > > predisposed
> > > > > > to creating something "new".
> > > > >
> > > > > I personally know an eleven-year-old Extra. 20-wpm-code-test
> > > Extra, at
> > > > > that. He was 10 when he passed the 20wpm. He was 8, IIRC,

> when he
> > > > > passed the Tech exam.
> > > >
> > > > Sounds believable to me. My 10 and 11 YOs are studying. They want
> to
> > > > pass the 5 WPM in time for field day.
> > >
> > > Do you and your 10 and 11 YOs have FRS radios? Do they want them so
> > > that they can talk with their friends?
> >
> > Can't afford them right now as handy as they would be for our charity
> > bike rides that we like to do (got into that through the ham club).
> > Between them and their 3 brothers, it's tricky just trying to keep
> them
> > in bikes plus save up for a an extra pair of 2M rigs and eventually an
> > HF rig. Luckily they do neighborhood handywork and pay for half of
> their
> > own hobby stuff, otherwise I'd never be able to afford it.
>
> They do neigborhood handywork? Man - now that is really a dying breed.
>
> I remember I used to have a paper route when I was a kid. Nowadays the
> newspapers are all delivered by adults in cars, because(I assume) there
> aren't enough kids that are interested in doing it anymore.
>
> As much as I respect your kid's work ethic, the reality is that in
> today's society, the notion of having to actually work for something
> has been virtually lost. I'm attempting to return to some kind
> of "reward for work" ethic that reflects today's reality. The thing
> is - most kids aren't interested in getting on HF nowadays - because
> they can just get on the telephone or Internet and communicate more
> reliably around the world. Also, kids want to be able to communicate
> with their own peers(who have the same general interests). The idea is
> to create a critical mass of kids to make the whole thing feasible -
> provide a big enough carrot, and a small enough hill to climb to get to
> it. Obviously, we shouldn't just let anyone on who just signs their
> name on a piece of paper; but requiring all youngsters to have to learn
> about inductors is a little bit overboard, when all they want to start
> out with is to learn to communicate a little further than their 500mW
> fixed-antenna UHF rigs allow them. I want to teach them the right way
> to get there, and give them enough rewards that they are going to want
> to learn the right way to get there. This is an entryway to the
> Service - hopefully many will go on to get their Technician and higher
> licences.
>
> I think MURS could be somewhat of a help in getting kids educated about
> radios - but the fastest digital speed possible on MURS will be about
> 4800bps(in reality 1200bps). This is not enough of an incentive.
> 19,200bps can be cheaply and easily done on the 1.25m/70cm ham bands,
> and I think that would be a VERY big incentive.

>
> > You can see them at http://www.tfn.net/~gfloyd7/cmn/
>
> --
> ------- Stewart - N0MHS --------
> Wireless Entertainment/Communication Devices, Networks, and
> Public Radio Services Information(MURS,FRS,GMRS,ARS,CB):
> http://www.pubcel.com
>
>
> Sent via Deja.com
> http://www.deja.com/

1024. Re: "They oughta require a license....blah, blah, blah"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 21:14:06 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010119161406.16762.00000561@nso-mp.aol.com>
Source record: 1274

In article <3A689357.3A2A@bellsouth.net>, Jerry Oxendine
<joxendi@bellsouth.net> writes:

>Len,
>
>I don't know about "officially" requiring a license, but I have asked
>for licenses at hamfests on transceivers and amplifiers. Yes, some of
>'em got mad, but, knowing that Riley H. and company were roaming the
>premises, I wouldn't take the risk of selling to a CBer (found that out
>because the person{s} told me so).

I have no quarrel with private property sales at hamfests. As
far as I am concerned there, a seller can ask to see a photo
ID such as a driver's license to make sure. If I was accepting
checks as payments I would want at least that kind of ID.

How do you feel about having amateur radio police at the door
of an HRO branch? Or any other store selling amateur radio
equipment? How about over the Internet store sites?

>I DO think that cash or equivilent prizes should be substituted to non-
>hams at hamfests instead of handing out IC706MKIIGs to the general pub-
>lic.

I have no problem with that. Door prizes are door prizes.
Make it a round trip for two to Tahiti and I might attend. :-)

>Some of these items are sure to end up being used illegally. Some
>hamfests do this, others don't---but I wish they would. Could be the
>source of that "mysterious" kerchunker on 2M is a handheld won by a per-
>son without a clue as to the laws governing its use.

I do have a problem with such suppositions. What makes
the "mysterious kerchunker" some kind of "illegal" who isn't
FCC-green-carded? How can you tell?

Are the "illegals" always non-amateur? Does a "kerchunk"
carry any ID of the kerchunker? :-)

didit

1025. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 21:14:58 UTC
From: horseshoestew@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <94aao8$5ch$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1276
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

In article <3A68A49A.379C13B2@dvol.com>,
Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com> wrote:
> > Were there any pushes back then to get more young people
> > interested in Amateur Radio?
>
> >
> There was no lack of young people then, I was one. Kids flooded into
the
> hobby. The creation of the Novice license in 1951 was extremely
successful
> in luring kids into ham radio. The availability and readily accesibile
> dirt-cheap military surplus radios and parts was another huge boosting
> factor. Any kid could and many did get on HF for well under a hundred
bucks
> in 2001 dollars. Srounging was an artform and part of a perenially-
broke kid
> becoming a ham and a lot of fun in itself.
> >
> Just about all large high schools had school-supported ham clubs and
club
> stations. The 80 & 40m Novice bands crawled with other kids. A kid
could
> actually understand the circuitry and get a soldering iron into the
radios.
> The VHF & UHF bands were for experimentation for the most part.
There were
> very few antenna and tower restrictions, "real people" didn't live in
> apartments. If you were a kid interested in electronics the customary
> gateway to an EE was a ham ticket. Got ya points with admissions
officers.
> >
> Life in general was also very different from today. The overall pace
of life
> was slower and simpler, people had more spare time. Ya didn't mess
with
> girls until you were 16-17. There were no home computers. There were
ham
> stores in every populated area. There was no horde of CBers, no cell
> phones, no Internet, endless list.
> >

That's a cool story, thanks.

> It's all changed and I have my doubts about how much "better off "
ham radio
> is today vs. 1958 even though the number of hams then was some small
> fraction of today's license count.

The thing is, the percentage of hams using HF is way down too. To be
able to reach a critical mass of other people to communicate with on
VHF/UHF, you really need more people.

> w3rv

--
------- Stewart - N0MHS --------
Wireless Entertainment/Communication Devices, Networks, and
Public Radio Services Information(MURS,FRS,GMRS,ARS,CB):
http://www.pubcel.com

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1026. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 21:21:53 UTC
From: Gene <webmaster@zylay.com>
Message-ID: <3A68AFF1.FF1CA4A@zylay.com>
Source record: 1277
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna

horseshoestew@my-deja.com wrote:
>
> In article <3A689446.56D6CB1C@zylay.com>,
> Gene <webmaster@zylay.com> wrote:
> > horseshoestew@my-deja.com wrote:
> > >
> > > In article <3A687987.6CC68AA6@zylay.com>,
> > > Gene <webmaster@zylay.com> wrote:
> > > > > Steven, J, Robeson, K4YZ wrote:
> > > > > > There are already NUMEROUS stories of YOUNG kids (7-8-9)
> > > passing
> > > > > > the PRESENT Technician license, so I really doubt they will
> > > predisposed
> > > > > > to creating something "new".
> > > > > >
> > > > > I personally know an eleven-year-old Extra. 20-wpm-code-test
> > > Extra, at
> > > > > that. He was 10 when he passed the 20wpm. He was 8, IIRC,
> when he
> > > > > passed the Tech exam.
> > > > >
> > > > Sounds believable to me. My 10 and 11 YOs are studying. They want
> to
> > > > pass the 5 WPM in time for field day.
> > > >
> > > Do you and your 10 and 11 YOs have FRS radios? Do they want them so
> > > that they can talk with their friends?
> > >
> > Can't afford them right now as handy as they would be for our charity
> > bike rides that we like to do (got into that through the ham club).
> > Between them and their 3 brothers, it's tricky just trying to keep
> them
> > in bikes plus save up for a an extra pair of 2M rigs and eventually an
> > HF rig. Luckily they do neighborhood handywork and pay for half of
> their
> > own hobby stuff, otherwise I'd never be able to afford it.
>
> They do neigborhood handywork? Man - now that is really a dying breed.
>
> I remember I used to have a paper route when I was a kid. Nowadays the
> newspapers are all delivered by adults in cars, because(I assume) there
> aren't enough kids that are interested in doing it anymore.
>

> As much as I respect your kid's work ethic, the reality is that in
> today's society, the notion of having to actually work for something
> has been virtually lost. I'm attempting to return to some kind
> of "reward for work" ethic that reflects today's reality. The thing
> is - most kids aren't interested in getting on HF nowadays - because
> they can just get on the telephone or Internet and communicate more
> reliably around the world. Also, kids want to be able to communicate
> with their own peers(who have the same general interests). The idea is
> to create a critical mass of kids to make the whole thing feasible -
> provide a big enough carrot, and a small enough hill to climb to get to
> it. Obviously, we shouldn't just let anyone on who just signs their
> name on a piece of paper; but requiring all youngsters to have to learn
> about inductors is a little bit overboard, when all they want to start
> out with is to learn to communicate a little further than their 500mW
> fixed-antenna UHF rigs allow them. I want to teach them the right way
> to get there, and give them enough rewards that they are going to want
> to learn the right way to get there. This is an entryway to the
> Service - hopefully many will go on to get their Technician and higher
> licences.

My kids love the idea of HF...they've talked on sideband on CB at a
friend's house before and thought that was really neat. Maybe one of
these days, you'll hear them down there, but it will probably be on CW
because they are fascinated by the code.

> I think MURS could be somewhat of a help in getting kids educated about
> radios - but the fastest digital speed possible on MURS will be about
> 4800bps(in reality 1200bps). This is not enough of an incentive.
> 19,200bps can be cheaply and easily done on the 1.25m/70cm ham bands,
> and I think that would be a VERY big incentive.
>
> > You can see them at http://www.tfn.net/~gfloyd7/cmn/
>
> --
> ------- Stewart - N0MHS --------
> Wireless Entertainment/Communication Devices, Networks, and
> Public Radio Services Information(MURS,FRS,GMRS,ARS,CB):
> http://www.pubcel.com
>
> Sent via Deja.com
> http://www.deja.com/

1027. Re: The Real Bill Clinton Legacy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 21:43:19 UTC
From: W6DKN <w6dkn@qsl.net>
Message-ID: <Xx2a6.783$ZB2.167709@paloalto-snr1.gtei.net>
Source record: 1278
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"darrell earnshaw" <Darrell.Earnshaw@eng.Sun.COM> wrote in message
news:3A686A70.856B9CEB@eng.Sun.COM...
> Dwight Stewart wrote:
> >
> > There has been much talk about the Clinton legacy. As William J.
> > Clinton leaves office, lets take a look at a few things around the
> > country to discover the real Clinton legacy.
> >
> > Politics & Race Relations...
> [...snip...]
>
> >
> > Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
> >
> > http://www.qsl.net/w5net
>
> Dwight,
>
> Of course you are entitled to your own interpretations and views.
> However, this newsgroup is about amateur radio, not politics, relgion,
> or other unrelated issues, and it is an inappropriate forum for personal
> soapboxes on issues unrelated to amateur radio. I also suspect that most
> subscribers to the NG probably couldn't care less about US politics or
> domestic issues -- newsgroups are not just for domestic US consumption -
> they're international. I'm sure there's a
> "US.politics.domestic.anti-liberals" or something newsgroup somewhere
> out there which is more appropriate.
>
> No disrespect intended.
>
> 73, Darrell
> nr3y.

Apparently you haven't been reading this newsgroup for very long...

73 de W6DKN

1028. Follow the Money

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 22:17:17 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <94aed5$8mn$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1279
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,alt.radio.family,rec.radio.cb

When you don't understand why somebody is doing something which seems senseless to you, sometimes it pays to try to "follow the money".

In this case it led me to a company called "PubCel". According to their web site, that company is involved in:

"Wireless Entertainment and Communications Solutions:

- MURS and ARS Voice and Data Communications Systems

- FRS and GMRS Voice Communication Systems"

I think it is safe to say that the "ARS" acronym might mean "Amateur Radio Service".

Also according to their web site, the company President is none other than Stewart Teaze, N0MHS.

Suddenly this proposal for the "Barbie Doll" Amateur Radio license isn't quite so senseless.

73, Hans, K0HB

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1029. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 22:25:25 UTC
From: horseshoestew@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <94aesc$968$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1280
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna

In article <94aagaese1@iac5.navix.net>,
"W4JLE" <Fred@w4jle.com> wrote:
> This sounds like a right wing, jackbooted, Nazi attempt to make
someone work
> to obtain a license. We can not allow this to happen!
>
> We should issue a license to anyone who shows an interest.
>
> We need to be sensitive to the desires of today's youth. Are none of
you
> able to fathom the deep loss to a young persons self esteem were they
to try
> and fail for what ever reason.
>
> Only a group of insensitive old hams that want to feel superior
because they
> expended some amount of effort is keeping this from reality.
>
> As of today I am forming NHI (No Hassle International) A group
dedicated to
> remove the artificial barriers keeping young people from what they
have a
> "right" to and deserve.
>
> To fight this fight against the narrow minded ego driven old hams
that are
> holding us down will require substantial funds.
>
> Please send $10, $20, or what ever you can afford to my address as
listed on
> QRZ. You can be sure the money will be put to the best possible use as
> determined by the Board of Directors of NHI. (Me)
>
> Yours to rid the bands of any incentives

Sarcasm noted, Fred. I'm not trying to produce a giveaway license -
but I am trying to forge a modern replacement to the lost Novice Class
license.

Maybe the right idea is to just call this class Novice, and call all
existing Novice Class operators "Novice Plus" - where "Plus" indicates
plus HF, as it does with the similarly closed Technician Plus class.
Novice Pluses would also pick up the extra sliver of privileges on 70cm.

> 3's and 8's
> Fred W4JLE
>
------- Stewart - N0MHS --------
Wireless Entertainment/Communication Devices, Networks, and
Public Radio Services Information(MURS,FRS,GMRS,ARS,CB):
http://www.pubcel.com

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1030. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 22:44:16 UTC
From: K0HB@USWEST.NET
Message-ID: <94ag00$r3a$1@news.netmar.com>
Source record: 1272

In article <PQ0a6.986$e5.2492970@news.ntplx.net>, Ed Hare, W1RFI
<w1rfi@arrl.net> writes:
>K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org> wrote:
>
>> Meet me on 40M at 7.030MHz at 0500Z on Jan 22. I'll share them with
>> you there.
>
>You picked the frequency. I think he should be allowed to pick the mode.
>

I agree. I'll be happy to use any mode Brian suggests (as long as it's legal
at that frequency).

73, de Hans, K0HB
--
If you take away the fuel, in time the flames will die.

----- Posted via NewsOne.Net: Free (anonymous) Usenet News via the Web -----
http://newsone.net/ -- Free reading and anonymous posting to 60,000+ groups
NewsOne.Net prohibits users from posting spam. If this or other posts
made through NewsOne.Net violate posting guidelines, email abuse@newsone.net

1031. Re: CA power crisis caused by internet

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 22:46:34 UTC
From: Gary - KJ6Q <davison7@gte.net>
Message-ID: <et3a6.1171$ZB2.186854@paloalto-snr1.gtei.net>
Source record: 1281
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

quote:

". The idea was to spur competition, but an unfortunate sequence
of events, along with the help of some opportunistic and unscrupulous
companys lead us to where we are now. It would have been difficult to
foresee this particular outcome."

"Opportunistic and unscrupulous"? Not hardly - just the natural outcome
of a VERY flawed bit of political manuevering - BLAMING someone for
stooping over to pick up GOLD thrown at their feet is unrealistic - it
was ALL very predictable!

As a friend pointed out, the "emergency" will go away as soon as the $$$
start rolling to the "right" people - and those primary power
transmissions that were so overloaded as to require rolling blackouts
will immediately, overnite, become magically once again able to handle
to loads they had formerly been unable to...

Deregulation will continue to be the ffort here in California and other
states to follow, and the public will "benefit" from that deregulation
of electrical power JUST as we have in the area of fuel for our
transportation - you're free to buy it wherever you choose - at THEIR
price!

--
Gary - KJ6Q
****
California's energy crisis...
Brought to you by your friendly environmentalists.
Cold? Hungry? Roast a Spotted Owl over a family room bonfire!
Out of work? Volunteer for a job at Sierra Club headquarters to help
tear down more dams and power plants in California and
along the Columbia river...

"Cecil" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3A683E64.BA8A34AE@IEEE.org...
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Meanwhile, the state is loaded with
> > environmental activitists who feel real good about locking away all
the
> > natural resources for "posterity" instead of meeting the
environmental
> > protection challenges headon with sensible protective requirements
that
> > are enforced.

>
> I hope they enjoy sitting around in the dark in the cold. KE6AJH was
> sitting at his computer in Santa Cruz yesterday when the blackout hit.
> Imagine a day trader being without power for a couple of hours while
> IBM is rising 12 points.
> --
> http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

1032. Re: Buy a ham ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 22:58:13 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <gF3a6.1003$e5.2506589@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 1282

Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com> wrote:

> One day soon we'll be able to fold NCI into the ARRL.

The members of both organizations are quite free to join either, neither or both.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1033. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 23:01:18 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <al3a6.1004$e5.2506859@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 1283

Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com> wrote:

> >> In society most people are too polite to tell someone about his gaff.
> >> They just think of him poorly behind his back. At least hams are
> >> honest and straightforward... :-)

> >Whoever originated the phrase, "honesty is the best policy" clearly
didn't
> >envision this scenario. :-)

> I suppose it's not much different than someone who is too polite to
> tell his CW contact that he has a bad fist and lies that he is being
> called to dinner to end the QSO early... :-)

Telling him in an "honest and straightforward" way about his gaff is the exact opposite of not telling him. That is not my idea of "not much different."

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1034. Re: CA power crisis caused by internet

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 23:06:20 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A68C86C.C46309B5@uci.edu>
Source record: 1287

Len Over 21 wrote:
> Incidentally, Southern California Edison Company (under its larger
> umbrella corporation) did not "build everything 'we' have" here.

I wasn't including you in "we", Len. Edison has built vitually
everything
where I live.

1035. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 23:08:13 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <FO3a6.1005$e5.2507270@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 1284

Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

> W1RFI wrote:

> > Frankly, Dick, I would much rather see new hams with sensitivities than those
> > who are cold and insensitive to the feelings of others.

> So there are no third categories?

Sure there are, but in comparing two extremes and saying which I prefer, I felt it best not to drag in too many other factors. I do not think that those who are moderate are a major problem in ham radio.

> You Political Correct mavens insist that your choices are all there is.

Can you explain what you are trying to tell me?

> What would be the matter with some newcomers with an attitude of "I'm
> gonna get this and do it well, make my mistakes and get it right and to
> heck with the minor irritations, whatever they may be. Maybe I can learn
> something about it all from them, if I don't let the chip blow off my
> shoulder".

I do not believe that all of those who make "gaffs," to steal from another poster, have chips on their shoulder. If anything, many of those who "gently remind" people of the words they are permitted to use on repeaters (name is okay, personal is not, handle only if you are an old timer) are the ones seen as having the chips. Would it not be a lot more polite (politically correct if you really do prefer that term) to offer him the advice that some hams will think poorly of him for saying "personal" instead of "name" in a more private setting than in front of everyone on the repeater?

> It must be in the water. NO one today seems to have anything but a
> fragile, easily destroyed ego. If I had been like that I'd have never
> made it into the teenage years, much less far beyond.

If you are saying that no one of your generation would be offended by being publically humiliated for making a minor poor choice of words, I think you are looking at the past through some very thick lenses. Maybe you had no concern for what people think of you, but human nature has not changed that much over the decades. Many people are by nature, insecure. I don't think it inappropriate to consider that when offering "gentle advice."

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1036. Re: Buy a ham ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 23:08:32 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A68C8F0.A50A4C79@uci.edu>
Source record: 1286

Dick Carroll wrote:
> > I prefer code that is easy to copy to the mal-adjusted bug,
> > non-robotic sound.

> > > If you don't agree with that attitude, don't answer my CQ, because you
> > > won't be treated to "properly timed" code.

> > Well, practice makes perfect I always say. ;-)

> Golly, Jim, that puts you in the same bracket with Brian Burke and
> Larry Roll, who insist on machine perfect code!

What does?

1037. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 23:08:56 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <kP3a6.1006$e5.2506971@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 1285

W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com> wrote:

> Ed is setting there in his dashiki ?) and love beads. In the 60's you had
to
> espouse all that sensitivity crap if you wanted to get a little trim.

Do you believe I am faking it?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1038. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 23:09:08 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <94aheebaa1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1291

In article <94a1m3sam1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
xjim@my-deja.com wrote:

> The entire state of California is on a self-inflicted stage III power
> emergency. Most probably so that The State can scare the people into
> a government takeover of the grid (California Nationalists?).

There you go again making assumptions about what other people would
want.

It
appears
> we prefer to complain and react to symptoms rather than address the
> causes. The stories in the news don't make sense either, because all
> we're hearing right now is finger pointing and panic. It's very hard
> for me to beleive that this calamity couldn't have been averted at any
> point on a time line if only someone would have acknowledged it.

There is no calamity. Governments all over America were just examining
all the piles of money from overtaxed citizens and wondering what to do
with it all. You couldn't lose in the stock market. Greenspan had to
keep tightening the money supply to slow down an over-robust economy.

Then GW won the election and the mainstream press mantra is "We're back
in the Worst Economy Ever" mode, with an energy crisis on top of it.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1039. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 23:12:02 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <eS3a6.1007$e5.2507546@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 1288

Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com> wrote:

> Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

> > I once knew an OT who had been off the air so long that he was new to
> >repeaters, and when he finally got a two meter rig he called CQ on the
> >repeater just as he would have on HF.
> > It isn't always the newcomers who miscue.

> Yep. Seniority makes little difference in making a gaff. And neither
> "CQ" or "W7xxx monitoring" say in plain english what it is we really
> want, namely a contact. Hobby jargon and knowing it's proper use is
> important, and if you try to operate without knowing it, then let's
> hope that you're not too sensitive of a person...
> (Human nature being what it is.) :-)

Actually, Aaron, it is not that human nature is even always "what it is." It is that if you participate in an open forum, there are always one or two who feel that the best thing that they could do for you is to publically and soundly berate you for any mistake you might make. It toughens the soul, you see? It will either make you, or make you go away. Either way, they believe that Amateur Radio benefits because it ensures we will end up with a "few good hams."

If you think their behaviour is inappropriate, it is only because you are too "politically correct" or never put down your love beads. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1040. My name is Timmy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 23:15:54 UTC
From: "www.kp82.com" <kp82@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <94ahr3bpj1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1295
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,alt.radio.family,rec.radio.cb

http://www.geocities.com/aunteekeyklown/Keyclown_wedding.html
73 de Tim

Knight Patrol #82

http://www.kp82.com

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1041. Re: Follow the Money

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 23:16:03 UTC
From: LRod <lr0d@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <94ahrcbpo1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1296
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,alt.radio.family,rec.radio.cb

In article <94aed5$8mn$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org> wrote:

> Also according to their web site, the company President is none other
> than Stewart Teaze, N0MHS.

Ka Ching!

Nice job Hans. I knew this thing smelled, but I thought he just wanted
to get his kids on the air and they were too lazy to get even the Tech.

LRod

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1042. Re: "They oughta require a license....blah, blah, blah"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 23:16:18 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <fW3a6.1008$e5.2507723@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 1289

Len Over 21 <lenover21@aol.com> wrote:

> >Some of these items are sure to end up being used illegally. Some
> >hamfests do this, others don't---but I wish they would. Could be the
> >source of that "mysterious" kerchunker on 2M is a handheld won by a per-
> >son without a clue as to the laws governing its use.

> I do have a problem with such suppositions. What makes
> the "mysterious kerchunker" some kind of "illegal" who isn't
> FCC-green-carded? How can you tell?

What part of "could be" did you not understand. I have no problem with suppositions that are identified as such. His was.

> Are the "illegals" always non-amateur? Does a "kerchunk"
> carry any ID of the kerchunker? :-)

The one doing the kerchunking is indeed always illegal. Transmitter fingerprinting has been used to successfully ID several kerchunkers over the years.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1043. Re: Will you let them take away your guns?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 23:17:43 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A68CB17.A30F2F15@uci.edu>
Source record: 1293

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> Jim:

> In such a situation, an armed response by law-abiding citizens would
> definitely be in order....

You gotta be nuts, Larry.

> What causes are you willing to fight and die for, Jim? Are you willing
> to die for baby killers, tree-huggers, and violent racists?

The guys in the Revolutionary War, and World Wars I and II did. So if I
was in the military, I guess I would have to also.

> (I consider myself to be an "environmentalist" also),

I meant to write eco-terrorists. You aren't one of them too, are you?

> the people you
> mention above are just amoral, self-serving criminals.

Right. So as long as it's a group you happen to agree with, it's
constitutional for them to start an armed rebellion. That's what I
thought.

73, Jim AC6XG

1044. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 23:18:34 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <mY3a6.1009$e5.2507857@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 1290

Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote:

> So to whom do you refer, and why is it such a big issue?

From what you had said in an earlier post, I thought that you did not see SS as anything other than as a "digital mode."

It appears I misunderstood. Sorry.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1045. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 23:19:16 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <0Z3a6.1010$e5.2508016@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 1292

Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com> wrote:

> I didn't have any spectrum allocated to me until I passed my test and
> got a license. That's pretty straight. But you knew that I was just
> yanking Ed's chain didn't you? I didn't expect to get two fish with
> only one hook... :-)

Perhaps we should all consider that any time we think about taking your
posts at face value.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1046. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 23:21:27 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <4%3a6.1011$e5.2508160@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 1294

Larry Roll K3LT <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote:

> Those who learn the Morse code well enough to effectively employ the CW
> mode on-the-air will also have the equipment to do so; therefore,
> they will be equipped to use that mode in the event of any sort of
> emergency where it would be practical to do so.

You may be right that most who learn the code will actually possess equipment to use it, if they stay active as hams, but I know many a code-tested ham who has no equipment at all, as well as a few who literally had the code-key burying cermony in their back yards, surrounded by all their friends. I also know a larger number of hams who passed a 13 wpm test, but would have difficulty getting past 5 wpm today.

Your mileage may vary.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1047. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 23:30:47 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <P74a6.1012$e5.2509094@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 1297

<xjim@my-deja.com> wrote:

> So why would anyone fight that? I think some people fear being
> rejected and so do not want to try! It also seems to me that the well
> meaning ARRL bunch got so hungry for bodies and subscribers that they
> engineered the changes on the premise that if licensing were extremely
> simple, then everyone would want to "join the club".

The ARRL's proposal to the FCC was for 4 license classes, 0, 5, 12 and 12 wpm, and that the level of the written exams be increased to make up for the changes in code testing. Not exactly the most "extremely simple" structure I could think of.

If you want extremely simple, go back to 1963, when I studied 4 pages of study guide to become a Novice, then to 1964 when I studied 16 pages of study guide to become a General. Nowadays, we hand prospective hams a study guide that is over 200 pages and tell them that this is what they need to know to be a beginner. I don't know about the current edition, but in the previous Now You're Talking, the question pools took up about 70 pages. Four pages vs sixteen pages vs over 200 pages. Which are you calling "extremely simple" again?

> The problem is, that if you go dragging the CB bands for converts and
giving out
> licenses, Why would they want to be hams?

No one is giving out licenses; those wishing to be hams are studying hundreds of pages of study guide and passing tests.

> The difference was in people getting licenses because they were hams as
opposed to
> people getting licenses to find out if they were hams or worse, finding
out that since
> they now have the bands, what are the use of hams.

Are you really saying that people are studing hundreds of pages of material just to find out if they are hams?

> Furthermore, I feel that by short circuiting the Elmer-Novice entry, a
> great many people have been cheated out of a foundation experience. And
> if you look hard at the operation of the no-coders, I bet you find that
> some of them just have useless 10 year licences, and there are not many
> more than there were when we had 4 year licenses and non-renewable 1
> year Novice tickets.

I agree; the lack of Elmering cost us a lot of hams. So did an "Elmering" process by which some hams made newcomers feel like they were seen as having

come from "skid row..." I don't know which had the larger effect.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1048. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 23:31:31 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <w84a6.1013$e5.2509207@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 1298

Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com> wrote:

> The first published 10-code was in an APCO bulletin in January of
> 1940, however they don't claim to have invented the code. They tried
> to standardize it in 1973, but it never caught on and there are
> hundreds of versions currently being used. Yes they call it "official"
> but nobody seems to notice... (Like ARRL phonetics?)

? ARRL phonetics ?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI
ARRL Lab

1049. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 23:32:38 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <z94a6.1014$e5.2508920@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 1299

W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com> wrote:

> > Then I am safe. I am a citizen of the state of West Virginia.

> And where did you cast your ballot for Gore?

Burlington, CT.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1050. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 23:34:39 UTC
From: Carl Zager <kb9rvb@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <94aiufcol1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1300

Ed,

I hope, IF the test is an issue, that some ARRLer with a testing and measurements background (more current than mine) would, indeed, offer to assist with the development and validation of the test pool. If not, so be it.

Frankly, the only problems that I have with the General pool (which I'm working on right now) are the numbers that I have to (MUST) memorize. There's just some background knowledge not in the study guides that a non-techie like me doesn't have and doesn't know where to find the answer, other than memorization. For example, one of my Monday night buddies showed me how to figure out the band from the frequency. I've looked for that in my study material and just can't find it. There are lists to memorize, but an explanation?

Thanks for your participation in all of these threads. I'm getting too old to have fun with the trollers, though <grin>.

In article <20010112073227.07248.00001186@ng-da1.aol.com>,
w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:
> >From: Carl Zager kb9rvb@my-deja.com
>
> >Has anyone actually "certified" in psychometry ever analyzed the
> >multiple choice tests to determine whether the incorrect answers
> >actually function appropriately?
>
> I don't believe anyone on the QPC has such certification. Those that
do would
> be quite welcome to do so; the QPC is seeking input on the Extra pool
right
> now.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>

--
Carl Zager
http://www.mccsc.edu/~czager
kb9rvb@my-deja.com

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1051. Re: The Real Bill Clinton Legacy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 23:39:26 UTC
From: W6DKN <w6dkn@qsl.net>
Message-ID: <Ne4a6.1303$ZB2.202025@paloalto-snr1.gtei.net>
Source record: 1302

```
<vk4lld@netinc.au> wrote in message news:94a6rb$n7r$1@news.netmar.com...
> Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
> > There has been much talk about the Clinton legacy. As William J.
> > Clinton leaves office, lets take a look at a few things around the
> > country to discover the real Clinton legacy.
>
> ///// C L I P /////
>
> Please take your American politics to alt.bloody.sleazy.washington newsgroup.
> This one is an international forum about amateur radio and not about
> second-rate governments in north america.
>
> In other words, bugger off mate.
>
> Graeme

QRM from "down under". Gee, just like 20 meters... E-DSP filter (kill file) activated.

73
```

1052. Re: CA power crisis caused by internet

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 23:41:13 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A68D099.C07ABD16@uci.edu>
Source record: 1301

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3A6888AD.D7FD7241@dvol.com>, Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com> writes:
>
> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >
> >> At one time here, roughly two weeks ago, some electric
> >> power brokers were charging FORTY times per KWHR
> >> versus the same rates of 1999. I don't think anyone saw
> >> that kind of greed.
> >
> >Hindsight always being 20-20 the potential was there and should have been
> >recognized. It's not exactly the first time greed became a monster. There
> >isn't a
> >corporate entity out there which won't commit economic rape if it can legally
> >get away with it.

> Perhaps true, but FORTY times increase in KWHR rate in
> one year?!?

Edison has said that their energy costs have increased 100 times over
what they were last year. Obviously the need for regulation still
exists. There still exists a monopoly in the power generating business
out here.

ac6xg

1053. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-19 23:56:18 UTC
From: "Steven J Robeson", K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <94ak6udrg1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1304
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna

In article <94a7g1$220$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
horseshoestew@my-deja.com wrote:

>I think MURS could be somewhat of a help in getting kids educated
>about radios -

MURS will no more "educate" kids about radio than chatting in a
porn chat room "educates" you about computer technology.

You turn on the box, select a channel and talk.

Steve

--
"If You're Not A Ham....You're SPAM!"

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1054. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 00:02:50 UTC
From: "Steven J Robeson", K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <94akj6$e1i$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1303

In article <94aesc$968$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
horseshoestew@my-deja.com wrote:

>Maybe the right idea is to just call this class Novice, and call all
>existing Novice Class operators "Novice Plus" - where "Plus" indicates
>plus HF, as it does with the similarly closed Technician Plus class.
>Novice Pluses would also pick up the extra sliver of privileges on
>70cm.

What for? The present Technician grants "tons" of priviledges
over what you are proposing, and if the licensee passes the 5WPM, the
FCC has already said it's OK to add the "plus" part as long as you keep
the CSCE in your possession.

Noble effort, Don Quixote.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1055. Re: Follow the Money

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 00:28:18 UTC
From: horseshoestew@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <94am2q$fc8$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1306
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,alt.radio.family,rec.radio.cb

In article <94aed5$8mn$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org> wrote:
> When you don't understand why somebody is doing something which seems
> senseless to you, sometimes it pays to try to "follow the money".
>
> In this case it led me to a company called "PubCel". According to
> their web site, that company is involved in:
>
> "Wireless Entertainment and Communications Solutions:
>
> - MURS and ARS Voice and Data Communications Systems
>
> - FRS and GMRS Voice Communication Systems"
>
> I think it is safe to say that the "ARS" acronym might mean "Amateur
> Radio Service".
>
> Also according to their web site, the company President is none other
> than Stewart Teaze, N0MHS.
>
> Suddenly this proposal for the "Barbie Doll" Amateur Radio license
> isn't quite so senseless.

I've never tried to hide the fact that I'm trying to create a
business. Quite the opposite - why would I list the web site on the
signature to all my posts, if I was trying to hide something

Hey, Hans, I wonder why you switched your approach to this slimly
veiled "personal attack"? It couldn't be that I was right about the
point regarding inductors and capacitors on the Novice test, could it?

Let's stick to the point at hand. You made a good point about the lack
of digital modes in the proposal - THIS is the kind of stuff I'm
looking for.

> 73, Hans, K0HB

--
------- Stewart - N0MHS --------
Wireless Entertainment/Communication Devices, Networks, and
Public Radio Services Information(MURS,FRS,GMRS,ARS,CB):
http://www.pubcel.com

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1056. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 00:32:02 UTC
From: horseshoestew@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <94ama3ffc1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1307
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna

In article <94ak6udrg1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
Steven J Robeson, K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com> wrote:
> In article <94a7g1$220$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
> horseshoestew@my-deja.com wrote:
>
> >I think MURS could be somewhat of a help in getting kids educated
> >about radios -
>
> MURS will no more "educate" kids about radio than chatting in a
> porn chat room "educates" you about computer technology.
>
> You turn on the box, select a channel and talk.

Not true. MURS allows external antennas and digital modes. These are
big differences over simple FRS.

If ARS is to "compete" with MURS, we are going to have to come up with
something new.

> Steve

------- Stewart - N0MHS --------
Wireless Entertainment/Communication Devices, Networks, and
Public Radio Services Information(MURS,FRS,GMRS,ARS,CB):
http://www.pubcel.com

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1057. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 00:37:17 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <d65a6.1016$e5.2512691@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 1305

Carl Zager <kb9rvb@my-deja.com> wrote:

> I hope, IF the test is an issue, that some ARRLer with a testing and
> measurements background (more current than mine) would, indeed, offer to
> assist with the development and validation of the test pool. If not, so
> be it.

Every year, I have generally offered some input to the ARRL HQ folks who work with Bart Jahnke, the ARRL representative on the QPC. Unfortunately, I have only limited time to spend on that. I sure wish that more people would weigh in and give the QPC their input on what changes are needed on the pools.

> There's just some background knowledge not in the study guides that a
> non-techie like me doesn't have and doesn't know where to find the
> answer, other than memorization. For example, one of my Monday night
> buddies showed me how to figure out the band from the frequency. I've
> looked for that in my study material and just can't find it. There are
> lists to memorize, but an explanation?

I went to the ARRL General Class manual, and lo and behold, there was no info about wavelenght.

So, let me give it a whirl.

Electromagnetic or radio waves can be visualized just as waves in water. If you put your hand in the water and move it very fast, small ripples will move from your hand, away in all directions. If you move your hand more slowly, the ripples move just as fast, but are spaced farther apart. The distance between the peaks (or valleys) of the ripples is the "wavelength" of the waves you are creating, and this wavelength is related to the speed the wave is traveling and how fast you are wiggling your hand. The wiggle rate could be expressed in "wiggles per second," thus expressing it as a frequency.

The "hand" being used to generate ripples in electromagnetic waves is usually a transmitter. The the transmitter is generating an electrical AC signal, at a fast enough rate to be called "radio frequency" (RF). Rather than expressing it as "wiggles per second," the transmitter rate is expressed in "cycles per second." The unit for cycles per second is Hertz, abbreviated "Hz." This RF signal, when applied to an antenna creates an electrmagnetic wave. To round off just a bit, the wavelength is related to the speed of the wave and the frequency by the formula:

wavelength in meters = 300,000,000 meters per second / F where F is the frequency in Hz

This is a bit cumbersome. An easy way to calculate the wavelength in meters is to use the formula:

wavelength in meters = 300 / F where F is the frequency in MHz (the M comes from the metric system, for Mega or 1,000,000 times the basic unit).

So, to try this for a few frequencies in the ham bands, you end up with:

3.5 MHz = 85.7 meters
4.0 MHz = 75 meters
7.0 MHz = 42.9 meters
10.1 MHz = 29. 7 meters
14.0 MHz = 21.4 meters
144 MHz = 2.1 meters

The "frequency" of a particular signal can be expressed either as a frequency, as in 14.0 MHz or as a wavelength. Either one says the same thing. You probably notice that the wavelength numbers are pretty close to what hams call 80 meter band, the 75 meter band, the 40 meter band, the 30 meter band, the 20 meter band and the 2 meter band. Although the exact wavelength for the 3.5 MHz signal is 85.7 meters, hams have rounded these bands off to a convenient number and use those rounded numbers in common reference to the bands.

Memorizing the bands works just fine; in fact, most hams, even Extras, really don't think much about the relationship between frequency and wavelength in common speech. You will soon refer to the 80 meter band with complete ease as you think about frequencies; it becomes second nature. You will think of that wavelength relationship when you think about antenna size -- a half-wave dipole (neglecting factors that make a "real" dipole a little bit shorter than its electrical length) is, well, a half-wavelength long. So an 80-meter band half-wave dipole is about 40 meters long.

But if you would rather figure out the answer when you take your test instead of memorizing it, memorize the following two formulas (or just the first one and apply a bit of simple algebra and solve for the unknown):

wavlength in meters = 300 / F

F = wavelength in meters / 300

Is that easier than all that memorizing? :-) I hope my few paragraphs helped you understand it. Don't worry, when I took my 1964 General exam, I memorized the formula without understanding it. You are one step ahead of where I was when I first started. :-)

If you have any more questions about the theory, go ahead and email me at home, w1rfi@aol.com. I only check my home email every few days, but I will try to point you in the right direction, if I can.

Good luck on your General.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1058. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 00:42:40 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <fb5a6.1017$e5.2513495@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 1308
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna

<Steven J Robeson>; K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com> wrote:

> MURS will no more "educate" kids about radio than chatting in a
> porn chat room "educates" you about computer technology.

Some of us have more experience in that than others, I guess. :-)

Those who use the MURS radios will learn something in the process. First, the radio has a range. They will learn that buildings and obstructions limit that range. They will learn that the range is farther if you are at the top of the building than if you are in a valley.

I think a better analogy that the porn chat room (where did you dig that one up) would be to ask what education has been the result of giving kids internet access in general? As a big kid, I can't begin to describe how much I learned that way.

> You turn on the box, select a channel and talk.

That is indeed most of the picture. Now, can we use the good and bad of MURS to find the subset of those kids that don't yet know they would like to be hams?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1059. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 00:53:12 UTC
From: horseshoestew@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <94anhmgel1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1309
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

In article <3A68A49A.379C13B2@dvol.com>,
Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com> wrote:
> > Were there any pushes back then to get more young people
> > interested in Amateur Radio?
>
> >
> There was no lack of young people then, I was one. Kids flooded into
the
> hobby. The creation of the Novice license in 1951 was extremely
successful
> in luring kids into ham radio

I wonder if it would be possible to get the text of the arguments made for the successful creation of this license class back in 1951. Even though they would be 50 years old, I am sure there would be some relevant ideas.

This stuff must be archived in Washington, DC, somewhere. I would think it would have been put on microfilm a long time ago. Does the FCC have a library for this kind of thing?

> w3rv

--
------- Stewart - N0MHS --------
Wireless Entertainment/Communication Devices, Networks, and
Public Radio Services Information(MURS,FRS,GMRS,ARS,CB):
http://www.pubcel.com

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1060. Re: Follow the Money

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 01:00:17 UTC
From: CitySlicker <not_enuf_time@foolscorner.net>
Message-ID: <94anv1$2b4@dispatch.concentric.net>
Source record: 1310
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,alt.radio.family,rec.radio.cb

Another group of geniuses cross posting this dribble in the CB group. Keep studying those manuals you will get it figured out. Question 66.

<horseshoestew@my-deja.com> wrote in message
news:94am2q$fc8$1@nnrp1.deja.com...
> In article <94aed5$8mn$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
> K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org> wrote:
> > When you don't understand why somebody is doing something which seems
> > senseless to you, sometimes it pays to try to "follow the money".
> >
> > In this case it led me to a company called "PubCel". According to
> > their web site, that company is involved in:
> >
> > "Wireless Entertainment and Communications Solutions:
> >
> > - MURS and ARS Voice and Data Communications Systems
> >
> > - FRS and GMRS Voice Communication Systems"
> >
> > I think it is safe to say that the "ARS" acronym might mean "Amateur
> > Radio Service".
> >
> > Also according to their web site, the company President is none other
> > than Stewart Teaze, N0MHS.
> >
> > Suddenly this proposal for the "Barbie Doll" Amateur Radio license
> > isn't quite so senseless.
>
> I've never tried to hide the fact that I'm trying to create a
> business. Quite the opposite - why would I list the web site on the
> signature to all my posts, if I was trying to hide something
>
> Hey, Hans, I wonder why you switched your approach to this slimly
> veiled "personal attack"? It couldn't be that I was right about the
> point regarding inductors and capacitors on the Novice test, could it?
>
> Let's stick to the point at hand. You made a good point about the lack
> of digital modes in the proposal - THIS is the kind of stuff I'm
> looking for.
>
> > 73, Hans, K0HB
>
> --

> ------- Stewart - N0MHS --------
> Wireless Entertainment/Communication Devices, Networks, and
> Public Radio Services Information(MURS,FRS,GMRS,ARS,CB):
> http://www.pubcel.com
>
>
> Sent via Deja.com
> http://www.deja.com/

1061. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 01:05:38 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A68E462.AEB662BD@uci.edu>
Source record: 1311

"Ed Hare, W1RFI" wrote:

> Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote:

> > So to whom do you refer, and why is it such a big issue?

> From what you had said in an earlier post, I thought that you did not see SS
> as anything other than as a "digital mode."

Digital modes aren't boring. Having a computer make your carrier hop
around just for the heck of it seems kinda dull though. I guess it
would be fun the first time you actually got the thing to work though.

> It appears I misunderstood. Sorry.

Good man.

73, Jim AC6XG

1062. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 01:11:29 UTC
From: 'Doc <w5lz@oio.net>
Message-ID: <3A68E5C1.FE10CA6F@oio.net>
Source record: 1312
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

horseshoestew,
There's a lack of hams on HF? We must be listening
to different HF bands! Most HF bands have more people
on them than there is room for.
'Doc

1063. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 01:14:01 UTC
From: Bruce Muscolino <w6toy@erols.com>
Message-ID: <3A68E659.FF81A08B@erols.com>
Source record: 1313
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,alt.radio.family,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc

Stewart,

The idea has already been tried. Back about 15 or 20 years the Dutch instituted a license class for beginners. It consisted of about 5 frequencies in the two meter band. Licenses required only a simple test. No code. It was hoped that these Novices would upgrade and become regular licensees. As for as I know none ever did. The service still exists, I believe.

If you want to have youngsters or oldsters learn about radio the best way is the old Novice license. % wpm code, a simple theory test, and a one or two year limit within which they HAVE to upgrade!

73

1064. Top ten most popular alchoholic beverages in Hiram, GA

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 01:23:08 UTC
From: Stagger Lee <SLee@houston.net>
Message-ID: <3A68E87C.5CA1116A@houston.net>
Source record: 1314
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

```
Top ten most popular alchoholic beverages in Hiram, GA

10. Really, Really, Really, Really Old Milwaukee
9. Wisemann Scotch
8. Amaretto Di Hiram
7. Orville Redenbacher's Butter-flavored Vodka
6. McBourbon
5. Dinty Moore's Pork 'n' Booze
4. Ernest, Julio, Tom and Roseanne Gallo
3. Dr. Scholl's Medicated Tequila
2. Seagrams 7, Braves 0
1. Chivas Du Sterno
```

1065. Top ten signs you're in a Hiram, GA hospital

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 01:28:55 UTC
From: Stagger Lee <SLee@houston.net>
Message-ID: <3A68E9D7.6CDB4026@houston.net>
Source record: 1315
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Top ten signs you're in a Hiram, GA hospital

10. You go in for routine surgery, you come out with a tail.
9. You recognize your doctor as kid who was mopping the lobby when you checked in.
8. Instead of sponge bath, they send in a St. Bernard to lick you.
7. As you're going under, your surgeon says, "man, am I baked."
6. In operating room, you see Roger Wisemann scrubbing up.
5. Every couple of minutes you hear a bugle playing taps.
4. All the diplomas on the wall are signed by Sally Struthers.
3. You and your roommate have to take turns on the I.V.
2. Through fog of anesthesia, you hear surgeon shouting, "bring the damn scotch tape!"
1. Instead of "patient" they use the term "plaintiff."

1066. 1963 Novice Study Guide

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 01:30:28 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <6U5a6.1021$e5.2520241@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 1317

I had promised to find this and post it.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI
ARRL Lab

ARRL Study Guide - 1963 - Copyright 1963, American Radio Relay League, Inc.
All rights reserved.

CHAPTER 2

The Novice License

The Novice Class license offers an ideal way to get started in amateur radio -- reduced code speed and a simplified written examination. It grants a portion of amateur privileges on an "apprenticeship" basis for one year. The examination is available only by mail. This chapter explains the license in detail and contains sample questions for the written exam.

In an incentive to encourage a greater number of people to engage in the hobby of amateur radio, the Federal Communications Commission has established a Novice Class of license with greatly reduced requirements and only a few of the privileges available to amateurs. This class of license might well he termed an apprenticeship. It has a term of but one year, compared with the five-yea terms of other amateur licenses, and the objective is to give a newcomer a period of a year of actual on-the-air experience or training in amateur operation so that he may develop his skills toward one of the permanent classes of license more rapidly than he would by textbook study and audio-oscillator code practice.

The Novice Class license examination may now be taken only by mail, under the direct supervision of an amateur holding a General Class license or higher, or a commercial radiotelegraph license. This is true no matter where the applicant lives. Refer to the section "Examination Procedures " in Chapter 5 for details on the rules governing the routine for making application and obtaining a set of examination papers. Requirements for the Novice license are the passing of a code test in sending and receiving at the rate of 5 words per minute, and a written examination in the most elementary aspects of amateur regulations and theory.

The privileges which are currently available to the Novice licensee are:

3700 3750 kc. - telegraphy
7150-7200 kc. - telegraphy
21,100-21,250 kc. - telegraphy

145-147 MC. --telegraphy or voice

In addition, the transmitter used by a Novice licensee must be crystal-controlled, and may not have an input exceeding 75 watts. Of course, the Novice may operate portable or mobile on any of these frequencies. (SeeChapter 7).

The most important point concerning the Novice license is that it is valid for only one year and may not be renewed. Before the end of his license term the Novice must qualify for one of the other grades of amateur licenses, or go off the air. He may try for a Technician Class or a General Class license (or Conditional Class, if eligible to take the mail examination). Whatever his choice, he must qualify for all requirements of the particular license class inasmuch as the Novice Class license, being obtained by mail, carries no credit toward a higher grade of license even where the examination elements are identical (such as the Technician 5 w.p.m. code test). He may not try for a class higher than those mentioned, of course, since experience as a Novice operator does not qualify for the service requirements for the Extra Class license.

Anyone who is a citizen of the United States may apply for the Novice, license, except a person who holds or ever has held an amateur license of any class. Thus a Novice not only is unable to renew his license at the end of his term, but he may not again apply for Novice privileges. If an applicant for Novice privileges feels that he can pass the standard written examination for amateur licenses but is unable to meet the 13 w.p.m. code requirement, he may simultaneously apply also for the Technician Class of license, taking the 5 w.p.m. code test, the elementary Novice written exam, and the standard written exam.

A Novice may operate any FCC-licensed amateur radio station, but only to the extent of the privileges available to the Novice and similarly available to the licensee of the station being operated. For example, when a Novice visits a station licensed to a General Class amateur, he may operate in only the Novice bands, using crystal control and with 75 watts input power or less. He uses his host's call sign exactly as issued, however. When a Novice operates a Technician's station, he may use only the 145-147 Mc band, since that is the only band common to both Novices and Technicians.

As stated, the written examination for the Novice license is quite simple. It consists of about 20 questions dealing with basic amateur regulations, and certain points of theory and technique. The questions are of the "multiple-choice" type, as explained in Chapter 1. There are no diagrams required. Following is a set of questions similar to those which are asked in the examination. If you are thoroughly able to answer each of these sample questions, you will have no difficulty in passing the written exam. However, in any event we recommend additional study of at least the technical material in How to Become a Radio Amateur and preferably of the introductory chapters of The Radio Amateur's Handbook ($3.50), both available postpaid from the ARRL, West Hartford 7, Conn.

The receiving code test for the Novice Class license consists of 25 five-letter words, mostly common ones. No punctuation marks or numerals are included. To pass, the applicant must copy at least 25 consecutive letters accurately. In the sending test, numerals and simple punctuation marks may be included.

QUESTIONS:

1. What is the maximum input power permitted to the final stage of the transmitter in a station licensed to the holder of a Novice Class license or operated by such an operator?

The maximum input power permitted a Novice is 75 watts.

2. What is the maximum penalty for a violation of the rules and regulations of the Federal Communications Commission?

A fine of up to $500 for each day during which the offense occurs, suspension of operator license, and revocation of station license.

3. On what frequency bands may the holder of a Novice Class license operate an amateur radio station?

3700-3750 kc.
7150-7200 kc.
21,100-21,250 kc.
145-147 MC.

4. On what frequency bands may the holder of a Novice Class license operate an amateur radiotelephone station?

5. What is the log of an amateur station, and what information is required to be entered therein? How long must it be preserved ?

The log of an amateur station is the written record of transmissions. The log must show:
1) the date and time of transmission
2) the signature of each licensed operator operating the equipment and the name of any person not holding a license who speaks over a radiotelephone transmitter directly or by recording, or operates a teleprinter keyboard
3) call of the station called
4) the input power to the transmitter
5) the frequency band used
6) the type of emission used
7) the location of the station at the time of transmission
8) the message traffic handled

Information such as the input power, frequency band, type of emission, location of station, need be entered only once provided the conditions are not changed. Similarly, one entry of the date need not be repeated for other transmissions made on that date. If the station is mobile, the approximate geographic location can be indicated in the log.

The log of an amateur station must be preserved for at least one year following the last date of entry. Similarly, any message traffic handled must be kept on file for at least one year.

6. What is the term of an amateur Novice Class license? Under what conditions may this license be renewed?

The term of an amateur Novice Class license is one year. It may not be renewed under any conditions.

7. What are the rules and regulations regarding the transmission of improper language, false signals, or malicious interference?

The transmission of obscene, indecent or profane language, or of false or deceptive signals or call letters, or of malicious interference is expressly prohibited and there are heavy penalties for violation.

8. What are the rules and regulations regarding purity and stability of emissions?

Below 144 megacycles, spurious radiations must be reduced in accordance with good engineering practice, and must not cause interference to near-by receivers of good engineering design not tuned to the transmitter. Voice modulation of a transmitter must not cause spurious emissions; the maximum modulation percentage is 100%. Simultaneous frequency modulation and amplitude modulation is not permitted. The frequency of the signal transmitted must be as constant as the state of the art permits.

9. What method of frequency control is required to be used in the transmitter of a station licensed to the holder of a Novice Class license?

The frequency must be crystal-controlled.

10. What are the rules and regulations regarding the measurement of the frequencies of the emissions of an amateur radio station?

Regular measurement of the frequency of the transmitter is required. This measurement must be by means independent of the means used to control the transmitting frequency and must be of sufficient accuracy to ensure operation within the frequency band used.

11. Who may be permitted to operate the transmitter of an amateur radio station licensed to the holder of a Novice Class license?

Any amateur radio operator (though a Technician may operate a Novice's station only in the band 145-147 Mc., since that is the only band the two classes have in common).

12. Under what circumstances may an amateur radio station be used by a person who does not hold a valid license?

A person not properly licensed may not operate an amateur station. However, he may speak over the microphone of an amateur radiotelephone station or use the keyboard of an amateur radio-teleprinter, provided a duly licensed operator is present to control the emissions.

13. What is the maximum permissible percentage of modulation of an amateur radiotelephone station?

One hundred per cent.

14. At what intervals must an amateur station be identified by the transmission of its call sign? May any transmission be made without identification of the station?

An amateur station must identify its call sign at the beginning and end of each transmission and at least every ten minutes if a single transmission lasts longer than ten minutes. No transmission by itself may be made without identification of the station, except that during a sequence of transmissions each less than three minutes long, the call sign needs to be given only once each ten minutes as well as at the beginning and end of the work.

15. Under what conditions is notice of portable or mobile operation required to be given, and to whom in each case?

Notice of intended portable operation, or mobile operation, must be given the FCC Engineer-in-Charge of the inspection district in which such portable or mobile operation is contemplated only when the operation is or is expected to be for a period longer than 48 hours.

16. What are the recognized abbreviations for: kilocycles, megacycles, Eastern Standard Time, Greenwich Mean Time, continuous wave, frequency modulation, amplitude modulation?

kilocycles - kc.
megacycles - MC.
Eastern Standard Time - EST
Greenwich Mean Time - GMT
continuous wave - C.W.
frequency modulation - f.m.
amplitude modulation - a.m.

17. What is the relationship between a fundamental frequency and its second harmonic; its third harmonic, etc.?

The second harmonic is twice the frequency of the fundamental, the third harmonic is three times the fundamental frequency, and so on. A harmonic is always related to its fundamental frequency by an integral multiplier; i.e., 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, etc.

18. What is the relationship between a cycle, a kilocycle, and a megacycle?

1 kilocycle = 1000 cycles
1 megacycle = 1000 kilocycles = 1,000,000 cycles

19. What instrument is used to measure: electrical potential; electrical current; electrical power; electrical energy?

Electrical potential is measured by a voltmeter.
Electrical current is measured by an ammeter, milliammeter, or microammeter.
Electrical power is measured by a wattmeter.
Electrical energy is measured by a watt-hour meter.

20. What is the purpose of: a modulator; an amplifier; a rectifier; a filter?

A modulator is used to vary the amplitude, frequency or phase of the output of a transmitter for the purpose of transmitting information. An amplifier is used to increase the amplitude, or power level, of a signal. A rectifier is used to change alternating current into pulsating direct, current. The purpose of a filter is to attenuate undesired frequencies while simultaneously passing, without appreciable attenuation, a desired band of frequencies and/or direct current. Examples: The power-supply "smoothing filter," which eliminates the alternating-current ripple from the output of a rectifier but permits direct current to flow with little or no attenuation; the "low-pass" filter, which attenuates all frequencies (such as harmonics of a transmitter) above a given frequency but passes all lower frequencies.

21. What is meant by: amplification; modulation; detection; attenuation?

Amplification is the process of increasing the amplitude, or power level, of a signal. Modulation is the process of varying the amplitude, frequency or phase of the radio-frequency output of a transmitter. Modulation is normally employed for the purpose of transmitting information. However, it may also occur inadvertently, as in the case of "hum" modulation of a signal resulting from ripple in the output of an insufficiently-filtered d.c. power supply. Detection or demodulation is the process of extracting the information contained in the modulation on a radio-frequency signal. Attenuation is a reduction in amplitude.

22. What is the purpose of: a radio-frequency choke; an audio-frequency choke; a filter choke?

The purpose of a radio-frequency choke is to oppose the flow of radio-frequency current while permitting direct current and audio frequencies to flow without appreciable opposition. The purpose of an audio-frequency choke is to oppose the flow of audio-frequency currents while permitting direct current to flow. The purpose of a filter choke is to aid in smoothing the direct-current output of a rectifier.

23. How is the actual power input to the tube or tubes supplying energy to the antenna of an amateur transmitter determined?

The input power is determined by measuring the direct-current plate voltage and the d.c. plate current to the tube or tubes in the final stage in the transmitter. The power input is equal to the plate voltage multiplied by the plate current in amperes. Example: Two tubes in the final stage of the transmitter take 50 milliamperes each, at a plate voltage of 500 volts. The total plate current is 2 X 50 = 100 milliamperes, or 0.1 ampere. The power input is therefore 500 X 0.1 = 50

watts.

24. Why are a rectifier and filter required in the plate power supply system of an amateur transmitter when operated from alternating current?

The amateur regulations require that an adequately-filtered plate supply be used on transmitters operating below 144 Mc. The rectifier is used to convert the alternating current into direct current. However, its d.c. output is pulsating, not constant, and the filter must be used to smooth out the pulsations so that the output is essentially "pure" -- that is free from pulsations or "ripple."

25. What is a frequency multiplier?

A frequency multiplier is a device that delivers output at an integral multiple (i.e., 2, 3, 4 times, etc.) of the applied frequency. The output of a frequency multiplier is consequently on a frequency that is a harmonic of the fundamental (applied) frequency.

26. What are the undesirable effects of overmodulation in radiotelephony?

Overmodulation results in the generation of spurious sidebands - that is, frequencies lying outside the band of frequencies or "channel" actually required for transmitting the information contained in the modulation. Those spurious frequencies, called "splatter," will interfere with communication on near-by channels and may even lie outside an amateur band. At close range they may also cause interference with broadcast reception.

27. What is meant by a "parasitic" oscillation?

A parasitic oscillation is one not essential to the operation of the equipment and usually occurring on a frequency considerably removed from the operating frequency.

28. What is the purpose of a "key-click filter" and when should it be used?

The purpose of a key-click filter is to reduce spurious radiation generally when keying a radiotelegraph transmitter. It should be used whenever required for suppressing such spurious radiations.

29. What is Ohm's Law?

Ohm's Law expresses the relationship between potential, current and resistance in any circuit.

It is stated as I = E / R where I = current in amperes, E = potential in volts and R = resistance in ohms. By simple algebra it is also E = I * R and R = E / I.

30. What precautions should be taken to avoid the danger of shock from high-voltage electrical circuits?

Such circuits in transmitters and receivers should not be exposed where the operator can inadvertently come in contact with them when the power is turned on. All work on equipment involving the possibility of contact with such circuits should be done only after the power has been turned off. All power-supply capacitors should have bleeder resistors connected across them, to discharge the capacitors after the power has been turned off.

31. What is the relationship between the frequency and the wavelength of a radio wave if its velocity in space is 300,000,000 meters per second?

The frequency in cycles multiplied by the wavelength in meters is 300,000,000. Therefore, the wavelength is inversely proportional to the frequency; in other words, the longer the wavelength, the lower the frequency. The formula for calculating frequency (f) in cycles when the wavelength in meters is known is f = 3,000,000 / wavelength ; similarly, wavelength = 3,000,000 / f. Example: The wavelength of a signal whose frequency is 3700 kilocycles is 300,000,000 / 3,700,000 or 81.08 meters.

32. What symbol is used in the amateur rules to designate amplitude-modulated telegraphy without the use of modulating audio frequencies (on-off keying)?

Al. (The "A" indicates amplitude modulation, and the numeral "1" is used to indicate telegraphy by on-off keying).

33. What is the ruling regarding eligibility for reexamination?

An applicant who fails an operator examination may not take another examination for the same or higher privileges within 30 days (except that this does not apply to an examination for a General Class license following a mail examination for a Conditional, Novice or Technician Class license).

34. What factors are commonly responsible for harmonic radiation and what practical means can be used to detect and correct such condition?

The principal factors responsible for harmonic radiation are (1) improper operating conditions in the final amplifier, such as excessive grid bias and excessive drive, causing the tube or tubes to develop unnecessarily large harmonic output: (2) poor selectivity interstage tank circuits, resulting in excessive harmonic content in the excitation voltage applied to the final stage (3) inadequate selectivity in the final tank circuit because of too-low operating Q; and (4) insufficient selectivity in the coupling circuit between the final-amplifier tank circuit and the antenna, or omission of such a coupling circuit.

These defects can be corrected by (1) reducing grid bias and drive to the minimum necessary for reasonably efficient operation of the final tube or tubes; (2) using higher-Q interstage circuits, usually by increasing the ratio of capacitance to inductance or by decreasing the coupling to lighten the loading on the circuit; (3) adjusting the final tank inductance so that the tuning capacitor will be set for higher capacitance at the operating frequency: and (4) installing a tuned

antenna-coupling or matching circuit between the transmitter and the transmission line or antenna.

The presence of harmonics in the output of a transmitter can be detected by the use of an absorption wavemeter, having a sensitive indicator, coupled to the final tank circuit or to the antenna coupling circuit, and successively tuned through the harmonics of the operating frequency. Alternatively, tests can be conducted with a nearby amateur station, with the cooperating amateur listening on the various harmonic frequencies while the transmitter is in operation. The receiving station should not be so close that the fundamental-frequency signal strength will be such as to overload the receiver and thus cause spurious harmonic responses in the receiver itself.

1067. Re: CA power crisis caused by internet

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 01:31:11 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nospam.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.g7fl4m4.pminews@ca.news.verio.net>
Source record: 1316

On 19 Jan 2001 20:43:30 GMT, Len Over 21 wrote:

>> IIRC the DWP was exempt from the CPUC's fiat that production
>> facilities be sold. If SCE, SDGE, and PG&E were allowed to
>> keep their dynamos as well, would there have been a "shortage"?
>> Doubtful.
>
>Phil, the LA Department of Water and Power is a municipal
>agency.

It is well established law that a governmental agency that is
engaged in a commercial activity that is equal to or in direct
competition with similar private sector enterprises does not
automatically enjoy "exempt" status that governmetal agencies
otherwise enjoy. The Legislature or the CPUC has to grant that
status, usually by the use of the term "investor-owned utilities"
in either the statutes or CPUC Orders.

"Selling" production facilities of the DWP was not,
>is not, part of any plan by any California Public Utilities
>Commission...or any other state group.

That's what I said.....

>As of today, Friday, the DWP is selling close to 9 GWatts

9 GW is 9000 MW....equal to NINE units of nuclear power
plant generation (1 "unit" is 1000 MW). Five plants the size
of Diablo Canyon. Hard to believe. Where are they hiding them?

--
=== PMK ===

1068. Re: Follow the Money

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 01:35:44 UTC
From: LRod <lr0d@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <94aq1gilk1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1320
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,alt.radio.family,rec.radio.cb

In article <94anv1$2b4@dispatch.concentric.net>,
"CitySlicker" <not_enuf_time@foolscorner.net> wrote:

> Another group of geniuses cross posting this dribble in the CB group.

Doncha just love it when some "genius" badmouths the (learned)
opposition, and then uses "dribble" for drivel...in the same sentence?

LRod

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1069. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 01:43:17 UTC
From: Gene <webmaster@zylay.com>
Message-ID: <3A68ED35.E5ED0FA4@zylay.com>
Source record: 1318
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna

Steven, J, Robeson, K4YZ wrote:

> In article <94a7g1$220$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
> horseshoestew@my-deja.com wrote:
>
> >I think MURS could be somewhat of a help in getting kids educated
> >about radios -
>
> MURS will no more "educate" kids about radio than chatting in a
> porn chat room "educates" you about computer technology.
>
> You turn on the box, select a channel and talk.

The only way it might help is if they have an Elmer type to explain what is actually happening when they talk. From that standpoint, CB would be better because at least they can practice antenna and electronics theory (especially if they get busted radios donated for practice demolition er I mean repair), and there's at least a little bit of propagation that might get their attention and give them something more to learn about.

At the same time, having adult supervision would be even more necessary in case "emergency censorship" of the ongoing conversations become necessary.

1070. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 01:46:41 UTC
From: Gene <webmaster@zylay.com>
Message-ID: <3A68EE00.F52D6B6F@zylay.com>
Source record: 1319
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna

horseshoestew@my-deja.com wrote:

> In article <94ak6udrg1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
> Steven J Robeson, K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com> wrote:
> > In article <94a7g1$220$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
> > horseshoestew@my-deja.com wrote:
> >
> > >I think MURS could be somewhat of a help in getting kids educated
> > >about radios -
> >
> > MURS will no more "educate" kids about radio than chatting in a
> > porn chat room "educates" you about computer technology.
> >
> > You turn on the box, select a channel and talk.
>
> Not true. MURS allows external antennas and digital modes. These are
> big differences over simple FRS.
>
> If ARS is to "compete" with MURS, we are going to have to come up with
> something new.

I'm not familiar with MURS and wasn't aware of the extra room to play. I would still be concerned about the cost of equipment though.

1071. Top ten signs your phone company is in Glendale, WV

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 02:09:35 UTC
From: Stagger Lee <SLee@houston.net>
Message-ID: <3A68F35F.119A8161@houston.net>
Source record: 1321
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Top ten signs your phone company is in Glendale, WV

10. All calls are $2 for the first minute, $94 each additional minute
9. Operator makes you describe what you're wearing
8. Their so-called "dial tone" is just a guy with a kazoo
7. You can only place long distance calls during an electrical storm
6. They bill you for calls made by some guy named Roger, and when
you
complain they say, "whatsa problem, man, you no like Roger?"
5. Whenever you call their office, you hear gunfire
4. For some reason, your phone doesn't work unless you're wearing
3-D
glasses
3. Everyone you talk to sounds like the guy at the drive-thru window
at
McDonald's
2. No matter what number you dial, you always get Roger Wiseman
1. Their slogan is: "Reach out and touch yourself"

1072. Top ten problems being a Glendale, WV ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 02:18:22 UTC
From: Stagger Lee <SLee@houston.net>
Message-ID: <3A68F56E.E46FF77B@houston.net>
Source record: 1322
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Top ten problems being a Glendale, WV ham

10. Phone sex operators keep hanging up on you
9. FOX is starting a new show about you: "America's Least Wanted"
8. You get a heart-shaped box filled with angry hornets
7. The babes just don't seem to go for your home-made Star Trek
uniform
6. You're taking private tutorials with Jocelyn Elders
5. You're being stalked by Riley Hollingsworth.
4. The last time you got laid was during the Eisenhower
administration
3. You spend your vacation chasin' lizards
2. The Pope asks you for tips on celibacy
1. You ain't a Gingrich, but your nickname's "Newt"

1073. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 02:24:42 UTC
From: horseshoestew@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <94ast5kms1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1324
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna

In article <3A68EE00.F52D6B6F@zylay.com>,
Gene <webmaster@zylay.com> wrote:
> horseshoestew@my-deja.com wrote:
>
> > In article <94ak6udrg1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
> > Steven J Robeson, K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com> wrote:
> > > In article <94a7g1$220$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
> > > horseshoestew@my-deja.com wrote:
> > >
> > > >I think MURS could be somewhat of a help in getting kids educated
> > > >about radios -
> > >
> > > MURS will no more "educate" kids about radio than chatting
in a
> > > porn chat room "educates" you about computer technology.
> > >
> > > You turn on the box, select a channel and talk.
> >
> > Not true. MURS allows external antennas and digital modes. These
are
> > big differences over simple FRS.
> >
> > If ARS is to "compete" with MURS, we are going to have to come up
with
> > something new.
>
> I'm not familiar with MURS and wasn't aware of the extra room to
play. I
> would still be concerned about the cost of equipment though.

Everybody is holding their breath until the Motorola objection to FCC's creation of MURS is settled. If that gets settled positively (Motorola's objection is set aside), then I expect many manufacters to begin making MURS radios. Prices will drop, accordingly. I expect that within a year we will see decent MURS radios in the $70-$100 range. Right now the only thing specifically available are offerings from Radio Shack in the $125 range, or the 1W Motorola Spirit single channel(9 selectable)VHF business radios(don't get the two watt version, it is not useful for MURS, as the only two MURS specific channels it supports use a 25Khz bandwidth, MURS will be using 12.5).

--
------- Stewart - N0MHS --------
Wireless Entertainment/Communication Devices, Networks, and

Public Radio Services Information(MURS,FRS,GMRS,ARS,CB):
http://www.pubcel.com

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1074. Top ten signs you've visited a Hiram, GA chiropractor

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 02:25:54 UTC
From: Stagger Lee <SLee@houston.net>
Message-ID: <3A68F732.5473F3D4@houston.net>
Source record: 1323
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Top ten signs you've visited a Hiram, GA chiropractor

10. When you walk, you make a wacky accordion sound.
9. Keeps saying, "A spine is like a box of chocolates."
8. Repeatedly asks, "You a cop? You sure you ain't no cop?"
7. Over and over, you hear crunching sounds followed by "Uh-oh."
6. There's a two-drink minimum.
5. At end of session, lies down on the table and says, "My turn!"
4. He was trained by Roger Wiseman.
3. Rushes in late to your appointment, still wearing his Burger King uniform.
2. Hints that for an extra $50, he'll "straighten" something else.
1. You're fully-clothed and he's naked.

1075. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 02:30:01 UTC
From: horseshoestew@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <94at75$l1e$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1325
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

In article <3A68E5C1.FE10CA6F@oio.net>,
'Doc <w5lz@oio.net> wrote:
>
>
> horseshoestew,
> There's a lack of hams on HF?

Didn't say that. Go back and read. Again - I said the percentage of hams using HF is down. I would guess that the number using HF has remained fairly constant. As you know, those that are using VHF/UHF communicate over shorter distances - it is these people who I am talking about. Every year they become a greater and greater percentage of the ham population. The problem is that less and less of all hams are ACTUALLY using VHF/UHF.

> 'Doc
>

--
------- Stewart - N0MHS --------
Wireless Entertainment/Communication Devices, Networks, and
Public Radio Services Information(MURS,FRS,GMRS,ARS,CB):
http://www.pubcel.com

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1076. Re: Follow the Money

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 02:33:44 UTC
From: horseshoestew@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <94ate8$l4r$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1326
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,alt.radio.family,rec.radio.cb

In article <94anv1$2b4@dispatch.concentric.net>,
"CitySlicker" <not_enuf_time@foolscorner.net> wrote:
> Another group of geniuses cross posting this dribble in the CB group.
Keep
> studying those manuals you will get it figured out. Question 66.

I originally posted to rec.radio.cb to support my argument that CB is
obviously NOT the proper environment to be starting our kids off in
radio - and you folks did not disappoint me, as the typical vulgarity
of your posts show.

Look, I don't have anything against you folks - I just don't think it
is appropriate for kids to be learning radio on the 11 meter band.

------- Stewart - N0MHS --------
Wireless Entertainment/Communication Devices, Networks, and
Public Radio Services Information(MURS,FRS,GMRS,ARS,CB):
http://www.pubcel.com

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1077. Re: "They oughta require a license....blah, blah, blah"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 02:53:45 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nospam.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.g7fp0r0.pminews@ca.news.verio.net>
Source record: 1327

On 19 Jan 2001 21:14:06 GMT, Len Over 21 wrote:

>Are the "illegals" always non-amateur? Does a "kerchunk"
>carry any ID of the kerchunker? :-)

It carries the "fingerprint" of the tranmitter....the FCC has
used such IDs very successfully in enforcment even when I was on
board.

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

1078. Re: Top ten most popular alchoholic beverages in Hiram, GA

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 03:05:01 UTC
From: AC6V <ac6v@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3A69005C.491DD81D@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 1328
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In all due respect -- only one alchoholic beverage belongs on a
rec.radio.amateur.xx newgroup and that is an 807
--
All in gud fun
73 From Rod AC6V In San Diego
700 Ham Topics & 6,000 Links
http://ac6v.com/
I Doubt, Therefore I Might Be!!!

Stagger Lee wrote:

> Top ten most popular alchoholic beverages in Hiram, GA
>
> 10. Really, Really, Really, Really Old Milwaukee
> 9. Wisemann Scotch
> 8. Amaretto Di Hiram
> 7. Orville Redenbacher's Butter-flavored Vodka
> 6. McBourbon
> 5. Dinty Moore's Pork 'n' Booze
> 4. Ernest, Julio, Tom and Roseanne Gallo
> 3. Dr. Scholl's Medicated Tequila
> 2. Seagrams 7, Braves 0
> 1. Chivas Du Sterno

1079. Re: The Real Bill Clinton Legacy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 03:45:38 UTC
From: DX405 <lightnin9@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <94b275$334$1@dagobah.blueriver.net>
Source record: 1329

Any loser named Graeme needs to check if his anal virginity is still intact.
As far as second rate governments, we all need to look at the gun grabbers
in Australia and the sissies who submit to them. So bugger off, Aussie loser
<vk4lld@netinc.au> wrote in message news:94a6rb$n7r$1@news.netmar.com...
> Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
> > There has been much talk about the Clinton legacy. As William J.
> > Clinton leaves office, lets take a look at a few things around the
> > country to discover the real Clinton legacy.
>
> ///// C L I P /////
>
> Please take your American politics to alt.bloody.sleazy.washington
newsgroup.
> This one is an international forum about amateur radio and not about
> second-rate governments in north america.
>
> In other words, bugger off mate.
>
> Graeme
>
>
>
>
>
>
> ----- Posted via NewsOne.Net: Free (anonymous) Usenet News via the
eb -----
> http://newsone.net/ -- Free reading and anonymous posting to 60,000+
groups
> NewsOne.Net prohibits users from posting spam. If this or other posts
> made through NewsOne.Net violate posting guidelines, email
abuse@newsone.net

1080. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 03:59:23 UTC
From: Keith McQueen <kb7m@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <t28a6.2182$E52.635055@news.uswest.net>
Source record: 1330
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,alt.radio.family,rec.radio.cb

For once a constructive suggestion! My 11 year old has asked me several times if I can find a ham radio technician text that is geared for young people. So far I haven't found anything. Anybody for getting something like this together? It doesn't need to talk down to the kids. Kids are bright and intelligent and can understand amazing things. But it HAS to be made interesting to THEM. If you could disguise it in a Nintendo game it would work even better. If it were available for download for a free or minimal cost so much the better. Now THAT would be a contribution!

<Steven J Robeson>; "K4YZ" <k4yz@my-deja.com> wrote in message news:949em4$a2a$1@nnrp1.deja.com...
>
> If you REALLY want to make an impact on kids in Amateur Radio, try
> writing a text FOR kids...THAT will help them along the way. Trying to
> wrangle a "new" Amateur Radio license out of the FCC for posterity's
> sake isn't it.
>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4YZ
>
>
> Sent via Deja.com
> http://www.deja.com/

1081. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 04:44:10 UTC
From: Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com>
Message-ID: <3A691799.43A44BFB@dvol.com>
Source record: 1331
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

horseshoestew@my-deja.com wrote:

>
> > There were no home computers. There were
> >ham
> > stores in every populated area. There was no horde of CBers, no cell
> > phones, no Internet, endless list.
> > >
>
> That's a cool story, thanks.

>
Dunno how "cool" it is but it was a poke at demonstrating why us Old Farts come from fundamentally different "cultural" directions than do many of the much younger hams of today. I mean like the whole point to RRAP is that it's the current really whizzy outlet of convenience for the usual generational warfare which probably goes back to when the first Species Homo Sapiens kid told his father he wasn't gonna sleep up in the freaking family tree any longer.
>

> > It's all changed and I have my doubts about how much "better off "
> ham radio
> > is today vs. 1958 even though the number of hams then was some small
> > fraction of today's license count.
>
> The thing is, the percentage of hams using HF is way down too.

>
I guess so considering the big volume of hams today which don't have HF privs which was not the case in earlier days. .
>
Fact is that there isn't any way to put the calipers on HF activity and band utilization. If I had the time I could spend all day every day on HF and barely even scratch the surface. Over the past half century four MF/MF ham bands have come into broad use thus there is something of a dilution effect, basically a 55% percent increase in the size of the playground. We got the three WARC bands in '79 which accounts for three new bands plus 160 has returned from the deep dark "200 Meters and Down" days into a very current hot button.
>

> able to reach a critical mass of other people to communicate with on
> VHF/UHF, you really need more people.

>
What the heck is a "critical mass" in this context?
>
I won't comment on that one beyond the fact that VHF/UHF ops are not the
reason I've kept renewing my ticket.
>
--
------- Stewart - N0MHS --------
>
w3rv

1082. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 05:41:49 UTC
From: CW <cmagers@sprynet.com>
Message-ID: <94b8mnpvr1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 1332
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna

Something new appears to be all that you are after. The current Technician
serves all the needs you have outlined.
--
CW
KC7NOD
<horseshoestew@my-deja.com> wrote in message
news:94ama3ffc1@nnrp1.deja.com...
> In article <94ak6udrg1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
> Steven J Robeson, K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com> wrote:
> > In article <94a7g1$220$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
> > horseshoestew@my-deja.com wrote:
> >
> > >I think MURS could be somewhat of a help in getting kids educated
> > >about radios -
> >
> > MURS will no more "educate" kids about radio than chatting in a
> > porn chat room "educates" you about computer technology.
> >
> > You turn on the box, select a channel and talk.
>
> Not true. MURS allows external antennas and digital modes. These are
> big differences over simple FRS.
>
> If ARS is to "compete" with MURS, we are going to have to come up with
> something new.
>
> > Steve
>
> ------- Stewart - N0MHS --------
> Wireless Entertainment/Communication Devices, Networks, and
> Public Radio Services Information(MURS,FRS,GMRS,ARS,CB):
> http://www.pubcel.com
>
>
> Sent via Deja.com
> http://www.deja.com/

1083. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 05:49:35 UTC
From: Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com>
Message-ID: <3A6926EF.D544E65@dvol.com>
Source record: 1333
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

horseshoestew@my-deja.com wrote:

> > There was no lack of young people then, I was one. Kids flooded into
> the
> > hobby. The creation of the Novice license in 1951 was extremely
> successful
> > in luring kids into ham radio
>
> I wonder if it would be possible to get the text of the arguments made
> for the successful creation of this license class back in 1951. Even
> though they would be 50 years old, I am sure there would be some
> relevant ideas.

>
You betchum. There was a huge outcry from the Old Farts of my youth about
the FCC and the ARRL having the unthinkable audacity to even suggest
letting pimply 5wpm weenies like me get on the HF ham bands until we did
13wpm solid copy with a pencil. In front of an FCC exaniner of course.
>
The Tech license also came out of that "restructuring" maneuver.
>

>This stuff must be archived in Washington, DC, somewhere. I would

> think it would have been put on microfilm a long time ago. Does the
> FCC have a library for this kind of thing?

>
No. Regulatory agencies are not keepers of history. It's all in the ARRL
collection of QSTs now archived in CDs going to the 1915 issue one, volume
one, in particular cruise the Letters to The Editor columns for the
earlier iterations of rrap. Heh.

> ------- Stewart - N0MHS --------

>
w3rv

1084. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 05:52:19 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <5q9i6ts8b3k2tfbdp8dlb3p9505730mh3t@4ax.com>
Source record: 1334
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

horseshoestew@my-deja.com wrote:
> I am curious - are there any hams that remember what the policy of the
> ARRL, FCC, and hams in general was in 1958, in regards to the issue of
> Sputnik?

I don't remember any policy. I was a teenage ham at the time. I
remember listening to Sputnik on my old receiver and thinking it was
pretty neat...

>Were there any pushes back then to get more young people
>interested in Amateur Radio?

That was not a problem then. One old magazine I have estimates that
about 50% of the new hams in the late 50's were teenagers...

1085. Re: Sound Familiar?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 05:52:23 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <bm9i6tgphu40q24nle3mg93smhejm2itb4@4ax.com>
Source record: 1335

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
>You cannot escape the coexistance of the amateur radio
>service with dozens of other radio services...

I am not trying to escape the totality of radio. My posts here are mostly are about *amateur radio* because this is an *amateur radio news group* and because *amateur radio* is my hobby interest. If I wanted to hear about broadcast radio, CB radio, SWLing or other radio subjects I would specifically visit those particular groups...

But...goodness knows we do stray from the subject, so feel free to post on the totality of radio. I certainly have no objections. Just don't expect all of us to do so... :-)

1086. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 05:52:25 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <ol9i6ts9svdmj8l2brvmcm561hrhnlsj3g@4ax.com>
Source record: 1336

"Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net> wrote:
>Aaron, I answered that question with volumes, and continued until I realized
>that you really would only accept a "yes" or "no" answer...

Not true Ed. I gave you permission to answer any way you liked... :-)

1087. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 05:52:25 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <sk9i6tgmpvfl0vacpj7ivboisji1uos8sl@4ax.com>
Source record: 1337

"Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net> wrote:

>Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com> wrote:
>>But you knew that I was just yanking Ed's chain didn't you?

>Perhaps we should all consider that any time we think about taking your
>posts at face value.

You recently admitted to a bit of chain yanking yourself Ed. You're
not really going to give me and Brian another lecture are you... :-)

1088. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 05:52:26 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <qj9i6tsn5fjk7a3aph2lap416qqv4sbbfc@4ax.com>
Source record: 1338

"Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net> wrote:

>Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com> wrote:
>
>> >> In society most people are too polite to tell someone about his gaff.
>> >> They just think of him poorly behind his back. At least hams are
>> >> honest and straightforward... :-)
>
>> >Whoever originated the phrase, "honesty is the best policy" clearly
>didn't
>> >envision this scenario. :-)
>
>> I suppose it's not much different than someone who is too polite to
>> tell his CW contact that he has a bad fist and lies that he is being
>> called to dinner to end the QSO early... :-)
>
>Telling him in an "honest and straightforward" way about his gaff is the
>exact opposite of not telling him. That is not my idea of "not much
>different."

I was referring to my first line above:
"In society most people are too polite to tell
someone about his gaff."

You were too polite to tell a CW contact that he had a poor fist. You were so polite that you would rather lie about having to QRT to go dinner than tell him about his bad fist. That's not much different from being too polite to tell someone about his gaff... :-)

1089. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 05:52:27 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <tg9i6tcctbenm6ov0ptcd18be6dlmamfjk@4ax.com>
Source record: 1339

"Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net> wrote:
>? ARRL phonetics ?

On page 532 of my 1954 ARRL handbook
the title over the phonetics list is:

"ARRL Word List for Radiotelephony"... :-)

1090. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 05:52:27 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <fi9i6tgeon90m38apituem9l60ermncqun@4ax.com>
Source record: 1340

"Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net> wrote:
>if you participate in an open forum, there are always one or two who
>feel that the best thing that they could do for you is to publically and
>soundly berate you...

And there are also those who fail to learn the practices and
procedures of a specialized group before entering the frey, and
consequently make fools of themselves.

>If you think their behaviour is inappropriate...

I think both types of behaviors are inappropriate and avoidable...

1091. Re: Sound Familiar?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 06:00:27 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net>
Message-ID: <3A69297B.C55617EF@ovis.net>
Source record: 1341

Aaron Jones wrote:
>
> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
> >What is this glorious, religious connection to the past and
> >only the past of amateur radio?!?
>
> Because this is an *amateur radio* newsgroup...
>
> >If you want some cogent historical information on the history
> >of ALL radio in the first 30 years of its life, read...
>
> But I'm not interested in all radio history, just ham radio history,
> which is why I collect old callbooks, ham magazines, license manuals,
> ham databases, ect. And I scan and post old ham stuff from time to
> time for discussions sake on this *ham* newsgroup...

Len insists on his "rights" Aaron. He feels free--nay, he insists on his "right" to post his usually lengthy diatribes in an amateur radio group. He isn't a ham but seems to think that radio amateurs are under some sort of obligation to pay credence to his views. You'd think that if the guy was really interested in amateur radio, he'd have managed to obtain a license by now.

You'd think he might have figured out by now that most of the folks reading and posting here are really interested in amateur radio.

Dave Heil K8MN

1092. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 06:09:49 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <94ba3d$t4a$0@208.206.142.99>
Source record: 1342

Brian Kelly wrote:
>
> Aaron Jones wrote:
>
> > >>
> > >What immediately comes to mind when you hear 10-18 or QSX?
> >
> > That I need to go look them up... :-) Your point?
>
> >
> My point is that there are very few of these codes are in general use,
> having to look them up defeats the whole intended purpose of the things.

Well, it depends on how ingrained they became.I still remember 10-18
though I haven't used it in 15 years. It meant "what is your location?".

Dick

1093. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 06:10:31 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <94ba4n$t4a$1@208.206.142.99>
Source record: 1343

Aaron Jones wrote:
>
> Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com> wrote:
> >My point is that there are very few of these codes are in general use,
> >having to look them up defeats the whole intended purpose of the things.
>
> I don't completely disagree with that. In fact many public service
> agencies have gone to plain English for just that reason. I think that
> the intended purpose of the 10-codes and the Q codes is to save radio
> time. To be effective they must be learned, that's true. But once
> learned, they do serve the intended purpose...

Sorta like Morze code.....

1094. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 06:12:45 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <94ba8t$t4a$2@208.206.142.99>
Source record: 1344

Phil Kane wrote:
>
> On Thu, 18 Jan 2001 18:48:39 GMT, Aaron Jones wrote:
>
> >There is no "official list". Some codes seem universal (like "10-4")
>
> Actually there is an "official" APCO list but its use is
> voluntary.

And it got mutated a lot by more local agencies.

Dick

1095. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 06:35:11 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <94bbiv$7o8$0@208.206.142.99>
Source record: 1345

Aaron Jones wrote:
>
> "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nospam.spam> wrote:
> > Actually there is an "official" APCO list
>
> The first published 10-code was in an APCO bulletin in January of 1940

I have an APCO "National Police Communications Network Directory and Reference Guide" from 1945, and one from 1951. It's amazing how much changed in that six year period.

Dick

1096. Re: cellphone block

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 06:36:56 UTC
From: JC <jayc@j.s>
Message-ID: <3A69320D.1CF9CECE@j.s>
Source record: 1346
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

~Steve~ wrote:

> You may want to check and make sure they are using a jammer before taking any action.
>

I'm just gonna find an appropriate FCC section and send it to school. As to making sure jammers are using jammer, they annouced "one will not be able to use cellphone inside the building as we have a cellphone blocker in use" on bulletin.

1097. Re: CA power crisis caused by internet

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 06:43:23 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <94bc2b$96j$0@208.206.142.99>
Source record: 1347
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Brian Kelly wrote:
>
> JR wrote:
>
> > California can thank the tree huggers for their current energy crisis.
> >
>
> >
> It's gonna get interesting everywhere when it becomes obvious that the only
> way out is more nukes.
> >
> w3rv

Why don't they make some effort to do more with geothermal energy? Ca.
is loaded with the stuff and there's no natural gas bills involved. Too
simple a solution?

I know there is some geothermal installations in northern CA but looks
like it would be -or would have been- an easy out for them all along...
Guess that's too much to ask from politics, 'specially on the Left
Coast. No "vested interests" in geothermal as in oil and gas.

Dick

1098. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 06:45:23 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010120014523.22779.00000700@nso-fa.aol.com>
Source record: 1350

In article <3A68A49A.379C13B2@dvol.com>, Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com> writes:

>> Were there any pushes back then to get more young people
>> interested in Amateur Radio?
>
>There was no lack of young people then, I was one. Kids flooded into the
>hobby.

So was I, old-timer. :-) But...back then, to "kids" (and quite a few
grown-ups) circa 1950s, radio was a sort of black magic with
wires, solder, and things that glowed in the dark.

> The creation of the Novice license in 1951 was extremely successful
>in luring kids into ham radio. The availability and readily accesibile
>dirt-cheap military surplus radios and parts was another huge boosting
>factor. Any kid could and many did get on HF for well under a hundred bucks
>in 2001 dollars.

In 1951 an ARC-5 receiver in the domestic shipping carton was
$6 at W9ERU's H&H Electronics in Rockford, Illinois. An ARC-
5 transmitter was $12 and the antenna coupler and modulator
was $18. Surplus BC-348 receivers were terribly expensive at
around $49 while a less-technically-able National NC-57
"Communications Receiver" cost $98 list. In the dollars of
those days it still represented a sizeable fraction of income.

>Just about all large high schools had school-supported ham clubs and club
>stations.

Maybe in your area, but not in mine, a city of about 80
thousand back then.

>The 80 & 40m Novice bands crawled with other kids.

Really? My experience was a lot of WW2 vets were doing
the crawling.

> A kid could
>actually understand the circuitry and get a soldering iron into the radios.

100 Watt American Beauty irons. Yeah, sure... :-)

>There were
>very few antenna and tower restrictions, "real people" didn't live in
>apartments.

No problem, there were very few antenna towers. :-)

> If you were a kid interested in electronics the customary
>gateway to an EE was a ham ticket.

Oh? Of five in my high school class of 1951 that became
EEs, none of them had ham tickets then. I'll check up on
that in August when my class has its 50th reunion... :-)

>Life in general was also very different from today. The overall pace of life
>was slower and simpler, people had more spare time.

Nonsense. People back then were saying the same thing
about those of 50 years past.

>Ya didn't mess with girls until you were 16-17.

More nonsense. :-)

>There were no home computers. There were ham
>stores in every populated area.

I can drive 2 miles to an HRO outlet in Burbank, CA. It's in a
mini-mall across Buena Vista from another mini-mall. :-)

>There was no horde of CBers, no cell phones, no Internet, endless list.

Let's look at the state of the art of radio for amateurs in 1958.
Vacuum tube technology for everything. Rock-bound
frequency control...deluxe was a VFO. No direct-reading
frequency meters. Sharp-selectivity IF filters was only just
starting and they were expen$ive. One had to wait at least
20 minutes until everything warmed up to reduce the drift.
Almost everything was HF since VHF and above was the
Twilight Zone inhabited only by gurus and wizards. :-)

One peaked the PA grid, dipped the PA plate and the PA
output was a pi-network for an under-150 Watt rig. Want
to have a multi-band HF transmitter? Good luck. Those
were not common at all unless there was Money. There
were more Urban Legends on technology than there was
textbook information for anyone, amateurs included. The
commercial people making things for HF were small in
number but high in experience...on tube technology.

>It's all changed and I have my doubts about how much "better off " ham radio
>is today vs. 1958 even though the number of hams then was some small
>fraction of today's license count.

What did amateurs have in 1998? Multi-band HF rigs, a
few of which could hit 6m. Frequency control was rock-
solid on ANY frequency, any band. Solid-state PAs
that didn't require touchy-touchy tuning at the higher HF
bands. Sharp-skirted crystal filters for receiver selectivity,
DSP for brick-wall filtering. Very high 3rd order IM
characteristics and sensitivities down to noise level of
50 Ohm impedances. Push-button modulation selection

of CW, AM, SSB, or FM. All kinds of towers and beams
and rotators available for purchase, you install or hire
somebody for grunt work. No problem. Want VHF or
UHF? No problem there. Select a band or two and there
is a rig available. Want an HT with rechargeable battery?
No problem...lots of bells and whistles in a little box.
Need an antenna tuner? No problem, take your choice of
manual or automatic, be able to read forward or reverse
power at a glance. All ready to go out of the box.

Anyone who wants to go back to 1958 is nuts!

didit

1099. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 06:45:25 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010120014525.22779.00000701@nso-fa.aol.com>
Source record: 1349

In article <94a2g1$t8l$1@nnrp1.deja.com>, horseshoestew@my-deja.com writes:

<snip to just one paragraph>

>I look at the current "communications gap" situation that is developing
>between the United States and Japan/Europe in the same vein as
>the "missle gap" that started to develop between the USA and USSR in
>1958. However, today's problem is probably more real and dangerous,
>yet less obvious, and more insidious than the problem of 1958. There
>will be no "Sputnik" to help immediately shock us back to our senses,
>and therefore no equivelant to the National Defense Education Act will
>be forthcoming anytime soon.

I don't understand this "communications gap" that is supposed
to be developing. What has been going on is rather intense
competition for commercial communications all over the world.
For a long while Asia has been leading that area due to low
production costs. Now north Europe is cutting into that market.
A cross-country drive across 2/3 of the USA will demonstrate
that, via all the antenna poles and towers that weren't there two
decades ago, the USA has been adding communications
facilities aplenty. I don't recall seeing any foreigners coming
into the USA to install all that equipment.

If one can get the gist of this alleged "communications gap,"
it does not impact amateur radio. All of that commercial
communications infrastructure was put in by commercial
communications workers, trained by commercial
communications firms. The active and passive devices used
in all that commercial communications has been largely
developed in the USA. Want technical information on that?
Go to the USA component makers' websites. Plenty of
data available. Input from USA radio amateurs was a
virtual zero...the whole infrastructure is commercial, not
amateur.

Is there some kind of insidious "missle gap" or equivalent
now? 43 years after 1958? I don't think so in the military
or commercial communications of the USA. The USA
has learned to live with the threat of nuclear warfare and
intercontinental ballistic missles...and has long since come
up with a counter to that, the rather horrifying MAD. The USA
has a rather strong military...whose communications is not
modeled on any amateur radio standards and practices.

Somehow, in all the 43 years since 1958, this tremendous commercial-military structure has been created without having to interest "young people" in fun amateur radio to provide some sort of base of radio knowledge. Radio has evolved rather far since tube days and old analog radio technology has become much more electronic in nature, including digital techniques so much that there is little differentiation between analog and digital.

The existing Novice class license has been failing for years. The negative trend numbers are clearly visible. The existing Novice class license has been around for a long time and no one has bothered to "fix" it to attract enough newcomers to keep it alive. One has to look much farther into the reasons for that failure, not sugar-coat over a virtual Novice class with some new name and saying that this window dressing will make it work. Very unlikely.

didit

1100. Re: CA power crisis caused by internet

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 06:45:26 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010120014526.22779.00000702@nso-fa.aol.com>
Source record: 1351

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.g7fl4m4.pminews@ca.news.verio.net>, "Phil Kane"
<Phil.Kane@nospam.spam> writes:

>On 19 Jan 2001 20:43:30 GMT, Len Over 21 wrote:
>
>>> IIRC the DWP was exempt from the CPUC's fiat that production
>>> facilities be sold. If SCE, SDGE, and PG&E were allowed to
>>> keep their dynamos as well, would there have been a "shortage"?
>>> Doubtful.
>>
>>Phil, the LA Department of Water and Power is a municipal
>>agency.
>
> It is well established law that a governmental agency that is
> engaged in a commercial activity that is equal to or in direct
> competition with similar private sector enterprises does not
> automatically enjoy "exempt" status that governmetal agencies
> otherwise enjoy. The Legislature or the CPUC has to grant that
> status, usually by the use of the term "investor-owned utilities"
> in either the statutes or CPUC Orders.

Okay, who is the private sector enterprise that is in direct
competition with the LA DWP? I'm curious since I've not
heard of any private sector competitor of electric power to
the LA DWP since I moved out here.

>>As of today, Friday, the DWP is selling close to 9 GWatts
>
> 9 GW is 9000 MW....equal to NINE units of nuclear power
> plant generation (1 "unit" is 1000 MW). Five plants the size
> of Diablo Canyon. Hard to believe. Where are they hiding them?

Bad note taking during breakfast while listening to TV news
on one subject and carrying on conversation with wife on
another subject. Let me correct my error by a quote from
page B4, LA Times Valley Edition for 19 January 2001:

"On Wednesday, the DWP provided a crucial 300 to 700
megawatts per hour, or 10% to 20% of its output, to the
state power grid as controlled blackouts rolled across
much of California. Meanwhile, the 3.8 million Los
Angeles residents wom the DWP serves had plenty of
money."

Phil, nobody is "hiding" any DWP electric power
generation plants. The one locally called "The Four

Stacks" (visible from the hill above my house) is on aeronautical sectional charts.

Yes, Phil, I made an error in numbers. Mea culpa.

The maximum electrical power generation of the LA DWP is roughly 3500 MWe (if everything is on-line), a personal input from an Electrical Engineer who works for the DWP.

I'm sorry your QTH (or 10-20 or whatever) is being hit with rolling blackouts. Down here in Los Angeles there are no rolling blackouts. Los Angeles DWP also has a praised general manager named S. David Freeman, new to DWP as of three years ago but very experienced in utility management. What is happening is that the LA DWP already has the capacity to help out the rest of the state and is doing so without disturbing its regular customers.

Locally the DWP manager is under political fire because Freeman hasn't charged enough per MWHR according to LA Mayor Richard Riordan. Riordan is worried about $170 million in electric power sales revenue already owed the DWP by the grid's customers. It seems to me that this "little" municipal electric facility is trying to help the rest of the state and is getting dissed rather unfairly by Californians farther north. TS. :-(

The LA DWP has the MWe capacity to serve its customers and still sell power to other power companies.. Other, private electric power suppliers don't have enough capacity. The only conclusion to be drawn there is Bad Management of the private companies. [I'm sure your mileage may vary]

didit

1101. Re: "They oughta require a license....blah, blah, blah"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 06:45:27 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010120014527.22779.00000703@nso-fa.aol.com>
Source record: 1348

In article <fW3a6.1008$e5.2507723@news.ntplx.net>, "Ed Hare, W1RFI"
<w1rfi@arrl.net> writes:

>> Are the "illegals" always non-amateur? Does a "kerchunk"
>> carry any ID of the kerchunker? :-)
>
>The one doing the kerchunking is indeed always illegal. Transmitter
>fingerprinting has been used to successfully ID several kerchunkers over the
>years.

OOs and run-of-the-mill hams can ID them illegal kerchunkers with
"fingerprint techniques?"

...OK... :-)

didit

1102. Re: It's like this....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 06:48:47 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <94bccf$96j$1@208.206.142.99>
Source record: 1352

>
>
> Steven J Robeson, K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com> wrote:

> I'd say you're trolling for a reason to CALL someone a jerk,
> Burke...

Jerk, Burke.... That has REAL ring to it.

1103. Re: CA power crisis caused by internet

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 07:03:43 UTC
From: Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com>
Message-ID: <3A69384F.55BCE830@dvol.com>
Source record: 1353

Len Over 21 wrote:

> One of the political idiocies going on is the LA Mayor angry
> at the DWP general manager for not charging enough on
> outside sale (about 6 cents per KWHR, roughly nominal
> in current trading charges). It's nonsense. Mayor Riordan
> is still involved in a rivalry with the Bay Area, insisting on
> "showing no mercy." :-)

>
Idiot. Goes a long way toward promoting cooperation on regional problems. None of us are out here alone.
>

> Lots of former Lockheed employees who stayed here insist
> that Lockheed got the shaft from the state and from the
> incorporated city of Burbank, Lockheed's home since 1930
> or so. In one way, environmentalists were responsible for
> Lockheed having had to spend an enormous sum for a water
> treatement plant at the tin-bending complex off Buena Vista
> (a half dozen or so large buildings, now all razed). After
> completion the city wasn't satisfied with test results, wanted
> much more not stated originally. Coupled with excessive
> state taxes, Lockheed called it quits for corporate HQ and
> moved.

>
So would I if I was Lockheed. The town fathers obviously shot themselves in the foot, they lost the jobs *and* the property tax income by being stupid. Same old, same old, they'll never learn.
>
I'm sensitive to enviormental issues but this mindless PC overkill has gotta be brought under control.
>
Brings up a piece I read a few years back. Somebody sorted thru ancient Spanish archives related to the history of the earlist Jesuit efforts to do their thing in what is now the LA basin. The locals were of course were quite ambivalent Indians who advised the Jesuits that setting up a mission in that neighbohood was not a very good idea. The Indians knew the game, the topography and wind patterns are such that they never set up camp in the LA basin because the smoke from their campfires simply stayed there and choked 'em. Their name for the LA basin was "The Valley of Smoke", decent fishing but no place to actually live.
>
Hello?
>

>Unstable

> >power availability has to be a hot topic in the Silicon Valley board rooms.
>
> Many places large and small. Today's paper carried a story
> about a store specializing in black leather clothing...rather
> hard to display such wares without lighting. :-)

>
. . . uhhhh . . OK . . . !

>
> ...and some elected state politicians are going to face
> rather severe problems in trying to get re-elected.

>
I'll tellya whut: If I was a Californian I'd be out on the streets working
overtime to make damned sure they got dumped at the first opportunity.
>

> All of California's budget surplus just disappeared...got trans-
> ported to a bunch of overcharging electric power suppliers.
>
> Legalized greed is my term for it. :-(

>
All they had to do was not go for the quick buck and think ahead, they did not do
that. They are dead meat now and they done it to themselves.
>

> didit

>
w3rv

1104. Re: CA power crisis caused by internet

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 07:08:31 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <94bdhf$96j$2@208.206.142.99>
Source record: 1354

W4JLE wrote:
>
> Len, not one time have I made derogatory remarks towards you, nor have I
> made nasty remarks about your positions I disagree with.

Oh,that won't matter at all. He has an ingrained hatred for anyone who
holds an Extra Class ham license. That is, a REAL one that required a
real code test.
I think his Mama was scared by the ghost of Mr. Morse when she was
carrying him.

1105. Re: Before responding to the Colt thread.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 07:14:54 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <94bdte$96j$3@208.206.142.99>
Source record: 1355

Qrm2000 wrote:
>
> If you respond to the Colt License Proposal thread, please drop
> alt.radio.family from the header. The majority of FRS users are simply
> American families using these low-powered radios as short-range "intercoms".
> They are not radio hobbists. Thanks.

Be glad to. It's not a serious proposal anyway, Stewart is just
Teazing you.

1106. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 07:27:33 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <94bel5gfv0@208.206.142.99>
Source record: 1356
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,alt.radio.family,rec.radio.cb

'Doc wrote:
>
> Stewart,
> Why are you wasting your time and ours with this? There
> is already an 'entry level' license. It sounds like you
> are advocating another 'junk' license. Give it a rest.
> 'Doc

Don't worry, Doc, FCC will promptly file it in the (Ahem!) proper file.

1107. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 08:01:38 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <94bgl2lot0@208.206.142.99>
Source record: 1357
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Brian Kelly wrote:
>
> > Were there any pushes back then to get more young people
> > interested in Amateur Radio?
>
> >
> There was no lack of young people then, I was one. Kids flooded into the
> hobby. The creation of the Novice license in 1951 was extremely successful
> in luring kids into ham radio. The availability and readily accesibile
> dirt-cheap military surplus radios and parts was another huge boosting
> factor. Any kid could and many did get on HF for well under a hundred bucks
> in 2001 dollars. Srounging was an artform and part of a perenially-broke kid
> becoming a ham and a lot of fun in itself.
> >
> Just about all large high schools had school-supported ham clubs and club
> stations. The 80 & 40m Novice bands crawled with other kids. A kid could
> actually understand the circuitry and get a soldering iron into the radios.
> The VHF & UHF bands were for experimentation for the most part. There were
> very few antenna and tower restrictions, "real people" didn't live in
> apartments. If you were a kid interested in electronics the customary
> gateway to an EE was a ham ticket. Got ya points with admissions officers.
> >
> Life in general was also very different from today. The overall pace of life
> was slower and simpler, people had more spare time. Ya didn't mess with
> girls until you were 16-17. There were no home computers. There were ham
> stores in every populated area. There was no horde of CBers, no cell
> phones, no Internet, endless list.
> >
> It's all changed and I have my doubts about how much "better off " ham radio
> is today vs. 1958 even though the number of hams then was some small
> fraction of today's license count.

Entry into ham radio today is for the middle aged to the retired, for
those who "always wanted to but never had the time or extra money, job
and family responsibilities kept me out", etc, etc. Kids have no clue
nor any interest.

In the eight years I worked as a VE we handled almost no kids, nor
anyone under age 30. There were a few females, but very darn few. Most
of the crowd were aged 35 and up, with the oldest at age 80.

My VE time ended over 7 years ago and I don't think it has done
anything but get worse since then. At that time we had no Internet
access in this rural region. The arrival of that passtime pretty well

cinched it.

1108. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 08:01:53 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <1ehi6ts40iapn7smdgafmn7v63n4soe31d@4ax.com>
Source record: 1358

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
>Let's look at the state of the art of radio for amateurs in 1958.
>Vacuum tube technology for everything.

I was using a CK722 ($5 retail) audio transistor mod
in my homebrew super-regen SW receiver...

>Almost everything was HF since VHF and above was the
>Twilight Zone inhabited only by gurus and wizards. :-)

In 1958 in Phoenix we had quite a large VHF club. Maybe 50 members. We had a weekly net on 50.34 Mc. AM. I was using a BC-455 surplus arc5 receiver fed by an International Crystal converter. My transmitter was a Globe Scout 680. The antenna was a 4 element Taco beam with an "armstrong" rotator. Twilight Zone? gurus and wizards? Hardly. I was a Junior in high school at the time. I did work a lot of DX with that setup though as we were coming up on the best sunspot peak in recorded history... :-)

> Want to have a multi-band HF transmitter? Good luck.

My Globe Scout covered 80 thru 6 meters unmodified...

>Anyone who wants to go back to 1958 is nuts!

Well, as I recall the girls were prettier, and the cars and radios were neater. But besides that, heck no I wouldn't go... :-)

1109. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 08:10:00 UTC
From: "Steven J Robeson", K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <94bh4n$34m$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1361

In article <94ama3ffc1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
horseshoestew@my-deja.com wrote:
> In article <94ak6udrg1@nnrp1.deja.com>,

> If ARS is to "compete" with MURS, we are going to have to come up with
> something new.

Uhhhhhh......Let's see.....

Satellites, APRS, HF DX, V/UHF repeaters, Moonbounce, DIGITAL
modes, PSK31, ARES, ATV, SSTV, QRP, contesting...

Yeah, Stewart, I can see how someone could get bored with Ham
Radio and give it all up for 2 watt MURS radios...

Now, PLEASE tell us how MURS is going to stimulate all those young
minds...???
--
"If You're Not A Ham....You're SPAM!"

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1110. Re: The Real Bill Clinton Legacy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 08:12:13 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3A69482B.562482E8@sccoast.net>
Source record: 1359
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

darrell earnshaw wrote:
>
> Of course you are entitled to your own
> interpretations and views. However, this
> newsgroup is about amateur radio, not
> politics, relgion, or other unrelated issues,
> and it is an inappropriate forum for personal
> soapboxes on issues unrelated to amateur radio.
> I also suspect that most subscribers to the NG
> probably couldn't care less about US politics or
> domestic issues -- newsgroups are not just for
> domestic US consumption - they're international.
> I'm sure there's a "US.politics.domestic.anti-
> liberals" or something newsgroup somewhere
> out there which is more appropriate.
>
> No disrespect intended.

That's fine, Darrell. However, I suggest that you read back over the last few months (or years, if you prefer) to see the number of politically related discussions in this newsgroup. In other words, political topics have been part of this newsgroup since its very beginning.

And there are several reasons for this. The main one is that many of the regulars in this newsgroup post here rather than chasing each other around the newsgroups simply because it is easier.

Of course, this should not bother you since you're free not to read anything that does not interest you (nobody forced you to click on my message and read it). In other words, if you see a topic that does not interest you, simply move on to other discussions.

Obviously that is hard to do when you don't agree with the content of the message you're complaining about. And it is especially hard when you cannot think of an effective argument against what is said in that message. So, instead, its easier in this case to fall back on the old "this is a ham radio newsgroup and the message is inappropriate" argument in an effort to hopefully end the discussion before it gets started.

Likewise, no disrespect intended, Darrell.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net

1111. Re: The Real Bill Clinton Legacy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 08:17:23 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3A694960.2C21738A@sccoast.net>
Source record: 1360
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

vk4lld@netinc.au wrote:
>
> Please take your American politics to
> alt.bloody.sleazy.washington newsgroup.
> This one is an international forum about
> amateur radio and not about second-rate
> governments in north america.
>
> In other words, bugger off mate.

My response to Darrell Earnshaw can serve as a response to your comments also. After all, I have to "bugger off," so I don't have time for a individualized response.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net

1112. Re: The Real Bill Clinton Legacy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 08:23:51 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3A694AE1.7174C12E@sccoast.net>
Source record: 1362
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

W6DKN wrote:
>
> Apparently you haven't been reading this
> newsgroup for very long...

I don't think he has read the newsgroup at all. Just glancing through the subject headers, at this very moment there are discussions about prisons, the California power crisis, cellphones, gay web sites, top ten most popular alchoholic beverages, and Jesse Jackson. Its not about politics - he just didn't like what I said.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net

1113. Re: Before responding to the Colt thread.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 08:40:59 UTC
From: "Steven J Robeson", K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <94biur$59q$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1363
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <20010119225146.19838.00000247@ng-fj1.aol.com>,
qrm2000@aol.com (Qrm2000) wrote:

>>"alt.radio.family" IS a valid forum for his ideas, as irrelevant as
>>they may be.

>A copy of my message to Stewart is in rec.radio.cb. It asks him to
>post to alt.radio.family separately. The reason is based on past
>experience with his posts.

OK, here's the direct question: As well intentioned (and I
understand your frustrations...he CAN be tiring...) as your efforts to
redirect his posts, ON WHOSE AUTHORITY do you do it? What writ of law
do you bear that carries any weight to try and force his hand?

And unless I miss something, you have no name. At least he puts a
name to his.

>If you are a regular reader of alt.radio.family and the e-groups for
>FRS, you will recall that about once a month, somebody posts a message
>lamenting the fact that they can't get other people to answer them
>when called. This is a common FRS experience, regardless of what part
>of the United States one is in.

And "calling CQ" is the only milestone by which you
measure "hobbyist"...?!?!

>FCC rules discourage "hobby" activities on FRS.

They SPECIFICALLY discourage hobby activities on 11 meters too,
but guess what...?!?!

>The range is very limited. One cannot modify equipment or attach
>external antennas. Moreover, the percentage of FRS users who will
>respond to a stranger is very small. Most wish to speak only with
>members of their own group, and they will employ CTCSS codes and
>scrambling models to accomplish this. In those rare cases where they
>do respond to a stranger, the norm is a brief exchange. As soon as
>the novelty wears off, it's over, as quickly as it began.

Then it seems having eGroup's and entire "newsgroups" on so
minimal an asset is pretty wasteful.

However, I do know that there ARE persons (and no small number)
that are using FRS to supplement their 11 meter and scanner activities.

Seems awfully "hobby oriented" to me.

> If your FRS experience differs, we welcome your reports.

> QRM

> (posted & mailed)

And your name is...?!?!
--
"If You're Not A Ham....You're SPAM!"

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1114. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 11:09:41 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <94brlkame1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1364

In article <_PO96.1507$ed.895875@nntp2.onemain.com>,
"Richard McCollum" <rmccoll@radiks.net> wrote:
>
> "Brian" <brianburke@my-deja.com> wrote in message
> news:947s0e$271$1@nnrp1.deja.com...
> >
> > True story.
> >
> > Just after the no-code Tech license was authorized, I heard a QSO in
> > progress on the 146.85 machine in St Louis. An OT with a brand new
NCT
> > license/call was getting reamed by a 2x2 named Curtis. It appeared
that
> > the Tech had identified himself sayng "Oh" where the "Zero" should
have
> > been. The 2x2 was calling the new ham a stupid idiot.
> >
> > The Tech explained that it was an "Oh" and not a zero because the
> > instructor in his Tech class said in ham radio the sero is ALWAYS
> > slashed. The sero on the license wasn't slashed.
> >
> > Then a few other hams tried to intercede and change the subject, but
NO.
> > Curt just wouldn't let it go. It really got ugly and I was
embarassed
> > for ham radio and felt sorry that the new ham had to get that kind
of
> > greeting.
> >
> > Now Dick will come on here and say that the new Tech should already
> > know everything there is to know about ham radio and "should have
known"
> > that it couldn't have been an "Oh." After all, he passed a test.
>
> Sorry to see my old machine -- I built ABE 4 -- sink to this level.
That
> sort of BS is why we put it on in the first place. 'Youse vill march
in
> schtrait lines und youse vill like it' was certainly the motto of some
of
> the local machines; our's was 'if it don't get you in trouble with
Sam, we
> don't care'.

Dick, believe it or not, this was the 1st and last time I heard Curtis on the machine. I recall one ham telling him that the root word of his name was "curteous."

Supposedly had a ham brother around.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1115. Re: 10 bucks buys a ham license.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 11:19:02 UTC
From: Exham@nospam.com
Message-ID: <3a697372.1288175@news.accessnv.com>
Source record: 1365
Cross-posted to: radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Tue, 16 Jan 2001 21:11:58 -0600, "Steve Woodruff"
<sjwoodr.nospam@nospam.email.com> wrote:

>"D. S. Platt" <jeepp@erols.com> wrote in message

>I have no problem paying a fee.... but i was suprised tonight to learn that
>i had to pay the $10 fee for EACH exam i took. I upgraded to general, and had
>intentions of attempting the extra class exam.... but when i found out it would cost me
>an additional $10 i figured i'd wait until next month when i could be
>reasonably sure that i'd pass with ease.

Correct me if I am wrong but isn't that illegal under the FCC rules?
Doesn't it say "regardless of the number of elements taken"? Maybe
you should have a talk with the VEC. Sounds like they owe you a
freebie.

Sec. 97.527 Reimbursement for expenses.

(b) The maximum amount of reimbursement from any one examinee for
any one examination at a particular session regardless of the number
of examination elements taken must not exceed that announced by the
FCC in a Public Notice. (The basis for the maximum fee is $4.00 for
1984, adjusted annually each January 1 thereafter for changes in the
Department of Labor Consumer Price Index.)

1116. Re: 10 bucks buys a ham license.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 11:25:42 UTC
From: Exham@nospam.com
Message-ID: <3a697521.1719157@news.accessnv.com>
Source record: 1366
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Thu, 18 Jan 2001 17:23:26 -0600, "Steve Woodruff"
<sjwoodr.nospam@nospam.email.com> wrote:

>I really don't have anything to complain about... i didn't pay the
>additional fee -- i just didn't take the extra class exam after I
>passed the general class one.

Yes you do have something to complain about. It's going to cost you
another $10 to take the Extra exam at the next session when it should
have been included in the last session. Whether you took it when you
upgraded for general or later, they are still going to charge you an
extra $10. I'd show them the FCC regulation (I posted it here in
another reply to you) and ask for a freebie.

1117. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 11:53:48 UTC
From: Bruce Muscolino <w6toy@erols.com>
Message-ID: <3A697C4C.943281BF@erols.com>
Source record: 1367
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,alt.radio.family,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc

Stewart,

The Netherlands implemented a license class very close to what you propose back about 1985 or so. A communicators license intended to bring the Citizens Band under control. About 5 frequencies were set aside in the two meter band for users. A ham license was granted with no code and only a simple theory test, about adequate to determine if the on light was on! People flocked to get in on the simple ham license. The government hoped if they were really interested they would upgrade, and if they weren't they could still take advantage of the thrill of communication and not bother the others. Holland requires evidence of a ham license before you can buy a ham radio,

The result? Almost no upgrades. Those who got into it stayed there. IS that what you want for our kids?

73

Stewart R Teaze wrote:
>
> The rapidly-expanding Family Radio Service has exposed millions of young
> people to the world
> of radio communications.

1118. Re: Top ten signs you've visited a Hiram, GA chiropractor

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 14:35:14 UTC
From: KC8JBO <roger_kc8jbo@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <94c7n2iar1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1368
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Stagger Lee" <SLee@houston.net> wrote in message
news:3A68F732.5473F3D4@houston.net...

Hey, gutless coward, you still molesting your grandkids????

> Top ten signs you've visited a Hiram, GA chiropractor
>
> 10. When you walk, you make a wacky accordion sound.
> 9. Keeps saying, "A spine is like a box of chocolates."
> 8. Repeatedly asks, "You a cop? You sure you ain't no cop?"
> 7. Over and over, you hear crunching sounds followed by "Uh-oh."
> 6. There's a two-drink minimum.
> 5. At end of session, lies down on the table and says, "My turn!"
> 4. He was trained by Roger Wiseman.

No, he'd be trained by Oris Grimm the 2nd..............

> 3. Rushes in late to your appointment, still wearing his Burger
King
> uniform.
> 2. Hints that for an extra $50, he'll "straighten" something else.
> 1. You're fully-clothed and he's naked.

Damn, oris.....

--
73 de Roger, KC8JBO
EM99 |ARRL|VE [ARRL & W5YI]|ARES |RACES
Yaesu FT-920 |Inverted Vee @ 40 ft.
Yaesu FT-90R

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1119. Re: Top ten most popular alchoholic beverages in Hiram, GA

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 14:37:42 UTC
From: KC8JBO <roger_kc8jbo@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <94c7rmibk1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1369
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Stagger Lee" <SLee@houston.net> wrote in message
news:3A68E87C.5CA1116A@houston.net...
> Top ten most popular alchoholic beverages in Hiram, GA
>
> 10. Really, Really, Really, Really Old Milwaukee
> 9. Wisemann Scotch

Sorry, heroin addict, try harder.....
Your food stamps just don't let you buy your Thunderbird, do they,
Lenny?

> 8. Amaretto Di Hiram
> 7. Orville Redenbacher's Butter-flavored Vodka
> 6. McBourbon
> 5. Dinty Moore's Pork 'n' Booze
> 4. Ernest, Julio, Tom and Roseanne Gallo
> 3. Dr. Scholl's Medicated Tequila
> 2. Seagrams 7, Braves 0
> 1. Chivas Du Sterno

I'd advise you to keep me out of your pissing contest with W4AMP...
just a friendly warning....
--
73 de Roger, KC8JBO
EM99 |ARRL|VE [ARRL & W5YI]|ARES |RACES
Yaesu FT-920 |Inverted Vee @ 40 ft.
Yaesu FT-90R

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1120. Re: Top ten problems being a Glendale, WV ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 14:41:04 UTC
From: KC8JBO <roger_kc8jbo@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <94c820ilk1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1372
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <3A68F56E.E46FF77B@houston.net>,
Stagger Lee <SLee@houston.net> wrote:
> Top ten problems being a Glendale, WV ham

Projecting your lifestyle onto others... Child molester?????
--
73 de Roger, KC8JBO
EM99 |ARRL|VE [ARRL & W5YI]|ARES |RACES
Yaesu FT-920 |Inverted Vee @ 40 ft.
Yaesu FT-90R

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1121. Re: Top ten signs your phone company is in Glendale, WV

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 14:43:25 UTC
From: KC8JBO <roger_kc8jbo@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <94c86cimv1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1370
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <3A68F35F.119A8161@houston.net>,
Stagger Lee <SLee@houston.net> wrote:
>
>
> Top ten signs <slap!>

Poor queer Tex AASS boy.....how's that AIDS coming along????
"Stagger Lee" here has quite a criminal record for his pedophilia.
Actually it's a much better company than yours in TEXASSS, which uses
used tin cans and a piece of string. My phone company is that newly
merged one of Bell Atlantic and GTE.....
Now run along and finish watching those old Sailor Moon tapes......

--
73 de Roger, KC8JBO
EM99 |ARRL|VE [ARRL & W5YI]|ARES |RACES
Yaesu FT-920 |Inverted Vee @ 40 ft.
Yaesu FT-90R

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1122. Re: Top ten signs you're in a Hiram, GA hospital

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 14:45:01 UTC
From: KC8JBO <roger_kc8jbo@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <94c89d$io0$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1371
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Stagger Lee" <SLee@houston.net> wrote in message
news:3A68E9D7.6CDB4026@houston.net...
> Top ten signs you're in a Hiram, GA hospital
>
> 10. You go in for routine surgery, you come out with a tail.
> 9. You recognize your doctor as kid who was mopping the lobby when
> you checked in.
> 8. Instead of sponge bath, they send in a St. Bernard to lick
you.
> 7. As you're going under, your surgeon says, "man, am I baked."
> 6. In operating room, you see Roger Wisemann scrubbing up.

Only one"n" in Wiseman, heroin addict!!!!!

> 5. Every couple of minutes you hear a bugle playing taps.
> 4. All the diplomas on the wall are signed by Sally Struthers.
> 3. You and your roommate have to take turns on the I.V.
> 2. Through fog of anesthesia, you hear surgeon shouting, "bring
the
> damn scotch tape!"
> 1. Instead of "patient" they use the term "plaintiff."

Tell us why your old lady made you take all your SHITTY ham equipment
out to that unfinished cinder-block hut.

--
73 de Roger, KC8JBO
EM99 |ARRL|VE [ARRL & W5YI]|ARES |RACES
Yaesu FT-920 |Inverted Vee @ 40 ft.
Yaesu FT-90R

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1123. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 15:05:32 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccoll@radiks.net>
Message-ID: <RMha6.488$1x1.689447@nntp3.onemain.com>
Source record: 1373

"Bruce Muscolino" <w6toy@erols.com> wrote in message
news:3A697C4C.943281BF@erols.com...
>
> The result? Almost no upgrades. Those who got into it stayed there.
> IS that what you want for our kids?
>
> 73
>

That has been the history of codeless tickets everywhere.

1124. Re: Top ten most popular alchoholic beverages in Hiram, GA

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 15:11:50 UTC
From: RWZ <>
Message-ID: <ekaj6tsa5gllgv917k047lhts612vmbsop@4ax.com>
Source record: 1374
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Sat, 20 Jan 2001 14:37:42 GMT, KC8JBO <roger_kc8jbo@my-deja.com>
wrote:

>I'd advise you to keep me out of your pissing contest with W4AMP...
>just a friendly warning....

You are REALLY scary. BOO! Asshole.

1125. Re: Before responding to the Colt thread.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 15:25:15 UTC
From: horseshoestew@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <94cakm$kh9$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1375
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <94biur$59q$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
Steven J Robeson, K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com> wrote:
> >FCC rules discourage "hobby" activities on FRS.
>
> They SPECIFICALLY discourage hobby activities on 11 meters too,
> but guess what...?!?!
>

Yes - this is the crux of my point in including the CB group in the
original post. 11 meters is no place for newcomers to be learning.

QRM;

I do understand your concern about the vile nature of CB, and CB posts moving into FRS and the FRS newsgroup. I don't know if you have noticed, but FRS IS becoming a bit more like CB everyday, and, I think we can all agree, CB is obviously not the place for our kids to be learning about radio. The more serious ones need somewhere to go. I have been working on an update to my proposal with significant changes based on the comments I have received(most importantly, I will be using the traditional term "Novice Class" to describe the class), and I will only post it to the r.r.a.p., and a.r.f. newsgroups.

Also, QRM makes a good point about staying on subject. Criticism is good, but let's all of us try to keep things related directly to the subject, and be on our best behaviour(my "Sputnik" diversion, while interesting to some, and which I thought might be relevant, turned out not to be on subject). Most importantly, I would like to ask folks not to reply to CB-like trolls and baits.

Finally, some may ask if I am serious about this... Yes, I am. It is sometimes difficult for me to see my ideas get ripped to shreds before my eyes, but I've gotten better at understanding peoples concerns, and using them to make the proposal better.

--
------- Stewart - N0MHS --------
Wireless Entertainment/Communication Devices, Networks, and
Public Radio Services Information(MURS,FRS,GMRS,ARS,CB):
http://www.pubcel.com

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1126. Re: Follow the Money

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 15:34:03 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <94cb5b$kt3$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1376
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,alt.radio.family,rec.radio.cb

In article <94am2q$fc8$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
horseshoestew@my-deja.com wrote:

> > Suddenly this proposal for the "Barbie Doll" Amateur Radio license
> > isn't quite so senseless.
>
> I've never tried to hide the fact that I'm trying to create a
> business. Quite the opposite - why would I list the web site on the
> signature to all my posts, if I was trying to hide something
>
> Hey, Hans, I wonder why you switched your approach to this slimly
> veiled "personal attack"? It couldn't be that I was right about the
> point regarding inductors and capacitors on the Novice test, could it?

Don't be paranoid! I didn't say you were hiding anything.
I didn't say it was wrong to have a business (lot's of people
have ham radio businesses). I just pointed out that I now have
a better insight into the reasons for your nonsensical proposal.
Doesn't make you a bad person.

73, de Hans, K0HB

PS: My old ARRL license manual has questions about capacitors and
inductors in the Novice section, so you weren't "right about the
point".

--
"We are fellow travelers on a journey between two
eternities, and it's a trip far too brief for me
to be concerned about your speed at the Code of
Morse."

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1127. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 15:37:27 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <94cbbnkvf1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1382

In article <94akj6$e1i$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
Steven J Robeson, K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com> wrote:

> Noble effort, Don Quixote.

Can we limit the discussion to the idea, and not degrade this to
a discussion of personalities?

Thanks.

73, Hans, K0HB

--
"We are fellow travelers on a journey between two
eternities, and it's a trip far too brief for me
to be concerned about your speed at the Code of
Morse."

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1128. Re: It's like this....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 15:41:37 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010120104137.00714.00003152@nso-md.aol.com>
Source record: 1377

In article <949a92$6rk$1@nnrp1.deja.com>, Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
writes:

>
>However, taken in the context of the Clint DeSoto thread where I
>highlighted the idea of an amateur radio brotherhood, he implied that
>hams talking to hams OVER THE INTERNET have no need to share in any ham
>brotherhood.
>
>Such an idea spouted from your mouth in years gone by. You appear to
>have a loyal following.

Brian:

As long as I continue to speak the truth, why shouldn't I have a
loyal following? This is Usenet. A part of the Internet. It is not
Amateur Radio in any way, shape, or form. In this and other
amateur-radio related newsgroups, amateur radio is the major
topic, but still, ham radio it's not. We are not communicating
over-the-air on assigned amateur radio frequencies or operating
under the authority of our FCC-granted amateur radio licenses.
No such license is required to post here. To pick up the mic
of my 2-meter rig, press the PTT button, and say "K3LT
listening," I need a license. To post here, I don't. Get the idea
now, Brian?

73 de Larry, K3LT

1129. Re: Will you let them take away your guns?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 15:41:38 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010120104138.00714.00003153@nso-md.aol.com>
Source record: 1380

In article <3A68CB17.A30F2F15@uci.edu>, Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> writes:

>
>> In such a situation, an armed response by law-abiding citizens would
>> definitely be in order....
>
>You gotta be nuts, Larry.

Jim:

Do me a favor? As your punishment for deliberately truncating my
quote, in order to mask its complete meaning, make a nice, tight
fist, and slam it into your mouth at high velocity. Continue to do
so until at least three teeth are completely dislodged.

Here's what I really said:

"In such a situation, an armed response by law-abiding citizens would
definitely be in order to prevent the armed environmentalists, convicted
felons, abortion rights activists, and Ku Klux Klansmen from *actually*
shooting our elected Congressmen and Senators."

>> What causes are you willing to fight and die for, Jim? Are you willing
>> to die for baby killers, tree-huggers, and violent racists?
>
>The guys in the Revolutionary War, and World Wars I and II did. So if I
>was in the military, I guess I would have to also.

Don't look now, Jim, but nobody who ever fought in any U.S. war as
a U.S. serviceperson ever died for baby killers, tree huggers, or
violent racists. They died for the cause of freedom, not what people
do with their freedom. The fact that a certain segment of our
society misuses their freedom to create a sick society doesn't
diminish the sacrifice of those who fought to ensure that our
freedom continued to exist.

>> (I consider myself to be an "environmentalist" also),
>
>I meant to write eco-terrorists. You aren't one of them too, are you?

Nope. I'm not any kind of terrorist. I abhor terrorism. I am, if
anything, an "anti-terrorist."

>> the people you
>> mention above are just amoral, self-serving criminals.
>
>Right. So as long as it's a group you happen to agree with, it's

>constitutional for them to start an armed rebellion. That's what I
>thought.

Jim, there is such a thing as right and wrong, and I'm intelligent
enough to be able to make that distinction. If you are not, then
I can understand the problem you're having in understanding my
post.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1130. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 15:41:39 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010120104139.00714.00003155@nso-md.aol.com>
Source record: 1378

In article <4%3a6.1011$e5.2508160@news.ntplx.net>, "Ed Hare, W1RFI"
<w1rfi@arrl.net> writes:

>
>You may be right that most who learn the code will actually possess
>equipment to use it, if they stay active as hams, but I know many a
>code-tested ham who has no equipment at all, as well as a few who literally
>had the code-key burying cermony in their back yards, surrounded by all
>their friends. I also know a larger number of hams who passed a 13 wpm test,
>but would have difficulty getting past 5 wpm today.
>
>Your mileage may vary.

Ed:

The hams who have the "code-key burying cermony (sic) in their
back yards" are a perfect example of the slack-jawed, drooling,
knuckle-dragging ignorance of trailer-trash hams I've been talking
about in this newsgripe for years! Those who learn the code well
enough to somehow pass the tests, and never make a regular
practice of using CW on-the-air are also very common (in every
sense of the term). Nobody's mileage varies on that.

Being a proficient CW operator, and a regular CW user on-the-air,
defines the higher-level amateur radio operator. WE are
intellectually and morally superior, and have earned the right to
hold our place as the elite among amateur radio society. WE have
earned the right to our privilege and status; those who come
after us are only mere pretenders to our magnificent level of
enlightenment. Now, leave me alone -- I'm enjoying a fresh
silver platter of peeled grapes!

73 de Larry, K3LT

1131. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 15:41:39 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010120104139.00714.00003154@nso-md.aol.com>
Source record: 1379

In article <20010117075455.05313.00001012@ng-cd1.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>
>And I know a ham who took over a year of some pretty serious studying, using
>a
>number of different code tapes, and lots of advice from lots of experience
>hams, to pass the code est by the skin of her teeth. She is quite
>intellegent and articulate.

Ed:

That doesn't mean she isn't lazy. What is she doing with the code NOW? Is she using CW on-the-air? Is she advancing her proficiency in the mode? Or is she barking into a microphone?

If it took an "intelligent and articulate" YL over a year to pass a 5 WPM code test by the skin of her teeth, with lots of Elmering and advice from experienced hams, my guess is that she never tried using it on-the-air. Has she pumped a single dit through her dipole? I'm willing to bet she hasn't. Learning the code just as a means to an end, i.e. attaining voice privileges, will always be a burden, but that's how it is perceived. Learning the code in order to become a proficient CW operator is no burden at all.

>All it shows is that we are all different. By the rule that some have
>offered that the code test should measure effort, she should be given
>an Extra just for working so hard. :-)

I'm sure that she shares your politically correct, Welfare-State point of view. I ask you again -- is she using CW on-the-air? Let us in on the truth, Ed.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1132. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 15:42:52 UTC
From: Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com>
Message-ID: <3A69B1FC.204611DF@dvol.com>
Source record: 1381

Len Over 21 wrote:

>
> >There was no lack of young people then, I was one. Kids flooded into the
> >hobby.
>
> So was I, old-timer. :-) But...back then, to "kids" (and quite a few
> grown-ups) circa 1950s, radio was a sort of black magic with
> wires, solder, and things that glowed in the dark.

>
True enough.
>

> In 1951 an ARC-5 receiver in the domestic shipping carton was
> $6 at W9ERU's H&H Electronics in Rockford, Illinois. An ARC-
> 5 transmitter was $12

>
Yup, got mine for $10 on surplus row.
>

> and the antenna coupler and modulator
> was $18.

>
Hams usually didn't bother with those.
>

> Surplus BC-348 receivers were terribly expensive at
> around $49

>
I wouldn't touch one of those with a ten foot pole and neither did any other
serious HF ops.
>

> >Just about all large high schools had school-supported ham clubs and club
> >stations.
>
> Maybe in your area, but not in mine, a city of about 80
> thousand back then.

>
Yeah, in my area. Last time I lived in a city I was three years old, poof, outta
there. I went to a high school in a township which had around 450,00 citizens
back then, there were 450 +/- of us in the graduating class of '55 which included

6-8 hams. Which school is hard by the City of Philadelphia where the numerous high schools both public and parochial were bigger and they were *all* on the bands.
>

> >The 80 & 40m Novice bands crawled with other kids.
>
> Really? My experience was a lot of WW2 vets were doing
> the crawling.

>
The norm was to swap and log ages as Novices and very few were 30 or over. Most of the bubble of WWII vets who got into ham radio as a result of their wartime experiences already had their ham tickets by '53 when I got on the air, certainly by '58 which was 13 years after WWII ended.
>

> > A kid could
> >actually understand the circuitry and get a soldering iron into the radios.
>
> 100 Watt American Beauty irons. Yeah, sure... :-)

>
Wellers were already out there, I had two of 'em.
>

>
> No problem, there were very few antenna towers. :-)

>
At least 75% of the guys in my club had towers and several had multiple towers. Albeit only one of the student-age members had a tower.
>

>
> > If you were a kid interested in electronics the customary
> >gateway to an EE was a ham ticket.
>
> Oh? Of five in my high school class of 1951 that became
> EEs, none of them had ham tickets then. I'll check up on
> that in August when my class has its 50th reunion... :-)

>
Do that. At least three of the former Novices in my high school class went on to become EEs and two of us went into other engineering disciplines. One of the electron jugglers went on to become a GE VP. No doubt non-hams also became EEs but not out of that class.
>

> >Life in general was also very different from today. The overall pace of life
> >was slower and simpler, people had more spare time.
>
> Nonsense. People back then were saying the same thing

> about those of 50 years past.

>
Yes, because that's the way it was. How many daycare centers were there in 1958?

>

> >Ya didn't mess with girls until you were 16-17.

> More nonsense. :-)

>
Not in my neighborhood you didn't.
>

> >There were no home computers. There were ham
> >stores in every populated area.
>
> I can drive 2 miles to an HRO outlet in Burbank, CA. It's in a
> mini-mall across Buena Vista from another mini-mall. :-)

>
HRO is not the kind of ham store we had, all of 'em were owner-operated, big
differernce. We have one left which a true rarity.
>

>Let's look at the state of the art of radio for amateurs in 1958.

>
> Almost everything was HF since VHF and above was the
> Twilight Zone inhabited only by gurus and wizards. :-)

>
It wasn't that tough to get an SCR-522 up and running but not many cared about
VHF. VHF didn't get rolling until the repeaters came along.
>

>
> One peaked the PA grid, dipped the PA plate and the PA
> output was a pi-network for an under-150 Watt rig. Want
> to have a multi-band HF transmitter? Good luck.

>
Wrong. The Harvey-Wells bandswitched 160m thru 2m inclusive (might have been
80-2m). Plus the Valiant I & II, the Collins 32V series, The WRLs, B&W, many
others.
>

>
> Anyone who wants to go back to 1958 is nuts!

>
Of course, but that's not my point. My point is that in many instances the hams
who came out of the 50s & 60s have very different views and values than do those
who came in during the 80s-90s. Much of the "activity" in rrap is based on those

differences. No biggie.
>

>
> didit

>
w3rv

1133. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 15:43:12 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <94cbmg$l9e$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1383
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna

In article <94ama3ffc1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
horseshoestew@my-deja.com wrote:

> If ARS is to "compete" with MURS, we are going to have to come up with
> something new.

Amateur Radio is not intended as competition to MURS, FRS, GMRS, CB,
MARS, or any other radio service. And creating a new "Barbie Doll
Radio Service" distinctly segregated from mainstream Amateur Radio
will ultimately be damaging to Amateur Radio.

73, Hans, K0HB

--
"We are fellow travelers on a journey between two
eternities, and it's a trip far too brief for me
to be concerned about your speed at the Code of
Morse."

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1134. Re: It's like this....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 15:56:02 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <94ccehloe1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1384

In article <94bccf$96j$1@208.206.142.99>,
Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

> Jerk, Burke.... That has REAL ring to it.

Dick, Dick....

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1135. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 16:00:16 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A69B610.360924CB@IEEE.org>
Source record: 1385

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> Learning the code in order to become a proficient
> CW operator is no burden at all.

It certainly is a burden for people who don't like CW.
What is wrong with live and let live? Why must everyone
become proficient in your personal favorite mode?
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

1136. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 16:03:16 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A69B6C4.66746EF6@IEEE.org>
Source record: 1386

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> Being a proficient CW operator, and a regular CW user on-the-air,
> defines the higher-level amateur radio operator. WE are
> intellectually and morally superior, and have earned the right to
> hold our place as the elite among amateur radio society. WE have
> earned the right to our privilege and status;

How do you maintain privilege and status without worshipers?
Self-worship?
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

1137. Re: CA power crisis caused by internet

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 16:26:27 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccoll@radiks.net>
Message-ID: <sZia6.3281$AN.591979@nntp1.onemain.com>
Source record: 1387

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:3A69384F.55BCE830@dvol.com...
>
>
> > All of California's budget surplus just disappeared...got trans-
> > ported to a bunch of overcharging electric power suppliers.
> >
> > Legalized greed is my term for it. :-(
>
> >
> All they had to do was not go for the quick buck and think ahead, they
did not do
> that. They are dead meat now and they done it to themselves.
> >
> w3rv

Aren't you over-simplifying a bit, Brian? You are dealing with public utilities six inches from bankruptcy so you are not all that sure of being paid at all. A lot of these are natural gas turbine plants (a lot of them surplus jet engines on an alternator) and you have seen the price of natural gas lately on the spot market. Under the circumstances no sane supplier would get anything less than top dollar when he may very well have to take 20 cents on the buck five years from now. Orange County welshed on its debt so sovereign California is a crummy risk let alone one of their utilities.

There has been a lot of babble about 'long-term contracts' so maybe someone will learn a bit about the running of a power company. You have to plan for base load (the minimum draw on the system), seasonal loads (like winter or summer), and peak loads (when the coffee pots and electric water heaters come on in the morning) plus planning for intended or unintended maintenance.

For base loads, nothing beats the nuke. Burning coal or oil will actually raise the background radiation more than the equivalent hot rock and has a lot more total environmental damage. Being somewhat more variable, coal plants are ideal for seasonal loads. Union Electric in St. Louis takes advantage of a characteristic of coal plants -- that it takes almost no added fuel to run between about 75 and 90 percent -- to pump water up Taum Sauk mountain at nite and let it run hydro during the day. Peaking is by necessity a low-capital, high running-cost operation at one time served by firing up old plants that were not cost-effective any other time; environmental regs brought this to a grinding halt hence the jet engines.

Obviously, maintenance considerations enter the picture and California complicates the issue with annual pollution maximums. So one interconnects both for emergencies and cost considerations; if the Bureau of Reclamation has some extra hydro available why burn coal? You do have to take down the nuke for fueling and boiler tubes and flues do on occasion have to have the crud removed. One does not put all the eggs in one basket; we leave that to beancounters and politicians.

So this puts some problems in the hands of those designing and operating the connecting grid. When you buy power you in effect have a generation station at the border; when you sell, you have a major load at the border. This gets complicated by Esmerelda Q. Fartblossom bellowing, "No matter what anyone says, transmission lines cause leukemia and besides they are OOOOOOGLY" It is notable that the north-south transfer capabilities of the California grid are severely limited, in effect giving the state two systems.

While micropower installations are probably a good idea, presenting in general only the risk of electrocuting your linemen from an unknown source, such items as windmills and solar with their attendant problem of non-cooperation by the weather present some interesting network design problems as well.

Separating the grid from the generation facilities was basically dumb but handleable if not in the hands of politicians. It just collapsed sooner than later.

It is apparent that neither California system is meeting even its base load locally. Base load plants require tremendous capital which in turn requires a stable planning horizon and some form of guarantee of a return -- the dark side of regulation. As with most utilities, what you are really paying for is the bondholders. As a result, you usually get ossified management.

It is not a job to be run by committee or public hearing although I guess one must maintain the forms and illusion of democracy. In a state which conducts public hearings on the social impact of a new area code, the future does not look bright.

Dick McCollum N BK

1138. Re: Top ten most popular alchoholic beverages in Hiram, GA

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 16:42:04 UTC
From: KC8JBO <roger_kc8jbo@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <94cf4r$nt5$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1389
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

From: RumprangerWankingZero <>
Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy
Subject: Re: Top ten most popular alchoholic beverages in Hiram, GA
Date: Sat, 20 Jan 2001 09:11:50 -0600
Organization: MindSpring Enterprises
Lines: 8
Message-ID: <ekaj6tsa5gllgv917k047lhts612vmbsop@4ax.com>
References: <3A68E87C.5CA1116A@houston.net>
<94c7rmibk1@nnrp1.deja.com>
NNTP-Posting-Host: a5.79.ee.ba
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Server-Date: 20 Jan 2001 15:11:59 GMT
X-Newsreader: Forte Agent 1.8/32.548

NO BALLS <RWZ> whined in message
news:ekaj6tsa5gllgv917k047lhts612vmbsop@4ax.com...
> On Sat, 20 Jan 2001 14:37:42 GMT, KC8JBO <roger_kc8jbo@my-deja.com>
> wrote:
>
>
> >I'd advise you to keep me out of your pissing contest with W4AMP...
> >just a friendly warning....
>
> You are REALLY scary.

Now go change your diaper, colostomy boy. That's what you have to do on
a hourly basis from what I've heard. Of course, it wouldn't have
happened if your drunken, alcoholic daddy didn't use you as his bitch
for years.

>BOO!

Even though you never have to really dress up for Halloween, it's still
way too early for it.
You're so stupid it's a wonder you can remember to breathe. A half-wit
gave you a piece of his mind, and you held on to it, isn't that true,
PISSFLAP?
Now, why don't you two attack W4NTI, he made a "non-agression" pact
with W4AMP as well?
Or are you just a couple of hypocrites?

What did you e-mail me that you liked to ream with your tongue??
> Asshole.

Yeah, that's what it was.....
Hey, I heard you went to the butcher and asked for 10 cents worth of dog meat and he asked you if you wanted it wrapped or if you would eat it on the spot.

Fuckhead.

--
73 de Roger, KC8JBO
EM99 |ARRL|VE [ARRL & W5YI]|ARES |RACES
Yaesu FT-920 |Inverted Vee @ 40 ft.
Yaesu FT-90R

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1139. Re: Follow the Money

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 16:46:49 UTC
From: CitySlicker <not_enuf_time@foolscorner.net>
Message-ID: <94cfdp$mbq@dispatch.concentric.net>
Source record: 1388
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,alt.radio.family,rec.radio.cb

No, I meant "dribble" that is what morons start to do when they talk excitedly. Go learn some more.
Opposition? Hardly; go play in the mall with your FRS radios and stop taking up space in this group with your nonsense. Cross posting can go both ways.

"LRod" <lr0d@my-deja.com> wrote in message news:94aq1gilk1@nnrp1.deja.com...
> In article <94anv1$2b4@dispatch.concentric.net>,
> "CitySlicker" <not_enuf_time@foolscorner.net> wrote:
>
> > Another group of geniuses cross posting this dribble in the CB group.
>
> Doncha just love it when some "genius" badmouths the (learned)
> opposition, and then uses "dribble" for drivel...in the same sentence?
>
> LRod
>
>
> Sent via Deja.com
> http://www.deja.com/

1140. Re: Before responding to the Colt thread.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 17:09:14 UTC
From: "Steven J Robeson", K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <94cgnmovl1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1390
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <94cakm$kh9$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
horseshoestew@my-deja.com wrote:

> Finally, some may ask if I am serious about this... Yes, I am. It is
> sometimes difficult for me to see my ideas get ripped to shreds before
> my eyes,.....(snip)

Perhaps if you thought them out a bit more. This is/was a WAY
BIG "been there/done that". You reworded it a bit, but it was the same
thing you submitted last year, and it's still just as untenable today.

> but I've gotten better at understanding peoples concerns, and
> using them to make the proposal better.

Keep any proposal simple, mainstream and appropriate. A handful
of segregated channels at UHF is NOT the way to go.

73

Steve, K4YZ
--
"If You're Not A Ham....You're SPAM!"

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1141. Re: CA power crisis caused by internet

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 17:49:31 UTC
From: Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com>
Message-ID: <3A69CFAB.DE834B8@dvol.com>
Source record: 1391
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Dick Carroll wrote:

> Why don't they make some effort to do more with geothermal energy? Ca.
> is loaded with the stuff and there's no natural gas bills involved. Too
> simple a solution?
>
> I know there is some geothermal installations in northern CA but looks
> like it would be -or would have been- an easy out for them all along...
> Guess that's too much to ask from politics, 'specially on the Left
> Coast. No "vested interests" in geothermal as in oil and gas.

>
Good point. There's a lot to be said and a lot yet to be learned about
geo-thermal energy. Until very recently I was working on a project in a building
which was originally built as a commercial aircraft hanger. The next building
over is also a hanger converted to industrial use. The owner of that building
had a geo-thermal firm come in and punch twenty-some thermal wells in the front
lawn, install a complete heating/AC system, etc. Lotta bucks to get it running
but the owner expects to get heat & A/C energy savings somewhere in the 75%
range. Struck me as amazing, I had no idea it was possible. This is not SoCal,
our lows go to sub-zeros and the highs can hit over 100F with electricity
somewhere in the 13 cents per kwh. range. That guy is gonna save tens of
thousands of dollars per year, he'll get his investment back very quickly.
>
Yeah, a lot more needs to be done with geo-thermal energy in all it's forms.
>
A week or so ago it was announced that the first investor-owned wind power plant
came online, 200 monster high-efficiency windmills somewhere in the Northwest.
>

>
> Dick

>
w3rv

1142. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 18:12:18 UTC
From: Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com>
Message-ID: <3A69D502.A89C77F2@dvol.com>
Source record: 1392
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Dick Carroll wrote:

>
> Entry into ham radio today is for the middle aged to the retired, for
> those who "always wanted to but never had the time or extra money, job
> and family responsibilities kept me out", etc, etc. Kids have no clue
> nor any interest.

>
Seems like. The question is whether that's a no-counter or big trouble down the
road.
>

> In the eight years I worked as a VE we handled almost no kids, nor
> anyone under age 30. There were a few females, but very darn few. Most
> of the crowd were aged 35 and up, with the oldest at age 80.
>
> My VE time ended over 7 years ago and I don't think it has done
> anything but get worse since then. At that time we had no Internet
> access in this rural region. The arrival of that passtime pretty well
> cinched it.

>
I'm absolutely convinced that the Internet is the worst thing that ever hit ham
radio. Beyond that I don't think for one minute that a "solution" is to introduce
Internet-like capabilities into ham radio, they're two entirely different animals
with the only commonality between the two being competition for what people chose
to do with their leisure time.
>
We should get a better picture of what's really up over the next few years as the
licensing stats stabilize.
>
w3rv

1143. KC8JBO, start PRAYING!!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 18:13:14 UTC
From: kc8jbo_the_idiot@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <94ckfk$s40$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1393
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Get ready, MONKEY BOY.....You have a BIG suprise coming. Here is a
little HINT for you as to what it is:

*** GET READY TO JOIN YOUR FATHER ***

'Da BULL

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1144. Last posting to KC8JBO

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 18:22:04 UTC
From: kc8jbo_mommy@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <94cl05sht1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1394
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

This WILL be my LAST posting to KC8JBO.....He will SEE me next time we "talk" at his SICK MOTHERS home.

Get ready to be SENT to HELL to meet your SOB father,

The No Gun Ri TWINS

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1145. Re: CA power crisis caused by internet

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 18:33:04 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccoll@radiks.net>
Message-ID: <sQka6.3319$AN.622105@nntp1.onemain.com>
Source record: 1395
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:3A69CFAB.DE834B8@dvol.com...
> >
> A week or so ago it was announced that the first investor-owned wind
power plant
> came online, 200 monster high-efficiency windmills somewhere in the
Northwest.
> >
> w3rv

Enron has been running one in Iowa for years but is limited by Iowa P&Ls
grid. It is on their website.

Look at the companies they got to do the designs of everything from the
propellors to the gearboxes to the towers. Reads like a Who's Who of
engineering couth.

Dick NBK

1146. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 18:40:24 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010120134024.22806.00000184@ng-fm1.aol.com>
Source record: 1396

>From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

>I'm sure that she shares your politically correct, Welfare-State point
>of view. I ask you again -- is she using CW on-the-air? Let us in on
>the truth, Ed.

No, she is not. If you think that someone who found code that difficult would find it enjoyable you are not as intelligent as you tell us all you are.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1147. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 18:42:09 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010120134209.22806.00000186@ng-fm1.aol.com>
Source record: 1397

>From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

>I see. That way, you get to dumb-down *both* the code and theory
>tests with one stroke! Makes perfect sense, from the point-of-view
>of an ARRL HQ employee, who is worried sick about keeping his
>job and is desperate to do ANYTHING to get a few more people
>interested in getting a ham ticket and perhaps joining the League!
>Desperate times call for desperate measures, I guess.

Keep 'em coming, Larry; you amuse me. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1148. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 18:45:34 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010120134534.22806.00000187@ng-fm1.aol.com>
Source record: 1398

>From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

>Being a proficient CW operator, and a regular CW user on-the-air,
>defines the higher-level amateur radio operator.

It is one way to do that, Larry. I am starting to realize that you lack the vision to see that it is only one of many ways.

>WE have earned the right to our privilege and status; those who come
>after us are only mere pretenders to our magnificent level of
>enlightenment.

I am also starting to realize that you are pulling our chains, Larry.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1149. Re: The Real Bill Clinton Legacy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 18:55:36 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <94cmv5$u2h$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1404
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

In article <3A67DAD1.161C45F2@sccoast.net>,
stewartx@sccoast.net wrote:

> Sadly, I wish I could say that these things will improve after
Clinton
> leaves office. But, as long as liberals continue to control so much
of
> American life, these things are simply not likely to improve.
>
> Like Clinton did, Bush also has an opportunity to influence each of
> these things, but he has not shown any indication so far that he
intends
> to challenge the liberal stranglehold on this country.
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net
>
Very well put and accurate. I just heard the former President tell
everyone how much good they had done. And that just because they were
no longer in political power, that was not a reason to stop doing what
they did for the last 8 years. Hmmmmmm, where's Monica?

I am holding out hope that after the American public saw the demoncrats
in action in Florida, they will put an end to this feel good crap once
and for all.

Dan/W4NTI

--
"Just tellin the truth, and they cain't stand it."

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1150. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 18:55:43 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010120135543.22806.00000190@ng-fm1.aol.com>
Source record: 1399

>From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

>See? All the protestations from myself and others have had an impact.

:-) Of course, Dick; they changed things because you got on rrap and "protested" a lot.

>You gotta wonder if there would have been any improvement in some of the >questions had we not sounded off so much about them.

Some of us don't have to wonder...

> Whoever changes the questions must have been paying *some* attention.

They did if you sent them your input. If you did not, all of your protestations here were a tempest in a teapot.

>I'llhave to sign into the HQ website and check out the current question pool.

Have you really been "protesting" and insulting people without having looked at the pools?

> They would be hard to answer without knowing the material.

I think that the questions I discussed on another thread about meters vs frequency are another good example. I bet the guy was relieved to know he could answer all those questions by memorizing 300/F instead of rote, eh?

There are some questions in the pools that I think are too easily memorized without understanding, but, IMHO, they are a minority.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1151. Re: The Real Bill Clinton Legacy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 18:58:31 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <94cn4m$u48$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1405

In article <94a6rb$n7r$1@news.netmar.com>,
vk4lld@netinc.au wrote:
> Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
> > There has been much talk about the Clinton legacy. As William J.
> > Clinton leaves office, lets take a look at a few things around the
> > country to discover the real Clinton legacy.
>
> ///// C L I P /////
>
> Please take your American politics to alt.bloody.sleazy.washington
newsgroup.
> This one is an international forum about amateur radio and not about
> second-rate governments in north america.
>
> In other words, bugger off mate.
>
> Graeme
>
> ----- Posted via NewsOne.Net: Free (anonymous) Usenet News via the
Web -----
> http://newsone.net/ -- Free reading and anonymous posting to
60,000+ groups
> NewsOne.Net prohibits users from posting spam. If this or other
posts
> made through NewsOne.Net violate posting guidelines, email
abuse@newsone.net
>
Hey Aussie....I got a better idea, go stand out on the street corner
and tell the guy fixing to shoot you to go turn in his weapon.

Dan/W4NTI

--
"Just tellin the truth, and they cain't stand it."

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1152. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 19:01:06 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010120140106.22806.00000193@ng-fm1.aol.com>
Source record: 1400

>From: "W4JLE" Fred@w4jle.com

>I should know better than to communicate with someone that is my inferior...

Now that looks like a bona fide attempt to capture someone's goat...

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1153. Re: The Real Bill Clinton Legacy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 19:01:26 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <94cna3$ue7$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1406
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

In article <3A686A70.856B9CEB@eng.Sun.COM>,
Darrell.Earnshaw@Sun.com wrote:
> Dwight Stewart wrote:
> >
> > There has been much talk about the Clinton legacy. As William J.
> > Clinton leaves office, lets take a look at a few things around the
> > country to discover the real Clinton legacy.
> >
> > Politics & Race Relations...
> [...snip...]
>
> >
> > Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
> >
> > http://www.qsl.net/w5net
>
> Dwight,
>
> Of course you are entitled to your own interpretations and views.
> However, this newsgroup is about amateur radio, not politics, relgion,
> or other unrelated issues, and it is an inappropriate forum for
personal
> soapboxes on issues unrelated to amateur radio. I also suspect that
most
> subscribers to the NG probably couldn't care less about US politics or
> domestic issues -- newsgroups are not just for domestic US
consumption -
> they're international. I'm sure there's a
> "US.politics.domestic.anti-liberals" or something newsgroup somewhere
> out there which is more appropriate.
>
> No disrespect intended.
>
> 73, Darrell
> nr3y.
>
Amateur radio operators are thinking individuals. (for the most part)
Amateur radio operators think of other things, besides "rig here is".
(for the most part)

I have no problem of discussing things that effect our lives in the
context of a 'radio group'. In fact it gives us the thing that keeps
it all reasonably civil. And whats that you ask? A interest in radio.

Just my opinion, no disrespect intended.

Dan/W4NTI

--
"Just tellin the truth, and they cain't stand it."

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1154. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 19:04:38 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010120140438.22806.00000194@ng-fm1.aol.com>
Source record: 1401

>From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

>So without an effective test what assures that a licenesee ever did
>anything at all???

We need an effective test, to determine that the applicant has the qualifications to operate within the rules and to meet the regulatory goals of the Amateur Radio Service. I believe that the testing we have to day does that at least as well as the testing that got me into ham radio.

As to determining what a licencee did, how about we, well, determine what he or she actually did? The accomplishments of hams after they get their licenses form the reasons for the very existance of the Amateur Radio Service. If all hams did was pass Extra tests, of ANY era, there would not be sufficient justification for our use of the spectrum.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1155. Re: The Real Bill Clinton Legacy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 19:05:11 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <94cnh3uhu1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1411

In article <94b275$334$1@dagobah.blueriver.net>,
"DX405" <lightnin9@hotmail.com> wrote:
> Any loser named Graeme needs to check if his anal virginity is still
intact.
> As far as second rate governments, we all need to look at the gun
grabbers
> in Australia and the sissies who submit to them. So bugger off,
Aussie loser
> <vk4lld@netinc.au> wrote in message

Yeah I agree. I used to respect the Aussies. They sure were butt
kickers in Nam. Now I wonder if they could fight off their old ladies.

With all that open space in VK land, I wonder if all those wild animals
and 'local populations' will honor the gun ban?

Dan/W4NTI

--
"Just tellin the truth, and they cain't stand it."

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1156. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 19:06:44 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010120140644.22806.00000196@ng-fm1.aol.com>
Source record: 1402

>From: Aaron Jones nomail@nomail.com

>Well then, that's certainly a good thing. Passing a ham test doesn't
>show much about what hams know about radio and electronics... :-)

It is all relative, isn't it? Do you believe that passing the entry-level test of today -- the Technician exam, demonstrates more or less electronics and radio knowledge than passing the entry-level test of 1963? To help compare, I posted the 1963 Novice study guide in another post; I will send it to you if you missed it.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1157. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 19:08:47 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010120140847.22806.00000197@ng-fm1.aol.com>
Source record: 1403

>From: Aaron Jones nomail@nomail.com

>>? ARRL phonetics ?

>On page 532 of my 1954 ARRL handbook

Okay. I was worried that I may have missed something.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1158. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 19:13:21 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010120141321.22806.00000199@ng-fm1.aol.com>
Source record: 1407

>From: Aaron Jones nomail@nomail.com

>I was getting practice on the air before my Novice came... :-)

Quite permissible under the rules as a third-party participant under a control operator.

>>The "gaff" could have been avoided if everyone had decided that it wasn't a
>big
>>enough deal to be labeled a "gaff" in the first place.

>A gaff is simply a social error.

Okay, let me reword it.

>>The "gaff" could have been avoided if everyone had decided that it wasn't a
>big
>>enough deal to warrant giving the new ham a public tongue lashing.

Does saying "personal" instead of "name" or "handle" really need to be a "social error" in the amateur community?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1159. Re: CA power crisis caused by internet

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 19:13:52 UTC
From: Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com>
Message-ID: <3A69E370.6624479A@dvol.com>
Source record: 1408
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Richard McCollum wrote:

> "Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
> news:3A69CFAB.DE834B8@dvol.com...
> > >
> > A week or so ago it was announced that the first investor-owned wind
> power plant
> > came online, 200 monster high-efficiency windmills somewhere in the
> Northwest.
> > >
> > w3rv
>
> Enron has been running one in Iowa for years but is limited by Iowa P&Ls
> grid. It is on their website.

>
Good, I'll run it down.
>

>
> Look at the companies they got to do the designs of everything from the
> propellors to the gearboxes to the towers. Reads like a Who's Who of
> engineering couth.

>
I'm completely out of touch with that whole topic area, shame on me, I gotta
get up to speed. I've kinda had a jaundiced view of it because of some
business encounters with out-to-lunch basement inventor types who were
diddling with it. If the big guns are into it the scene has changed
dramatically.
>
Been a little over two hours since Junior took over, doesn't look like the
sky has fallen yet.
>

> Dick Nï¿½BK

>
w3rv

1160. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 19:15:43 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010120141543.22806.00000201@ng-fm1.aol.com>
Source record: 1409

>From: Aaron Jones nomail@nomail.com

>>if you participate in an open forum, there are always one or two who
>>feel that the best thing that they could do for you is to publically and
>>soundly berate you...

>And there are also those who fail to learn the practices and
>procedures of a specialized group before entering the frey, and
>consequently make fools of themselves.

>>If you think their behaviour is inappropriate...

>I think both types of behaviors are inappropriate and avoidable...

Equally so?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1161. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 19:19:51 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010120141951.22806.00000203@ng-fm1.aol.com>
Source record: 1410

>From: Cecil Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>The brush was not intended to be broad at all, Ed. I didn't mean to
>imply "all other PCTA folk". Just a handful of individuals. I probably
>should have said, "and a few other PCTA folk". That was my meaning.

Thanks for the clarification, Cecil; I think we just averted another flamewar.
:-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1162. Re: CA power crisis caused by internet

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 19:25:20 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccoll@radiks.net>
Message-ID: <7Bla6.3332$AN.637718@nntp1.onemain.com>
Source record: 1412
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:3A69E370.6624479A@dvol.com...
>
>
> Richard McCollum wrote:
>
> > "Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
> > news:3A69CFAB.DE834B8@dvol.com...
> > > > >
> > > > A week or so ago it was announced that the first investor-owned wind
> > power plant
> > > > came online, 200 monster high-efficiency windmills somewhere in the
> > Northwest.
> > > > >
> > > > w3rv
> > >
> > Enron has been running one in Iowa for years but is limited by Iowa
P&Ls
> > grid. It is on their website.
>
> >
> Good, I'll run it down.
> >
>
> >
> > Look at the companies they got to do the designs of everything from
the
> > propellors to the gearboxes to the towers. Reads like a Who's Who of
> > engineering couth.
>
> >
> I'm completely out of touch with that whole topic area, shame on me, I
gotta
> get up to speed. I've kinda had a jaundiced view of it because of some
> business encounters with out-to-lunch basement inventor types who were
> diddling with it. If the big guns are into it the scene has changed
> dramatically.
> >
> Been a little over two hours since Junior took over, doesn't look like
the
> sky has fallen yet.
> >

>
> > Dick N&#65533;BK
>
> >
> w3rv

He hasn't delegated the authority for the collapse yet :-)

just look at Enron.com and select Enron Wind. Incidentally, they run a
1.6 MW plant at Tehatchapi CA.

Dick

1163. Re: KC8JBO, start PRAYING I don't have AIDS when I SUCK YOU OFF!!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 19:26:59 UTC
From: KC8JBO <roger_kc8jbo@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <94coprvhm1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1417
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <94ckfk$s40$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
kc8jbo_the_idiot@my-deja.com wrote:
> Get ready, MONKEY BOY.....You have a BIG suprise coming. Here is
a
> little HINT for you as to what it is:
>
> *** GET READY TO JOIN YOUR FATHER ***
>
> 'Da BULL
> Sent via Deja.com
> http://www.deja.com/
>

BWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA!!
!
You gonna suck off all the nutsack goo from the "GOOKS" as you call
them on the way????

--
73 de Roger, KC8JBO
EM99 |ARRL|VE [ARRL & W5YI]|ARES |RACES
Yaesu FT-920 |Inverted Vee @ 40 ft.
Yaesu FT-90R

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1164. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 19:28:45 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010120142845.14777.00000813@nso-bd.aol.com>
Source record: 1416

In article <3A69B1FC.204611DF@dvol.com>, Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com> writes:

>> >Life in general was also very different from today. The overall pace of
>> >life was slower and simpler, people had more spare time.
>>
>> Nonsense. People back then were saying the same thing
>> about those of 50 years past.
>
>Yes, because that's the way it was. How many daycare centers were there in
>1958?

I can remember at least five in my home town but remembering
daycare centers were not a priority when I left it in 1956. :-)
At least four of those were begun during WW2 when more folks
worked.

>> >There were no home computers. There were ham
>> >stores in every populated area.
>>
>> I can drive 2 miles to an HRO outlet in Burbank, CA. It's in a
>> mini-mall across Buena Vista from another mini-mall. :-)
>
>HRO is not the kind of ham store we had, all of 'em were owner-operated, big
>differernce. We have one left which a true rarity.

The HRO in Burbank is about the size of H&H Electronics in
Rockford, IL. "Owner-operated" businesses carrying consumer
items are on the decline all over, a consequence of economics
rather than radio or customer-specific commerce.

A significant difference between 1958 and 1998 is the amount
and variety of ready-built amateur radios and equipment. On
the floor, not 'ordered-from-catalog' items.

>Wrong. The Harvey-Wells bandswitched 160m thru 2m inclusive (might have been
>80-2m). Plus the Valiant I & II, the Collins 32V series, The WRLs, B&W, many
>others.

Harvey-Wells went all the way to 2m in 1958? I thought the
Gonset G76 was sort of SOTA with 6m at the top end. :-)

At Ramo-Wooldridge (the 'RW' that spun off TRW) there was
a young engineer with a KWM-2 in his Triumph sports car
back in 1960. That's rather an exception to the rule, I think. :-)

>> Anyone who wants to go back to 1958 is nuts!
>

>Of course, but that's not my point. My point is that in many instances the
>hams who came out of the 50s & 60s have very different views and values than
do
>those who came in during the 80s-90s. Much of the "activity" in rrap is based
on
>those differences. No biggie.

Each generation has different views and values. :-)

Problems come about when each generation tries to instill its
set of values on other generations...because they "are right."
:-)

Interesting constant here and in ham publications: "We have
to get the young interested!" It's become a mantra.

Invariably that "need" is espoused by those who became
interested when they were young...which may or may not
be part of the "you have to do it they way I did it" school
of ham religion. Why just the "young?"

Grab them when they are young so they can be brain-
washed into "proper values?" Amateur radio is a hobby,
not a political doctrine.

Grab the young because adults have the temerity to talk
back to other adults? Amateur radio is a hobby, not a
military service.

Grab young folks so they can "get started on a career
in ham radio?" Amateur radio is a hobby, not a trade,
guild, union, or profession.

Maybe I'm wrong, but I and all the people I've worked
with in electronics in general found the subject very
interesting, fascinating, even fun...at any age. Why
can't the interest begin at any age group?

didit

1165. Re: Sound Familiar?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 19:28:46 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010120142846.14777.00000814@nso-bd.aol.com>
Source record: 1413

In article <bm9i6tgphu40q24nle3mg93smhejm2itb4@4ax.com>, Aaron Jones
<nomail@nomail.com> writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
>>You cannot escape the coexistance of the amateur radio
>>service with dozens of other radio services...
>
>I am not trying to escape the totality of radio. My posts here are
>mostly are about *amateur radio* because this is an *amateur radio
>news group* and because *amateur radio* is my hobby interest. If I
>wanted to hear about broadcast radio, CB radio, SWLing or other radio
>subjects I would specifically visit those particular groups...

My apologies. I've been under the mistaken notion that this
particular newsgroup discussed POLICY in regards to amateur
radio and amateur radio regulations.

If it was concerned with POLICY then I expected some
consideration with the coexistance of amateur radio with
other radio services.

Maybe there will be a scientific breakthrough soon where
there will be separate EM spectra just for the different
radio services...

>
>But...goodness knows we do stray from the subject, so feel free to
>post on the totality of radio. I certainly have no objections. Just
>don't expect all of us to do so... :-)

Something other than Guns and Gunnery, Politics, Morals
and Ethics in Modern Society (and resultant decay of
same) and other "radio" subjects? OK, fine by me...

didit

1166. Re: CA power crisis caused by internet

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 19:28:47 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010120142847.14777.00000815@nso-bd.aol.com>
Source record: 1414

In article <94bc2b$96j$0@208.206.142.99>, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
writes:

> Why don't they make some effort to do more with geothermal energy? Ca.
>is loaded with the stuff and there's no natural gas bills involved. Too
>simple a solution?
>
> I know there is some geothermal installations in northern CA but looks
>like it would be -or would have been- an easy out for them all along...
>Guess that's too much to ask from politics, 'specially on the Left
>Coast. No "vested interests" in geothermal as in oil and gas.

Dickie...please try to stay out of areas where you have
insufficient knowledge of the subject. Had you properly
researched the situation of geothermal energy, you would
have found that there is not enough in California to make
it worthwhile. Even "wind farms" of many, many wind
turbines barely make it on competitive energy production.

The "vested interests" in electric power production are
nuclear, fossil-fuel, and hydro plants. The rest are gist for
Discovery magazine, maybe Scientific American, but the
running costs per MWe can't compete with the three
major forms listed.

It would be better served to concentrate your explorative
efforts to innovating something like a pedal-powered
electric generator to go along with the key and CW rig
you said you used to carry around with you at all times.

didit

1167. Re: CA power crisis caused by internet

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 19:28:48 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010120142848.14777.00000816@nso-bd.aol.com>
Source record: 1415

In article <3A69384F.55BCE830@dvol.com>, Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com> writes:

>Brings up a piece I read a few years back. Somebody sorted thru ancient
>Spanish archives related to the history of the earlist Jesuit efforts to do
their
>thing in
>what is now the LA basin. The locals were of course were quite ambivalent
>Indians
>who advised the Jesuits that setting up a mission in that neighbohood was not
>a very good idea. The Indians knew the game, the topography and wind patterns
>are
>such that they never set up camp in the LA basin because the smoke from their
>campfires simply stayed there and choked 'em. Their name for the LA basin was
>"The Valley of Smoke", decent fishing but no place to actually live.
>>
>Hello?

Old story out here. One thing that happened from the LA basin
experience is some serious consideration about air pollution
from vehicles. That has worked out quite well for the nation, like
it or not. Measured air quality in Los Angeles and surrounding
area is now ranked as moderate and quite comparable to other
US cities not having such geographic anamolies. The old Bob
Hope radio show jokes about smog are just historical items now.

Just to hedge bets, though, my nearly 38-year-old house is
located in the hills of the Verdugos rather above any smog
(840' MSL by topo map). Bad for radio propagation since
everything is Near Vertical Incidence Skywave. :-(

>> All of California's budget surplus just disappeared...got trans-
>> ported to a bunch of overcharging electric power suppliers.
>>
>> Legalized greed is my term for it. :-(
>
>All they had to do was not go for the quick buck and think ahead, they did
>not do that. They are dead meat now and they done it to themselves.

Heh, it's already started. Item in Saturday's LA Times says the
"PX" or Power Exchange in Pasadena, CA, (place for trading
electric power, kind of a junior stock exchange) is now laying
off staff, expected to close down. Electric power trading now has
to revert to old system of power companies calling other power
companies like they did in the "old" days. :-)

It's not always easy living in a "test bed" area...

didit

1168. Re: Last posting to KC8JBO

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 19:28:55 UTC
From: KC8JBO <roger_kc8jbo@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <94cotgvir1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1418
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <94cl05sht1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
MY BITCH kc8jbo_mommy@yahoo.com wrote:
> This WILL be my LAST posting to KC8JBO.....He will SEE me next time
we
> "talk" at his SICK MOTHERS home.

Where's all that information you were going to post, no-balls eunuch???
BWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA I OWN YOU BITCH!!!!!!!!!

> Get ready to be SENT to HELL to meet your SOB father,
>
> The No Gun Ri TWINGOOGOBBLERS
>
> Sent via Deja.com
> http://www.deja.com/
>

MWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA!!
!
--
73 de Roger, KC8JBO
EM99 |ARRL|VE [ARRL & W5YI]|ARES |RACES
Yaesu FT-920 |Inverted Vee @ 40 ft.
Yaesu FT-90R

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1169. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 19:44:47 UTC
From: Anita Andringa <a.andringa@rhayward.demon.nl>
Message-ID: <980020018.29474.0.pluto.d4ee2a65@news.demon.nl>
Source record: 1419
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,alt.radio.family,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc

The information you had access to may have been stale, and never was
entirely accurate.
The class-D license did in fact give you 6 channels. You had to upgrade
within two years. THe upgrade requirement was later dropped.
After a short while the examination level was graded up quite considerably.
The license class was changed accordingly and now gives you a CW subband, an
SSB subband and an FM subband on 2 meters and on 70 centimeters.
The D-callsigns were assigned alphabetically, starting with pd0aab, then
aac, aad etc.
If you look in the callbook, you will notice that there are not many left
over. Many of the "old" names are now found under the A or C class entries
nowl
To recap: Dutch A-class is "everything" (hf, vhf and up, all modes) and
requires morse code and electronics theory. C-class is VHF and up, all
modes, requires same theory but no morse code. N-class replaces D-class (N
for Novice) and requires limited theory, gives acces to Novice subbands on
2m and 70cm.
No-code on HF has never existed in Holland, but we all know the rumours..
just have to see what happens now.

have a good one,

Rudolf

Bruce Muscolino <w6toy@erols.com> schreef in berichtnieuws
3A697C4C.943281BF@erols.com...
> Stewart,
>
> The Netherlands implemented a license class very close to what you
> propose back about 1985 or so. (...)

1170. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 19:51:56 UTC
From: xjim@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <94cq8rqb1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1420

> > So why would anyone fight that?

> Four pages vs sixteen pages vs over 200 pages. Which are you calling
> "extremely simple" again?

Again, since you only seem to have focused on the sound bite and not what I wrote; "The Novice ticket [1973] was extremely easy if you has [had] someone to to work with on it."

I certainly wasn't talking about Q&A Publications at all, or even the recent license restructuring at all (that I feel will have have far less impact than that of the loss of the Elmer-Novice entry to the no-code tech entry years ago). And don't think I didn't notice you changing the subject in order to plug your publications, but I am an ARRL supporter (on a great many issues) and long time member. Let's for a moment ignore the absolute number of pages because there is certainly more to a publication than the number of pages. In 1973, I found the License Manuals completely inadequate for study of the concepts that the radio amateur really needs to know in order to understand what he is doing, and how to get the most out of his station, and to do it without interfering with the neighbors. I turned to the 67, 68, and 69 editions of The Radio Amateurs Handbook in my study, long before taking the Novice exam and continuing to learn about amateur radio operations by doing, by making mistakes and by polishing my craft under the guidance and on the shoulders of those who went before.

Not by taking a packaged course that promises that I will be a ham when I take a test at the end of the seminar (as some VE's out here are promising). There is so much about Ham Radio that can't be taught in a publication or seminar because it is way too impersonal and doesn't give enough hands-on like the Novice License did.

Let me explain another way: The Novice License was an easy way to get on the air and get a taste of Amateur Radio, and provided a proving ground fertile with learning experiences with time to progress. The current entry situation caters to instant gratification and bestows priveleges not yet earned by experience.

> I agree; the lack of Elmering cost us a lot of hams. So did
an "Elmering"
> process by which some hams made newcomers feel like they were seen as
having
> come from "skid row..." I don't know which had the larger effect.

Perhaps the greatest effect has been from establishing "Skid Row" as an entry level training ground in 1959, that many find difficult to "unlearn" when moving forward.

Jim, ac6tk
PS, I just had someone explain to me this morning that reverb improves "talk-power". I'm sorry, but I couldn't help laughing.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1171. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 20:03:04 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <94cqtogsn0@208.207.71.162>
Source record: 1421

Brian wrote:
>
>
> There is no calamity.

Evidently you've never been to California. Turn of the electricity, and
there IS a calamity.

1172. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 20:25:14 UTC
From: xjim@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <94cs74$29f$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1423

The Energy Calamity is quite localized and not likely to hurt your 401k
but is being portrayed as an indication of "the need" for further
government control. The state has so many "partners" and restrictions
on the private sector already, it's hard for business to compete with
them. A great many business operations have moved away over the years
because of this. I suppose now that the census and re-apportionment is
over with, we can now all leave.

During the current stage III alert, many businesses and schools have to
drastically reduce or shut down electricity because of the rate plan
that extorts extreme penalties and fines for exceeding set stage III
limits. Even though the blackouts are being imposed up north,
businesses and schools all over the state have been closing or
operating in the dark because of the stage III restrictions.

The real calamity is that this was allowed to happen at all in a
(supposed)civilized society.

Jim, ac6tk
PS "over-robust"... is that something like excessively-winning? Why
did we have to beat down Microsoft?

> > The entire state of California is on a self-inflicted stage III
power
> > emergency. Most probably so that The State can scare the people
into
> > a government takeover of the grid (California Nationalists?).
>
> There you go again making assumptions about what other people would
> want.
>
> It
> appears
> > we prefer to complain and react to symptoms rather than address the
> > causes. The stories in the news don't make sense either, because
all
> > we're hearing right now is finger pointing and panic. It's very
hard
> > for me to beleive that this calamity couldn't have been averted at
any
> > point on a time line if only someone would have acknowledged it.
>
> There is no calamity. Governments all over America were just
examining
> all the piles of money from overtaxed citizens and wondering what to

do
> with it all. You couldn't lose in the stock market. Greenspan had to
> keep tightening the money supply to slow down an over-robust economy.
>
> Then GW won the election and the mainstream press mantra is "We're
back
> in the Worst Economy Ever" mode, with an energy crisis on top of it.
>
> Sent via Deja.com
> http://www.deja.com/
>

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1173. Re: CA power crisis caused by internet

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 20:33:52 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <94csng$li7$0@208.207.71.177>
Source record: 1422
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

> A week or so ago it was announced that the first investor-owned wind power plant
> came online, 200 monster high-efficiency windmills somewhere in the Northwest.
>

California has considerable windpowered electric generating capacity already, tho I don't know its efficiency level. Altamont Pass on I-580 about 30 miles east of San Francisco is almost surreal, you cruise over the mountains surrounded by hundreds of large modern windmills, of several designs including Savounis(sp?) Rotor ("eggbeater") style, all churning away, dumping their output into the power grid. There's another similarly sized field on State Rt 58 at Tehachapie Pass east of Bakersfield, well to the south. These locations are places where the wind almost never stops. I don't know much about the capacities of these generators nor much else about them (and would be interested) but they appear to be sizeable. I'm told that all are privately owned by investors who sell the output to power distributors, who are mandated under law to buy it.
Evidently these have long been absorbed into the consumption scheme and many of the windmills have been in place for a long time, and each time I go out that way I see what appears to be newly installed units.

Dick

1174. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 20:46:49 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <94ctfo$39n$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1424
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,alt.radio.family,rec.radio.cb

N0MHS writes:

> The rapidly-expanding Family Radio Service has exposed
> millions of young people to the world of radio communications.
> But now, where is a you kid to go who has is interested in
> experimenting with radios..... clip.

OK, rather than a bunch of old geezers sitting around casting cold water on Stewarts idea, let's look at it from the view of the intended market.

Dick and Jane, 14 years old, have "had it" with the limitations of the FRS and now are "interested in experimenting with radios". They've heard of something called "ham radio" and are investigating the entry classes.

Jane says "Here's something called the Technician class. You have to take a simple 35-question test."

Dick says "Here's something called the Colt class. You have to take a simple 25-question test from the same pool."

Dick and Jane decide to investigate further, to see what difference the 10 additional simple questions make.

Dick says "Colt gives you six simplex voice/digital channels on 446, and another six simplex voice/digital channels on 223MHz. You can even build a simple little repeater between them, as long as input and output are not on the same band."

Jane says "Technician gives you 22,243 Megahertz of spectrum on 16 bands between 50MHz and 250GHz. Holy Cow, Dick, that's millions and millions of frequencies instead of just 12."

Dick says "With a Colt license you can transmit 5 watts of power. That's a lot better than FRS!"

Jane says "5 watts is for sissies. With Technician we can transmit 1,500 watts of power!"

Dick says "Yes, but the Colt radios are cheap."

Jane says "Sure, but there are lots and lots of used radios around for Technicians, even cheaper, and your Colt radio will be basicly useless if you upgrade."

Dick says "Hey, but I could put my Colt antenna 20 feet above the house if I want."

Jane says "Big deal, Technicians have no arbitrary height limit like that; they can go as high as zoning laws allow, and even higher with conditional use permits."

Dick says "The Colt license will be a lot of other kids just like me."

Jane says "I thought we were sick of kid stuff, and wanted to experiment. The Technician license lets us talk to kids and doctors and lawyers and indian chiefs and satelites and astronauts and W1RFI even."

Dick says "Colts can use both voice and digital modes."

Jane says "Hey, with only 10 more simple questions the Technicians are allowed all of that, and other neat stuff like SSTV, FSTV, telecommand, and space communications."

Dick says "Jane, you are right. This Colt thing is really lame. I always said you were smarter than me. I could just kiss you."

Jane says "Dick, only after you pass your Technician License test, and keep your clammy paws off my double bazooka antenna."

73, de Hans, K0HB

--
"We are fellow travelers on a journey between two eternities, and it's a trip far too brief for me to be concerned about your speed at the Code of Morse."

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1175. Re: Follow the Money

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 20:50:51 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <94ctn9$3df$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1425
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,alt.radio.family,rec.radio.cb

In article <94ate8$l4r$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
horseshoestew@my-deja.com wrote:

> Look, I don't have anything against you folks - I just don't think it
> is appropriate for kids to be learning radio on the 11 meter band.

OK, rather than a bunch of old geezers sitting around casting
cold water on Stewarts idea, let's look at it from the view
of the intended market.

Dick and Jane, 14 years old, have "had it" with the
limitations of the FRS and now are "interested in experimenting
with radios". They've heard of something called "ham radio"
and are investigating the entry classes.

Jane says "Here's something called the Technician class. You
have to take a simple 35-question test."

Dick says "Here's something called the Colt class. You have
to take a simple 25-question test from the same pool."

Dick and Jane decide to investigate further, to see what
difference the 10 additional simple questions make.

Dick says "Colt gives you six simplex voice/digital channels
on 446, and another six simplex voice/digital channels on
223MHz. You can even build a simple little repeater between
them, as long as input and output are not on the same band."

Jane says "Technician gives you 22,243 Megahertz of spectrum
on 16 bands between 50MHz and 250GHz. Holy Cow, Dick, that's
millions and millions of frequencies instead of just 12."

Dick says "With a Colt license you can transmit 5 watts of
power. That's a lot better than FRS!"

Jane says "5 watts is for sissies. With Technician we can
transmit 1,500 watts of power!"

Dick says "Yes, but the Colt radios are cheap."

Jane says "Sure, but there are lots and lots of used radios
around for Technicians, even cheaper, and your Colt radio
will be basicly useless if you upgrade."

Dick says "Hey, but I could put my Colt antenna 20 feet above the
house if I want."

Jane says "Big deal, Technicians have no arbitrary height limit
like that; they can go as high as zoning laws allow, and even
higher with conditional use permits."

Dick says "The Colt license will be a lot of other kids just
like me."

Jane says "I thought we were sick of kid stuff, and wanted to
experiment. The Technician license lets us talk to kids and
doctors and lawyers and indian chiefs and satelites and
astronauts and W1RFI even."

Dick says "Colts can use both voice and digital modes."

Jane says "Hey, with only 10 more simple questions the Technicians
are allowed all of that, and other neat stuff like SSTV, FSTV,
telecommand, and space communications."

Dick says "Jane, you are right. This Colt thing is really lame.
I always said you were smarter than me. I could just kiss you."

Jane says "Dick, only after you pass your Technician License
test, and keep your clammy paws off my double bazooka antenna."

73, de Hans, K0HB

--
"We are fellow travelers on a journey between two
eternities, and it's a trip far too brief for me
to be concerned about your speed at the Code of
Morse."

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1176. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 21:08:41 UTC
From: CitySlicker <not_enuf_time@foolscorner.net>
Message-ID: <94cuop$ba1@freepress.concentric.net>
Source record: 1426
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Do you think you guys could remove rec.radio.cb from your chat?
"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:3A69D502.A89C77F2@dvol.com...
>
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> >
> > Entry into ham radio today is for the middle aged to the retired, for
> > those who "always wanted to but never had the time or extra money, job
> > and family responsibilities kept me out", etc, etc. Kids have no clue
> > nor any interest.
>
> >
> Seems like. The question is whether that's a no-counter or big trouble
down the
> road.
> >
>
> > In the eight years I worked as a VE we handled almost no kids, nor
> > anyone under age 30. There were a few females, but very darn few. Most
> > of the crowd were aged 35 and up, with the oldest at age 80.
> >
> > My VE time ended over 7 years ago and I don't think it has done
> > anything but get worse since then. At that time we had no Internet
> > access in this rural region. The arrival of that passtime pretty well
> > cinched it.
>
> >
> I'm absolutely convinced that the Internet is the worst thing that ever
hit ham
> radio. Beyond that I don't think for one minute that a "solution" is to
introduce
> Internet-like capabilities into ham radio, they're two entirely different
animals
> with the only commonality between the two being competition for what
people chose
> to do with their leisure time.
> >
> We should get a better picture of what's really up over the next few years
as the
> licensing stats stabilize.
> >

> w3rv
>
>
>

1177. Re: Follow the Money

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 21:11:04 UTC
From: CitySlicker <not_enuf_time@foolscorner.net>
Message-ID: <94cut8$b9t@freepress.concentric.net>
Source record: 1427
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,alt.radio.family,rec.radio.cb

I am sure Dick and Jane even have clue what your talking about. Give them a
CB and stop complicating their life.

"K0HB" <K0HB@arrl.org> wrote in message news:94ctn9$3df$1@nnrp1.deja.com...
> In article <94ate8$l4r$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
> horseshoestew@my-deja.com wrote:
>
> > Look, I don't have anything against you folks - I just don't think it
> > is appropriate for kids to be learning radio on the 11 meter band.
>
> OK, rather than a bunch of old geezers sitting around casting
> cold water on Stewarts idea, let's look at it from the view
> of the intended market.
>
> Dick and Jane, 14 years old, have "had it" with the
> limitations of the FRS and now are "interested in experimenting
> with radios". They've heard of something called "ham radio"
> and are investigating the entry classes.
>
> Jane says "Here's something called the Technician class. You
> have to take a simple 35-question test."
>
> Dick says "Here's something called the Colt class. You have
> to take a simple 25-question test from the same pool."
>
> Dick and Jane decide to investigate further, to see what
> difference the 10 additional simple questions make.
>
> Dick says "Colt gives you six simplex voice/digital channels
> on 446, and another six simplex voice/digital channels on
> 223MHz. You can even build a simple little repeater between
> them, as long as input and output are not on the same band."
>
> Jane says "Technician gives you 22,243 Megahertz of spectrum
> on 16 bands between 50MHz and 250GHz. Holy Cow, Dick, that's
> millions and millions of frequencies instead of just 12."
>
> Dick says "With a Colt license you can transmit 5 watts of
> power. That's a lot better than FRS!"
>
> Jane says "5 watts is for sissies. With Technician we can
> transmit 1,500 watts of power!"
>

> Dick says "Yes, but the Colt radios are cheap."
>
> Jane says "Sure, but there are lots and lots of used radios
> around for Technicians, even cheaper, and your Colt radio
> will be basicly useless if you upgrade."
>
> Dick says "Hey, but I could put my Colt antenna 20 feet above the
> house if I want."
>
> Jane says "Big deal, Technicians have no arbitrary height limit
> like that; they can go as high as zoning laws allow, and even
> higher with conditional use permits."
>
> Dick says "The Colt license will be a lot of other kids just
> like me."
>
> Jane says "I thought we were sick of kid stuff, and wanted to
> experiment. The Technician license lets us talk to kids and
> doctors and lawyers and indian chiefs and satelites and
> astronauts and W1RFI even."
>
> Dick says "Colts can use both voice and digital modes."
>
> Jane says "Hey, with only 10 more simple questions the Technicians
> are allowed all of that, and other neat stuff like SSTV, FSTV,
> telecommand, and space communications."
>
> Dick says "Jane, you are right. This Colt thing is really lame.
> I always said you were smarter than me. I could just kiss you."
>
> Jane says "Dick, only after you pass your Technician License
> test, and keep your clammy paws off my double bazooka antenna."
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB
>
>
> --
> "We are fellow travelers on a journey between two
> eternities, and it's a trip far too brief for me
> to be concerned about your speed at the Code of
> Morse."
>
>
>
>
>
>
> Sent via Deja.com
> http://www.deja.com/

1178. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 21:56:19 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A6A0983.3C715774@IEEE.org>
Source record: 1432

W1RFI wrote:
>
> >From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
> >Being a proficient CW operator, and a regular CW user on-the-air,
> >defines the higher-level amateur radio operator.
>
> It is one way to do that, Larry. I am starting to realize that you lack the
> vision to see that it is only one of many ways.

Don't worry about Larry, Ed. He knows how to be worshipped for his
"privilege and status" even if he's the only person around. :-)
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

1179. Re: Follow the Money

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 21:59:23 UTC
From: W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com>
Message-ID: <94d1od$6rl$1@iac5.navix.net>
Source record: 1428
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,alt.radio.family,rec.radio.cb

The need for all of this will go away once my group leaps into action. When we have eliminated all the "elitism" on the bands and issue every citizen an Extra class license, as is their God given right, all will be right with the world.

No Code!
No Test!
No Hassle!

--
Fred W4JLE NHI#1001
Executive Grand Pooba - No Hassle International
Doing away with all requirements for a Ham ticket
"We want, therefore we deserve"
Send your non-tax deductible donations today!

"K0HB" <K0HB@arrl.org> wrote in message news:94ctn9$3df$1@nnrp1.deja.com...
> In article <94ate8$l4r$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
> horseshoestew@my-deja.com wrote:
>
> > Look, I don't have anything against you folks - I just don't think it
> > is appropriate for kids to be learning radio on the 11 meter band.
>
> OK, rather than a bunch of old geezers sitting around casting
> cold water on Stewarts idea, let's look at it from the view
> of the intended market.
>
> Dick and Jane, 14 years old, have "had it" with the
> limitations of the FRS and now are "interested in experimenting
> with radios". They've heard of something called "ham radio"
> and are investigating the entry classes.
>
> Jane says "Here's something called the Technician class. You
> have to take a simple 35-question test."
>
> Dick says "Here's something called the Colt class. You have
> to take a simple 25-question test from the same pool."
>
> Dick and Jane decide to investigate further, to see what
> difference the 10 additional simple questions make.
>
> Dick says "Colt gives you six simplex voice/digital channels
> on 446, and another six simplex voice/digital channels on
> 223MHz. You can even build a simple little repeater between

> them, as long as input and output are not on the same band."
>
> Jane says "Technician gives you 22,243 Megahertz of spectrum
> on 16 bands between 50MHz and 250GHz. Holy Cow, Dick, that's
> millions and millions of frequencies instead of just 12."
>
> Dick says "With a Colt license you can transmit 5 watts of
> power. That's a lot better than FRS!"
>
> Jane says "5 watts is for sissies. With Technician we can
> transmit 1,500 watts of power!"
>
> Dick says "Yes, but the Colt radios are cheap."
>
> Jane says "Sure, but there are lots and lots of used radios
> around for Technicians, even cheaper, and your Colt radio
> will be basicly useless if you upgrade."
>
> Dick says "Hey, but I could put my Colt antenna 20 feet above the
> house if I want."
>
> Jane says "Big deal, Technicians have no arbitrary height limit
> like that; they can go as high as zoning laws allow, and even
> higher with conditional use permits."
>
> Dick says "The Colt license will be a lot of other kids just
> like me."
>
> Jane says "I thought we were sick of kid stuff, and wanted to
> experiment. The Technician license lets us talk to kids and
> doctors and lawyers and indian chiefs and satelites and
> astronauts and W1RFI even."
>
> Dick says "Colts can use both voice and digital modes."
>
> Jane says "Hey, with only 10 more simple questions the Technicians
> are allowed all of that, and other neat stuff like SSTV, FSTV,
> telecommand, and space communications."
>
> Dick says "Jane, you are right. This Colt thing is really lame.
> I always said you were smarter than me. I could just kiss you."
>
> Jane says "Dick, only after you pass your Technician License
> test, and keep your clammy paws off my double bazooka antenna."
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB
>
>
> --
> "We are fellow travelers on a journey between two

> eternities, and it's a trip far too brief for me
> to be concerned about your speed at the Code of
> Morse."
>
>
>
>
>
>
> Sent via Deja.com
> http://www.deja.com/

1180. Top ten most popular alchoholic beverages in Hiram, GA

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 22:02:44 UTC
From: SLee@houston.net
Message-ID: <94d1u4$d44$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 1429
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

```
Top ten most popular alchoholic beverages in Hiram, GA

10. Really, Really, Really, Really Old Milwaukee
9. Wiseman Scotch
8. Amaretto Di Hiram
7. Orville Redenbacher's Butter-flavored Vodka
6. McBourbon
5. Dinty Moore's Pork 'n' Booze
4. Ernest, Julio, Tom and Roseanne Gallo
3. Dr. Scholl's Medicated Tequila
2. Seagrams 7, Braves 0
1. Chivas Du Sterno
```

1181. Top ten signs you're in a Hiram, GA hospital

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 22:03:13 UTC
From: SLee@houston.net
Message-ID: <94d1v1$d44$1@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 1430
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Top ten signs you're in a Hiram, GA hospital

10. You go in for routine surgery, you come out with a tail.
9. You recognize your doctor as kid who was mopping the lobby when you checked in.
8. Instead of sponge bath, they send in a St. Bernard to lick you.
7. As you're going under, your surgeon says, "man, am I baked."
6. In operating room, you see Roger Wiseman scrubbing up.
5. Every couple of minutes you hear a bugle playing taps.
4. All the diplomas on the wall are signed by Sally Struthers.
3. You and your roommate have to take turns on the I.V.
2. Through fog of anesthesia, you hear surgeon shouting, "bring the damn scotch tape!"
1. Instead of "patient" they use the term "plaintiff."

1182. Top ten signs you've visited a Hiram, GA chiropractor

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 22:03:34 UTC
From: SLee@houston.net
Message-ID: <94d1vm$d44$2@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 1431
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Top ten signs you've visited a Hiram, GA chiropractor

10. When you walk, you make a wacky accordion sound.
9. Keeps saying, "A spine is like a box of chocolates."
8. Repeatedly asks, "You a cop? You sure you ain't no cop?"
7. Over and over, you hear crunching sounds followed by "Uh-oh."
6. There's a two-drink minimum.
5. At end of session, lies down on the table and says, "My turn!"
4. He was trained by Roger Wiseman.
3. Rushes in late to your appointment, still wearing his Burger King uniform.
2. Hints that for an extra $50, he'll "straighten" something else.
1. You're fully-clothed and he's naked.

1183. Re: CA power crisis caused by internet

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 22:14:35 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <94d2kb$745$0@208.207.71.177>
Source record: 1433

Richard McCollum wrote:
>
> While micropower installations are probably a good idea, presenting in
> general only the risk of electrocuting your linemen from an unknown
> source, such items as windmills and solar with their attendant problem of
> non-cooperation by the weather present some interesting network design
> problems as well.

All that water flowing from the Delta down to Los Angles in the
California Aquaduct always seemed to be wasted energy since enroute it
could easily be generating electricity several times over. I know of one
reservoir enroute where water storage is shared with power generation.
Then down south of Bakersfield where the Valley runs into the mountains
it all has to be pumped, using a LOT of electricity of course, across
those mountains on the last leg of the journey to LA. California has
done apretty good job of taking care of its water needs, but seems to
have sorta overlooked a stable supply for its longterm electrical
requirements.
We know that hyodrelectric generation is but a drop in the bucket.
Even back in these parts where there are several largelakes with
generating dams on the White River System, it only makes up around 5% of
the total used. But I'd imagine that same 5% could be very helpful to
northern Cal right now.
And there *are* significant if undeveloped geothermal resources in
several places in the Golden State. One is the area around Bishop and
the east slope of the Sierras. It matters not if they're far from metro
areas. What ie needs is development. In the Upper Napa Valley there is a
fair sized geothermal generating plant online now. Point is, even these
lesser installations help a lot in a squeeze, just as you mentioned with
Taum Sauk Reservoir. They can use it for peaking whenever needed. Mostly
hydroelectric power in these parts *IS* used for peaking.
Did you ever drive up and take a close look at Taum Sauk lake on top
of one of Missouri's two highest peaks, that you mentioned? It's a very
impressive 40 acre lake with the supply/drain tubing carved out from
inside the red ganite stone that is the mountain. The water falls 980
feet to the turbines, and gets pumped back up that far overnight. UE
gets a lot of efficiency and a very good return out of that investment.
And what a engineering and construction project!

>
> Separating the grid from the generation facilities was basically dumb but
> handleable if not in the hands of politicians. It just collapsed sooner
> than later.
>

I have little faith in elected officialdom in the Golden State. I spend at least a month each year out there, and have for a couple decades, from south of San Diego to the Amtrak exit at the northern border. The state has a lot of attactive attributes, but these do not number in selected important elected officials' reasoning power and common sense. Political Correctness and assuring their reelection is far more important than needed hardware or realistic planning.

> It is apparent that neither California system is meeting even its base
> load locally. Base load plants require tremendous capital which in turn
> requires a stable planning horizon and some form of guarantee of a
> return -- the dark side of regulation. As with most utilities, what you
> are really paying for is the bondholders. As a result, you usually get
> ossified management.
>

I think this statement proves my last. The most important part of their future utility supply planning seemsto have been to get the rates down so as to maximize their political capital, and let the distant future be taken care of by whomever was unfortunate enough to be in office at that time. What they failed to realize was that the future was coming a lot sooner than they thought.

> It is not a job to be run by committee or public hearing although I guess
> one must maintain the forms and illusion of democracy. In a state which
> conducts public hearings on the social impact of a new area code, the
> future does not look bright.

As long as they maintain the same political direction they've followed for the past 20 years they're doomed. Something's gotta give.

The worrysome feature of California is that it always seemed to be about 20 years ahead of the rest of the country in most areas of modern life. That has at times seemed a bit scary. Today's crisis just emphasizes that feeling. You wonder who else is sitting that close to the edge.

Dick

1184. Re: Follow the Money

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 22:22:27 UTC
From: CitySlicker <not_enuf_time@foolscorner.net>
Message-ID: <94d333$37h@dispatch.concentric.net>
Source record: 1434
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,alt.radio.family,rec.radio.cb

You still can't let go of the license. Must be a paper fetish.

"W4JLE" <Fred@w4jle.com> wrote in message
news:94d1od$6rl$1@iac5.navix.net...
> The need for all of this will go away once my group leaps into action.
When
> we have eliminated all the "elitism" on the bands and issue every citizen
an
> Extra class license, as is their God given right, all will be right with
the
> world.
>
> No Code!
> No Test!
> No Hassle!
>
> --
> Fred W4JLE NHI#1001
> Executive Grand Pooba - No Hassle International
> Doing away with all requirements for a Ham ticket
> "We want, therefore we deserve"
> Send your non-tax deductible donations today!
>
>
> "K0HB" <K0HB@arrl.org> wrote in message
news:94ctn9$3df$1@nnrp1.deja.com...
> > In article <94ate8$l4r$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
> > horseshoestew@my-deja.com wrote:
> >
> > > Look, I don't have anything against you folks - I just don't think it
> > > is appropriate for kids to be learning radio on the 11 meter band.
> >
> > OK, rather than a bunch of old geezers sitting around casting
> > cold water on Stewarts idea, let's look at it from the view
> > of the intended market.
> >
> > Dick and Jane, 14 years old, have "had it" with the
> > limitations of the FRS and now are "interested in experimenting
> > with radios". They've heard of something called "ham radio"
> > and are investigating the entry classes.
> >
> > Jane says "Here's something called the Technician class. You
> > have to take a simple 35-question test."

> >
> > Dick says "Here's something called the Colt class. You have
> > to take a simple 25-question test from the same pool."
> >
> > Dick and Jane decide to investigate further, to see what
> > difference the 10 additional simple questions make.
> >
> > Dick says "Colt gives you six simplex voice/digital channels
> > on 446, and another six simplex voice/digital channels on
> > 223MHz. You can even build a simple little repeater between
> > them, as long as input and output are not on the same band."
> >
> > Jane says "Technician gives you 22,243 Megahertz of spectrum
> > on 16 bands between 50MHz and 250GHz. Holy Cow, Dick, that's
> > millions and millions of frequencies instead of just 12."
> >
> > Dick says "With a Colt license you can transmit 5 watts of
> > power. That's a lot better than FRS!"
> >
> > Jane says "5 watts is for sissies. With Technician we can
> > transmit 1,500 watts of power!"
> >
> > Dick says "Yes, but the Colt radios are cheap."
> >
> > Jane says "Sure, but there are lots and lots of used radios
> > around for Technicians, even cheaper, and your Colt radio
> > will be basicly useless if you upgrade."
> >
> > Dick says "Hey, but I could put my Colt antenna 20 feet above the
> > house if I want."
> >
> > Jane says "Big deal, Technicians have no arbitrary height limit
> > like that; they can go as high as zoning laws allow, and even
> > higher with conditional use permits."
> >
> > Dick says "The Colt license will be a lot of other kids just
> > like me."
> >
> > Jane says "I thought we were sick of kid stuff, and wanted to
> > experiment. The Technician license lets us talk to kids and
> > doctors and lawyers and indian chiefs and satelites and
> > astronauts and W1RFI even."
> >
> > Dick says "Colts can use both voice and digital modes."
> >
> > Jane says "Hey, with only 10 more simple questions the Technicians
> > are allowed all of that, and other neat stuff like SSTV, FSTV,
> > telecommand, and space communications."
> >
> > Dick says "Jane, you are right. This Colt thing is really lame.

> > I always said you were smarter than me. I could just kiss you."
> >
> > Jane says "Dick, only after you pass your Technician License
> > test, and keep your clammy paws off my double bazooka antenna."
> >
> > 73, de Hans, K0HB
> >
> >
> > --
> > "We are fellow travelers on a journey between two
> > eternities, and it's a trip far too brief for me
> > to be concerned about your speed at the Code of
> > Morse."
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> > Sent via Deja.com
> > http://www.deja.com/
>
>

1185. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 22:58:22 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <94d56e$d31$0@208.207.71.177>
Source record: 1435

W1RFI wrote:
> The accomplishments of hams after they get their licenses
> form the reasons for the very existance of the Amateur Radio Service. If all
> hams did was pass Extra tests, of ANY era, there would not be sufficient
> justification for our use of the spectrum.

Repeatedly you assert that the test is pretty much worthlessand most
unnecessary. So then why even have one? Or is that down the Agenda a
ways?

1186. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 23:03:03 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <94d5f7$d31$1@208.207.71.177>
Source record: 1436

W1RFI wrote:
>
> Does saying "personal" instead of "name" or "handle" really need to be a
> "social error" in the amateur community?

No, it doesn't need to be used at all. The user should have presense of
mind enough to learn a few conventions before he heels his own tongue.
If he doesn't he'e better be a fairly fast learner.

1187. Enough already

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 23:12:37 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccoll@radiks.net>
Message-ID: <YVoa6.2453$ed.2021008@nntp2.onemain.com>
Source record: 1437
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,alt.radio.family,rec.radio.cb

"CitySlicker" attempted to dump 3/4 megabits into my mail server.

Nothing that is said on any newsgripe in Usenet is worth 750 KB

Killfiled for arrogance beyond belief.

1188. Re: Top ten most popular alchoholic beverages in Hiram, GA

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 23:16:40 UTC
From: KC8JBO <roger_kc8jbo@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <94d68l$a2u$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1438
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <94d1u4$d44$0@pita.alt.net>,
SLee@houston.net (Stagger Lee) wrote:

hey DRUNK, you already posted this already....and quit stealing
material from Letterman.

--
73 de Roger, KC8JBO
EM99 |ARRL|VE [ARRL & W5YI]|ARES |RACES
Yaesu FT-920 |Inverted Vee @ 40 ft.
Yaesu FT-90R

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1189. Re: Top ten signs you've visited a Hiram, GA chiropractor

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 23:17:34 UTC
From: KC8JBO <roger_kc8jbo@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <94d6aa$a3a$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1440
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <94d1vm$d44$2@pita.alt.net>,
SLee@houston.net (Stagger Lee) wrote:

Poor, poor Georgie-porgie.....

--
73 de Roger, KC8JBO
EM99 |ARRL|VE [ARRL & W5YI]|ARES |RACES
Yaesu FT-920 |Inverted Vee @ 40 ft.
Yaesu FT-90R

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1190. Re: Top ten signs you're in a Hiram, GA hospital

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 23:18:39 UTC
From: KC8JBO <roger_kc8jbo@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <94d6cb$a3n$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1439
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <94d1v1$d44$1@pita.alt.net>,
SLee@houston.net (Stagger Lee) wrote:

<Cancel>
This post was cancelled from within Mozilla.

--
73 de Roger, KC8JBO
EM99 |ARRL|VE [ARRL & W5YI]|ARES |RACES
Yaesu FT-920 |Inverted Vee @ 40 ft.
Yaesu FT-90R

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1191. Re: Top ten signs you're in a Hiram, GA hospital

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 23:56:52 UTC
From: SLee@houston.net
Message-ID: <94d8k4lvd0@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 1441
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Sat, 20 Jan 2001 23:18:39 GMT, KC8JBO <roger_kc8jbo@my-deja.com> wrote:
: In article <94d1v1$d44$1@pita.alt.net>,
: SLee@houston.net (Stagger Lee) wrote:
:
: <Cancel>
: This post was cancelled from within Mozilla.

Sorry, Woger. Most news servers now ignore cancel messages, due to
past abuse.

Poor Woger: Took wessons from know-nothing Dimmy.

Hahahahaha!

1192. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-20 23:58:18 UTC
From: Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com>
Message-ID: <3A6A261A.F73E75CA@dvol.com>
Source record: 1442

Len Over 21 wrote:

> >Wrong. The Harvey-Wells bandswitched 160m thru 2m inclusive (might have been
> >80-2m). Plus the Valiant I & II, the Collins 32V series, The WRLs, B&W, many
> >others.
>
> Harvey-Wells went all the way to 2m in 1958? I thought the
> Gonset G76 was sort of SOTA with 6m at the top end. :-)

>
The Harvey-Wells Bandmaster, 50 watts (807?), CW & AM, fairly compact, stood on what would usually be the end of it's cabinet. About twice as high as wide, sucked up very little desk space. Went to both 6m and 2m in addition to HF. I think it listed for $249.95 in the early 50s. The big sloping panel linear scale VFO slipped under the cabinet and was another 50 bucks or so. Died from overdoses of TVI and ssb.
>
>
>At Ramo-Wooldridge (the 'RW' that spun off TRW) there was

> a young engineer with a KWM-2 in his Triumph sports car
> back in 1960. That's rather an exception to the rule, I think. :-)

>
Bit of panel-butchering but it was his dime. There were others, wa3atp had a Swan 350 xcvr *and* a Swan kw amp tucked under the dash if his big Olds. The mobileers are an inventive bunch and some are slightly whacky.
>

> Maybe I'm wrong, but I and all the people I've worked
> with in electronics in general found the subject very
> interesting, fascinating, even fun...at any age. Why
> can't the interest begin at any age group?

>
Bah. I have absolutely no idea why this "we gotta get kids into the hobby or ham radio is gonna die!" thing is so pervasive. Makes no sense at all to me.
>
The youth factor associated with the 1951 Novice license happened under much different conditions in much different days and I doubt anything like it will ever be repeated. It's of some historical interest, it obviously left a big footprint, there were a helluva lot of kids but for the biggest part the history is the sum total value of it today.
>
Ham radio is a great hobby for all ages but particulary for the eldercrowd. They have the time, they have the money and they have attention spans longer than this

morning. We have several housebound hams around here whose only opportunity to socialize on a meanigful basis is via the airwaves. Providing them with that ability is 'way above most of the rest of the "items on the list" used to justifiy the existence of ham spectrum space as far as I'm concerned.
>
The kids need to be shown ham radio and supported if they do express an interest ditto any others of any age. A mindless thrash to twist ham radio into something it is not, has never been and never will be just to "attract kids" is nonsense preordained to go nowhere.
>

> didit

>
w3rv

1193. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 00:09:18 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010120190918.03154.00000332@ng-cu1.aol.com>
Source record: 1443

>From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

>> Does saying "personal" instead of "name" or "handle" really need to be a
>> "social error" in the amateur community?

> No, it doesn't need to be used at all. The user should have presense of
>mind enough to learn a few conventions before he heels his own tongue.
>If he doesn't he'e better be a fairly fast learner.

If I were getting into a new hobby that involved a community, as does ham radio, and was given the impression that I "better" be a fairly fast learner, or I would receive a public lashing for what I felt was an innocent choice of words, I would very quickly decide that is not a caring, sharing community. I almost certainly would find a different circle, because with friends like that, I would not need enemies.

Fortunately, when I first became a ham and probably made "gaffs" that I wasn't even aware of, I didn't receive the type of "welcome" you are describing.

IMHO, telling people what they "better" do is not in the spirit of ham radio that I have respected for decades.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1194. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 00:12:57 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010120191257.03154.00000333@ng-cu1.aol.com>
Source record: 1444

>From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

>Repeatedly you assert that the test is pretty much worthlessand most
>unnecessary.

I have never said that, Dick. Did you really understand that from my words, or does it suit your Agenda somehow to try to convince people that that is what I "really" mean?

To clarify it again, although I am pretty sure you won't remember this any longer than you will remember it the last time I said it, I believe that the testing of today tests the ability of the applicant to function within ham radio at least as well as did the tests of the days when I entered ham radio.

>So then why even have one?

I disagree with you; I feel it is important that ham radio have testing that tests the ability of the applcant to function within the rules of ham radio.

>Or is that down the Agenda a ways?

Not by me. I feel it is important that ham radio that test the ability of hte applicant to function within the rules of ham radio.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1195. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 00:27:16 UTC
From: Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com>
Message-ID: <3A6A2CE3.A02D6F50@dvol.com>
Source record: 1445
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

CitySlicker wrote:

> Do you think you guys could remove rec.radio.cb from your chat?

>
Of course. Haven't been paying attention to the addresses. Apologies.
>
Brian Kelly w3rv Philly

1196. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 00:27:56 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010120192756.03154.00000334@ng-cu1.aol.com>
Source record: 1446

>From: xjim@my-deja.com

>Again, since you only seem to have focused on the sound bite and not
>what I wrote; "The Novice ticket [1973] was extremely easy if you has
>[had] someone to to work with on it."

I found the 1963 Novice simple enough that I don't recall that I had to ask W1BNB anything about it. I posted the 1963 study guide for the Novice; compare its scope to the exams of today. If you are saying that the 1963 Novice exam is very simple compared to the Technician exam today, then we are in complete agreement.

>And don't think I didn't notice you
>changing the subject in order to plug your publications,

I don't think that ARRL is going to sell many 1963 study guides. My intent was not to "plug" ARRL's pubs, but to use one as an example of why I do not think the exams of today are simpler than they were in the era where I was first licensed.

> but I am an ARRL supporter (on a great many issues) and long time member.

I, too, am an ARRL supporter, although I have not agreed with ARRL on every issue nor do I think it is doing as good a job as can be done in every single thing it can do. I have been a member since about 1986, when I joined the staff.

>Let's for a moment ignore the absolute number of pages because there is
>certainly more to a publication than the number of pages.

I would agree if we were comparing even 50 pages to 200 -- 50 good pages can communicate more than 200 poor ones. But 4 pages for the Novice study guide vs 200+ pages for the Tech study guides is a lot to ignore.

>In 1973, I found the License Manuals completely inadequate for study of the
>concepts that the radio amateur really needs to know in order to
>understand what he is doing,

Absolutely correct. But they were adequate for the study of the concepts needed to pass the tests.

> and how to get the most out of his station, and to do it without
> interfering with the neighbors.

Then, as now, there clearly was a lot to learn after passing the tests and being given the priveleges -- a lifetime of learning for me, anyway. If all there was to ham radio was the test I took, either that test would have taken a lifetime to complete, or ham radio would not be of any interest to me.

>I turned
>to the 67, 68, and 69 editions of The Radio Amateurs Handbook in my
>study, long before taking the Novice exam and continuing to learn about
>amateur radio operations by doing, by making mistakes and by polishing
>my craft under the guidance and on the shoulders of those who went
>before.

I studied ONLY the 4-page study guide for the Novice and several months later, those 16 pages for the General. I bought a Handbook and Antenna Book later, and learned a whole lot more, including why some of those answers were correct. I think it was years later, in my TV repair days, that I finally figured out what a parasitic oscillation was and why it could cause RFI. :-)

>There is so much about Ham Radio that can't be taught in a
>publication or seminar ...

or by taking a test; it is only by doing, over an entire lifetime, that we discover our own personal potential in ham radio. I was a late bloomer. :-)

>because it is way too impersonal and doesn't
>give enough hands-on like the Novice License did.

What hands-on? I read 4 pages and took a test -- I was a Novice. The hands on started with the Novice license for me, but continues to this day. I am still learning.

>Let me explain another way: The Novice License was an easy way to get
>on the air and get a taste of Amateur Radio, and provided a proving
>ground fertile with learning experiences with time to progress.

>The current entry situation caters to instant gratification and bestows
>priveleges not yet earned by experience.

More instant gratification than I got by reading 4 pages of study guide? Although I had lots of Novice experience before I took my General to get all amateur priveleges, the rules did not require it. I could have studied 16 pages of study guide and passed the tests.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1197. Re: Sound Familiar?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 00:29:02 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010120192902.03154.00000335@ng-cu1.aol.com>
Source record: 1447

>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)

>Maybe there will be a scientific breakthrough soon where
>there will be separate EM spectra just for the different
>radio services...

The ultrawideband folks are saying... naw, never mind. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1198. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 00:31:43 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010120193143.03168.00000465@ng-cu1.aol.com>
Source record: 1448

>From: Brian Kelly kelly@dvol.com

>> Harvey-Wells went all the way to 2m in 1958? I thought the
>> Gonset G76 was sort of SOTA with 6m at the top end. :-)

>The Harvey-Wells Bandmaster, 50 watts (807?), CW & AM, fairly compact, stood
>on what would usually be the end of it's cabinet. About twice as high as wide,
>sucked up very little desk space. Went to both 6m and 2m in addition to HF.

Yes, it goes to 2 M. I have one in my shack.

>>Died from an overdose of TVI...

Then it is a darn good thing I never used it; it would not do for me to be
causing any RFI. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1199. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 00:36:18 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010120193618.03168.00000466@ng-cu1.aol.com>
Source record: 1449

>From: Brian Kelly kelly@dvol.com

>The youth factor associated with the 1951 Novice license happened under much
>different conditions in much different days and I doubt anything like it will
>ever
>be repeated.

Both for social reasons, Brian, and for the simple reason that the generation of hams who entered ham radio by that route does not seem to want tests to be made that simple again. :-)

The FCC is also not inclined to create a one-year, non-renewable license again, either.

>It's of some historical interest, it obviously left a big footprint,
>there were a helluva lot of kids but for the biggest part the history is the
>sum total value of it today.

There are now more modes commonly available to hams, more stable and reliable technology, more frequencies easily used -- the license had to change.

Too bad; that simple 20-question exam for the Novice brought a lot of people into it. What surprises me is that even with the entry-level being at least an order of magnitude more difficult and more complex, growth continued. I don't think I would be a ham today if someone had handed me a 200+ page study guide and told me that this is what I had to know to be a beginner in ham radio. And if they then told me that it was "dumbed down" from that 4-page book THEY had to read...

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1200. Re: Top ten signs you're in a Hiram, GA hospital

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 01:34:11 UTC
From: KC8JBO <roger_kc8jbo@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <94deaj$g5g$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1450
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <94d8k4lvd0@dosa.alt.net>,
SLee@houston.net (Stagger Lee) wrote:
>
> On Sat, 20 Jan 2001 23:18:39 GMT, KC8JBO <roger_kc8jbo@my-deja.com>
wrote:
> : In article <94d1v1$d44$1@pita.alt.net>,
> : SLee@houston.net (Stagger Lee) wrote:
> :
> : <Cancel>
> : This post was cancelled from within Mozilla.
>
> Sorry, Woger. Most news servers now ignore cancel messages, due to
> past abuse.

DUMBFUCK George..it wasn't a REAL cancel message to begin with.

> Poor Woger: Took wessons from know-nothing Dimmy.

I wonder if alt.net thinks the same way.......DUMBFUCK.

> Hahahahaha!

Poor George had to decide between the BOTTLE and his wife........
I bet you wish the BOTTLE of Alcohol WON........
LOL!!!!!! Of course it wasn't your FIRST wife, was it chronic Drunk?
And quit QRMing on the bands.

--
73 de Roger, KC8JBO
EM99 |ARRL|VE [ARRL & W5YI]|ARES |RACES
Yaesu FT-920 |Inverted Vee @ 40 ft.
Yaesu FT-90R

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1201. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 01:51:41 UTC
From: W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com>
Message-ID: <94dfc2$jj4$1@iac5.navix.net>
Source record: 1451

For God's sake Ed, you are working so hard to be politically correct. I guess if a kid is learning baseball, you should not point out he is running the bases in the wrong direction for fear he will give up baseball?

Give me a single reason we should be bending over and kissing some snot nosed kids ass to get him active in ham radio! If they are interested, I will bust my butt to help them.

I have Elmered more than a few in my time, but at no point did I waste time on anyone who had no interest.

I had one guy wanted to be a ham and was having trouble with the code. It took me a while to realize his problem was not the code, he did not know how to read or write. I worked with him for over a year and he earned his ticket. I remember him struggling to read to become a ham, then I listen to all the cock and bull about "how tough it is on the children to get a ticket".

Give me a break!
--
Fred W4JLE NHI#1001
Executive Grand Pooba - No Hassle International
Doing away with all requirements for a Ham ticket
"We want, therefore we deserve"
Send your non-tax deductible donations today!

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20010120190918.03154.00000332@ng-cu1.aol.com...
> >From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
>
> >> Does saying "personal" instead of "name" or "handle" really need to be
a
> >> "social error" in the amateur community?
>
> > No, it doesn't need to be used at all. The user should have presense of
> >mind enough to learn a few conventions before he heels his own tongue.
> >If he doesn't he'e better be a fairly fast learner.
>
> If I were getting into a new hobby that involved a community, as does ham
> radio, and was given the impression that I "better" be a fairly fast
learner,
> or I would receive a public lashing for what I felt was an innocent choice
of
> words, I would very quickly decide that is not a caring, sharing
community. I
> almost certainly would find a different circle, because with friends like

that,
> I would not need enemies.
>
> Fortunately, when I first became a ham and probably made "gaffs" that I
wasn't
> even aware of, I didn't receive the type of "welcome" you are describing.
>
> IMHO, telling people what they "better" do is not in the spirit of ham
radio
> that I have respected for decades.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>

1202. Re: CA power crisis caused by internet

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 02:09:02 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nospam.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.g7hdana.pminews@ca.news.verio.net>
Source record: 1453
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Sat, 20 Jan 2001 13:25:20 -0600, Richard McCollum wrote:

>just look at Enron.com and select Enron Wind. Incidentally, they run a
>1.6 MW plant at Tehatchapi CA.

1.6 MW? That takes about 3000 HP to generate....any
respectable freight locomotive prime mover can do that.

(That's Tehachapi, BTW).

There has been a "windmill farm" in Altamont Pass, 45 miles
east of San Francisco, for over 25 years. As long as the state
PUC mandated that the PG&E had to buy its power at retail
rates, it worked. When the state subsidy ended, PG&E said
"thanks but no thanks".

I wonder whether the windmills were spinning this week.

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

1203. Re: "They oughta require a license....blah, blah, blah"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 02:09:03 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nospam.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.g7he9fb.pminews@ca.news.verio.net>
Source record: 1452

On 20 Jan 2001 06:45:27 GMT, Len Over 21 wrote:

>OOs and run-of-the-mill hams can ID them illegal kerchunkers with
>"fingerprint techniques?"

No biggie, providing one has the specific software, receiver
with properly-modified AGC and wideband output and a late model
PC and VCR. The technique was developed by a ham at Boeing who
sold/gave it to the FCC in the early 1990s and AFAIK the program
is available "on the market".

Whether one has the necessary training and qualifications
to interpret the results in a manner to be accepted as expert
testimony is another matter.

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

1204. Re: cellphone block

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 02:09:04 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nospam.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.g7helbc.pminews@ca.news.verio.net>
Source record: 1454
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Sat, 20 Jan 2001 06:36:56 GMT, JC wrote:

>I'm just gonna find an appropriate FCC section and send it to
>school. As to making sure jammers are using jammer, they
>annouced "one will not be able to use cellphone inside the
>building as we have a cellphone blocker in use" on bulletin.

Call the FCC Consumer Assistance Center (1-888-225-5322) and
request that they send/FAX you a copy of the FCC Public Notice
issued a few months ago warning that the use of these devices is
unlawful. If that does not persuade the school management to
cease and desist, call the same number and lodge a complaint,
which will be investigated. This has a much higher priority
than kerchunking on two meters.

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

1205. Re: Sound Familiar?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 02:32:13 UTC
From: Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com>
Message-ID: <3A6A4A2D.9B3D31BD@dvol.com>
Source record: 1455

W1RFI wrote:

> >From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>
> >Maybe there will be a scientific breakthrough soon where
> >there will be separate EM spectra just for the different
> >radio services...
>
> The ultrawideband folks are saying... naw, never mind. :-)\

>
TRY me!
>

> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

>
w3rv

1206. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 02:37:58 UTC
From: Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com>
Message-ID: <3A6A4B86.DDE5D557@dvol.com>
Source record: 1456
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,alt.radio.family,rec.radio.cb

K0HB wrote:

> N0MHS writes:
>
> > The rapidly-expanding Family Radio Service has exposed
> > millions of young people to the world of radio communications.
> > But now, where is a you kid to go who has is interested in
> > experimenting with radios....... clip.
>
> OK, rather than a bunch of old geezers sitting around casting
> cold water on Stewarts idea, let's look at it from the view
> of the intended market.
>
> Dick and Jane, 14 years old, have "had it" with the
> limitations of the FRS and now are "interested in experimenting
> with radios". They've heard of something called "ham radio"
> and are investigating the entry classes.
>
> Jane says "Here's something called the Technician class. You
> have to take a simple 35-question test."
>
> Dick says "Here's something called the Colt class. You have
> to take a simple 25-question test from the same pool."
>
> Dick and Jane decide to investigate further, to see what
> difference the 10 additional simple questions make.
>
> Dick says "Colt gives you six simplex voice/digital channels
> on 446, and another six simplex voice/digital channels on
> 223MHz. You can even build a simple little repeater between
> them, as long as input and output are not on the same band."
>
> Jane says "Technician gives you 22,243 Megahertz of spectrum
> on 16 bands between 50MHz and 250GHz. Holy Cow, Dick, that's
> millions and millions of frequencies instead of just 12."
>
> Dick says "With a Colt license you can transmit 5 watts of
> power. That's a lot better than FRS!"
>
> Jane says "5 watts is for sissies. With Technician we can
> transmit 1,500 watts of power!"
>
> Dick says "Yes, but the Colt radios are cheap."

>
> Jane says "Sure, but there are lots and lots of used radios
> around for Technicians, even cheaper, and your Colt radio
> will be basicly useless if you upgrade."
>
> Dick says "Hey, but I could put my Colt antenna 20 feet above the
> house if I want."
>
> Jane says "Big deal, Technicians have no arbitrary height limit
> like that; they can go as high as zoning laws allow, and even
> higher with conditional use permits."
>
> Dick says "The Colt license will be a lot of other kids just
> like me."
>
> Jane says "I thought we were sick of kid stuff, and wanted to
> experiment. The Technician license lets us talk to kids and
> doctors and lawyers and indian chiefs and satelites and
> astronauts and W1RFI even."
>
> Dick says "Colts can use both voice and digital modes."
>
> Jane says "Hey, with only 10 more simple questions the Technicians
> are allowed all of that, and other neat stuff like SSTV, FSTV,
> telecommand, and space communications."
>
> Dick says "Jane, you are right. This Colt thing is really lame.
> I always said you were smarter than me. I could just kiss you."
>
> Jane says "Dick, only after you pass your Technician License
> test, and keep your clammy paws off my double bazooka antenna."
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB

>
Beautiful.
>
w3rv

1207. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 02:49:20 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <94dinfjbc1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1457

In article <94dfc2$jj4$1@iac5.navix.net>,
"W4JLE" <Fred@w4jle.com> wrote:
> For God's sake Ed, you are working so hard to be politically correct.
I
> guess if a kid is learning baseball, you should not point out he is
running
> the bases in the wrong direction for fear he will give up baseball?
>
> Give me a single reason we should be bending over and kissing some
snot
> nosed kids ass to get him active in ham radio! If they are interested,
I
> will bust my butt to help them.

Too late, I think its already broke.

> I have Elmered more than a few in my time, but at no point did I waste
time
> on anyone who had no interest.
>
> I had one guy wanted to be a ham and was having trouble with the code.
It
> took me a while to realize his problem was not the code, he did not
know how
> to read or write. I worked with him for over a year and he earned his
> ticket. I remember him struggling to read to become a ham, then I
listen to
> all the cock and bull about "how tough it is on the children to get a
> ticket".
>
> Give me a break!
> --
> Fred W4JLE NHI#1001
> Executive Grand Pooper - No Hassle International
> Doing away with all requirements for a Ham ticket
> "We want, therefore we deserve"
> Send your non-tax deductible donations today!

"We think, therefore, we are more brillianter than everyone else."

Brought to you by the tired old fart from the Jelly School of Inductive
Reasoning.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1208. Re: "They oughta require a license....blah, blah, blah"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 03:01:12 UTC
From: southpark_meskin@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <94djdmjrq1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1460

In article <3A662B55.A451E26@dvol.com>,
Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com> wrote:
>
> "Leland C. Scott" wrote:
>
> > > on ham radio. Fact is they don't have any real impact on anything
which is
> > why
> > > they're on the low end of the FCC's list of priorities.
> >
> > They maybe on the low end of the FCC's list, but the ARRL is
interested in
> > how many show up on 10m.
>
> >
> They've been on the low end of ten for eons when the spots are up and
I've been
> there, too. Right off most of those who are audible here are Central
and South
> American stations which nobody in this country including the FCC or
the ARRL can
> do anything about. I've never had a problem working either thru or
around them
> with 100 watts worth of cw, they're just some more ignorable garbage
on the ham
> bands. I'd sure as hell rather have to deal with a freebander on ten
for a new
> one than I would have to deal with Radio Moscow for a new one on 40.
> >
>
> > Now with the creation of MURS they have an excuse
> > to use opened up Ham 2m rigs, and most likely start to show up on
2m. I
> > guess you figure if they don't bother you it must not be a problem
for
> > anyone else.
>
> >
> I chose to not make it a problem for myself. You wanna make it a
problem for
> yourself go for it and good luck "fixing" it.
> >
>
> > --

> > Leland C. Scott
> > KC8LDO
>
> >
> w3rv
>
>
senior scott he give the cb peoples lots of the troubles over there.
He no good.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1209. Re: It's like this....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 03:01:46 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <94djeo$js5$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1458

In article <20010120104137.00714.00003152@nso-md.aol.com>,
yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote:
> In article <949a92$6rk$1@nnrp1.deja.com>, Brian
<brianburke@my-deja.com>
> writes:
>
> >
> >However, taken in the context of the Clint DeSoto thread where I
> >highlighted the idea of an amateur radio brotherhood, he implied that
> >hams talking to hams OVER THE INTERNET have no need to share in any
ham
> >brotherhood.
> >
> >Such an idea spouted from your mouth in years gone by. You appear to
> >have a loyal following.
>
> Brian:
>
> As long as I continue to speak the truth, why shouldn't I have a
> loyal following? This is Usenet. A part of the Internet. It is not
> Amateur Radio in any way, shape, or form. In this and other
> amateur-radio related newsgroups, amateur radio is the major
> topic, but still, ham radio it's not. We are not communicating
> over-the-air on assigned amateur radio frequencies or operating
> under the authority of our FCC-granted amateur radio licenses.
> No such license is required to post here. To pick up the mic
> of my 2-meter rig, press the PTT button, and say "K3LT
> listening," I need a license. To post here, I don't. Get the idea
> now, Brian?
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

And thus you shed all the Clint DeSoto notion of a fellowship of hams
who share a mutual respect, which was the thread that K0HB was trying to
promote, except without the fellowship and mutual respect. I think it
had something about learning the code, which apparently is far more
important than learning fellowship and mutual respect.

At this point I think its probably OK to tell you to join the KMA club
and ask you to retell your "Favorite Black on the Bus" story, since
we're not ditty boppin or QSLing.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1210. Re: "They oughta require a license....blah, blah, blah"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 03:03:20 UTC
From: southpark_meskin@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <94djhljsq1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1459

In article <3A689357.3A2A@bellsouth.net>,
joxendi@bellsouth.net wrote:
> Len,
>
> I don't know about "officially" requiring a license, but I have asked
> for licenses at hamfests on transceivers and amplifiers. Yes, some of
> 'em got mad, but, knowing that Riley H. and company were roaming the
> premises, I wouldn't take the risk of selling to a CBer (found that
out
> because the person{s} told me so).
>
> I DO think that cash or equivilent prizes should be substituted to
non-
> hams at hamfests instead of handing out IC706MKIIGs to the general
pub-
> lic. Some of these items are sure to end up being used illegally.
Some
> hamfests do this, others don't---but I wish they would. Could be the
> source of that "mysterious" kerchunker on 2M is a handheld won by a
per-
> son without a clue as to the laws governing its use.
>
> Jerr
> K4KWH
>
> Len Over 21 wrote:
> >
> > In article <3A662EB5.79A21E16@dvol.com>, Brian Kelly
<kelly@dvol.com> writes:
> >
> > >> There is no time machine to go back to undo the past. There
> > >> is the possibility that the existing and future FCC can solve
> > >> some problems in US civil radio. Support the FCC in
> > >> regulation of radio...or become lawless vigilantes who are
> > >> outnumbered by others. There is no honor or respect in
> > >> vigilanteism.
> > >
> > >Indeed and agreed. Probable factoid: The FCC would much prefer
dealing
> > >with some inane but basically harmless freebanders than they would
a
> > >phlanx of amateur (in the more common sense) "helper" frequency
cops up
> > >their butts.

> >
> > A problem with any vigilante group of self-styled "cops" occurs
> > when they run into another vigilante group having different
> > ideas of what is "best." Nobody wins except the Real cops.
> >
> > Remember that CB users outnumber radio amateurs by a
> > considerable ratio.
> >
> > didit
>

senior jerry he want to be the radio policia all over the land out
there. He makes mucho the troubles for the cb peoples

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1211. Re: Enough already

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 03:20:42 UTC
From: CitySlicker <not_enuf_time@foolscorner.net>
Message-ID: <94dkia$61a@dispatch.concentric.net>
Source record: 1461
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,alt.radio.family,rec.radio.cb

Well you guys insist on cross posting your BS to this NG. I asked more than once to end it I am tired of wading through your nonsense to read what I come here for.

"Richard McCollum" <rmccoll@radiks.net> wrote in message news:YVoa6.2453$ed.2021008@nntp2.onemain.com...
>
> "CitySlicker" attempted to dump 3/4 megabits into my mail server.
>
> Nothing that is said on any newsgripe in Usenet is worth 750 KB
>
> Killfiled for arrogance beyond belief.
>
>

1212. Re: Enough already

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 03:24:18 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A6A5662.106B5865@IEEE.org>
Source record: 1462
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,alt.radio.family,rec.radio.cb

CitySlicker wrote:
> Well you guys insist on cross posting your BS to this NG. I asked more than
> once to end it I am tired of wading through your nonsense to read what I
> come here for.

Your objection will only cause people who enjoy getting goats to
just try even harder to get yours. Why not just use your newsreader
kill file feature like I do? There is no way you or I can stop
others from crossposting.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

1213. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 03:26:16 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A6A56D8.6B598F4E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 1463

W1RFI wrote:
>
> From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
> >Repeatedly you assert that the test is pretty much worthlessand most
> >unnecessary.
>
> I have never said that, Dick. Did you really understand that from my words, or
> does it suit your Agenda somehow to try to convince people that that is what I
> "really" mean?

Dick has this delusion firmly set in his concrete brain. "Anyone who
is happy about lowering the Morse code requirement to 5wpm also wants
to eliminate all testing." There's no way to fight a delusion, Ed.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

1214. Re: It's like this....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 03:29:22 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A6A5792.240BC56F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 1464

Brian wrote:
> I think it
> had something about learning the code, which apparently is far more
> important than learning fellowship and mutual respect.

Of course, fellowship and mutual respect is impossible without Morse
code. Where have you been, Brian?
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

1215. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 03:33:12 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A6A5878.278A8786@IEEE.org>
Source record: 1466

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> W1RFI wrote:
> > Does saying "personal" instead of "name" or "handle" really need to be a
> > "social error" in the amateur community?
>
> No, it doesn't need to be used at all. The user should have presense of
> mind enough to learn a few conventions before he heels his own tongue.
> If he doesn't he'e better be a fairly fast learner.

Or what, Dick? Declare him a witch and burn him at the stake? If all
hams were like you, the FCC would abolish the ARS.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

1216. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 03:36:55 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A6A5957.FA0731DD@IEEE.org>
Source record: 1467

W4JLE wrote:
> For God's sake Ed, you are working so hard to be politically correct. I
> guess if a kid is learning baseball, you should not point out he is running
> the bases in the wrong direction for fear he will give up baseball?

Would you call him a dumb $hit idiot in the process and give him 50
lashes? We're talking about degree here. It's pretty obvious that
some OFs simply want to keep the newcomers out of "their" sandbox.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

1217. Re: CA power crisis caused by internet

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 03:43:13 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nospam.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.g7hlt8e.pminews@ca.news.verio.net>
Source record: 1465

On 20 Jan 2001 22:14:35 GMT, Dick Carroll wrote:

>> While micropower installations are probably a good idea, presenting in
>> general only the risk of electrocuting your linemen from an unknown
>> source,

Not if the system is properly designed, with lock-outs and
safety precautions taken. A while back I watched a transformer
switch-out and was heartened to see the crew hot-stick a line
that they themselves cut out and grounded. The electrician
installing a tap for a second subscriber on the premises entry
lugs (the reason for the switch-out) went in and probed the
meter-board even though he watched the transformer being hauled
down from the pole and the secondary leads were clearly waving
in the breeze.

Take no chances, or as the ARRL pubs say "Switch to Safety".

When my wife worked at the Dow Chemical plant in Pittsburg,
CA she was horrified to see the cogeneration primary and the
utility primary cross on the same pole....a disaster waiting to
happen (and it did, with attendant fireworks).

As I said, "properly designed"....

> All that water flowing from the Delta down to Los Angles in the
>California Aquaduct always seemed to be wasted energy since enroute it
>could easily be generating electricity several times over. I know of one
>reservoir enroute where water storage is shared with power generation.

The California Aqueduct originates in the Oroville Dam (on the
Feather River) where PG&E generates the hydro. There are
several small hydro plants above there on the Feather River.
Which one are you referring to?

>Then down south of Bakersfield where the Valley runs into the mountains
>it all has to be pumped, using a LOT of electricity of course, across
>those mountains on the last leg of the journey to LA.

IIRC most of the "hops" on the California Aqueduct are siphons,
where the function of the pumps is to start the siphon action.
My recollectuion is that the entire system is balanced to the
point that even including the electricity necessary for the
pumps, there is an excess of juice which is sold to the utilities.

>California has
>done apretty good job of taking care of its water needs, but seems to

>have sorta overlooked a stable supply for its longterm electrical
>requirements.

"Vote Yes on Water" - 1960 Prop. A - built that project.

>In the Upper Napa Valley there is a fair sized geothermal generating
>plant online now.

The Geysers is a very old plant that PG&E sold off because it was
no longer cost-effective.

> I have little faith in elected officialdom in the Golden State. I spend
>at least a month each year out there, and have for a couple decades,
>from south of San Diego to the Amtrak exit at the northern border.

The last Amtrak stop before Oregon is Redding, which is quite
a distance from the border. Do you take Amtrak? I make the
rail trip between Portland and Oakland/San Francisco at least
once a year, more if I can get someone else to foot the bill.

>The worrysome feature of California is that it always seemed to be
>about 20 years ahead of the rest of the country in most areas of modern
>life.

That's why I moved to California directly I graduated from
engineering school (where my major was electrical power
generation and transmission) almost 45 years ago.

>That has at times seemed a bit scary.

That's why we moved to Oregon in 1999 - Oregon is what
the good in California was 40 years ago, and alas is no longer.

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

1218. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 04:14:35 UTC
From: "Steven J Robeson", K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <94dnn7$n8b$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1468

In article <94cbbnkvf1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org> wrote:
> In article <94akj6$e1i$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,

> Steven J Robeson, K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com> wrote:
>
> > Noble effort, Don Quixote.
>
> Can we limit the discussion to the idea, and not degrade this to
> a discussion of personalities?

Seems you're the one bringing it up, and the comment wasn't
directed at you, Hans.

What's up with that?

> --
> "We are fellow travelers on a journey between two
> eternities, and it's a trip far too brief for me
> to be concerned about your speed at the Code of
> Morse."

And even further too brief for me to give a hoot about what you
are or are not concerned about.

--
"If You're Not A Ham....You're SPAM!"

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1219. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 04:32:59 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <mibk6ts5gemuta44dg9g1asjquu77014q4@4ax.com>
Source record: 1469

w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:
>It is all relative, isn't it? Do you believe that passing the entry-level test
>of today -- the Technician exam, demonstrates more or less electronics and
>radio knowledge than passing the entry-level test of 1963?

If I said the 1963 test was a joke, would you agree with me that the
2001 test is a joke? Not likely. So why do you keep going there? Let's
just discuss the merits of the test of today. Do you think that a test
that allows people to pass without knowing the material is a good
test?? :-)

>I posted the 1963 Novice study guide in another post;
>I will send it to you if you missed it.

I got it and your effort is much appreciated. Thanks...

1220. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 04:33:03 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <efbk6tkijke4qscv3m60d6d635971m19im@4ax.com>
Source record: 1470

w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:
>Quite permissible [to get on the air with no license] under the rules
>as a third-party participant under a control operator.

Well Ed, KN7ENT was the first call I ever used on the air (in 1957).
I chose it because it was not yet found in the callbook, and because
my best friends name was KENT... :-)

>Does saying "personal" instead of "name" or "handle" really need to be a
>"social error" in the amateur community?

No it doesn't. In fact "personal" may become acceptable ham jargon in
a few years. "Handle" which was once acceptable is starting not to be.
Who knows why or how these social rules come about, but they are a
fact of life. And those who insist on breaking them, either on purpose
or in ignorance, should not be surprised if they are treated
differently...

I recently moved to a large retirement community with thousands of
people. When out walking just about everybody here greets you as you
pass. But if I were to go just a few miles outside this retirement
community to the nearest mall, and started saying hello to everyone I
pass, they would likely be calling the cops on me for being a weirdo.
Even making unwanted eye contact while driving on the freeway can
cause you problems these days. Social rules don't make always make
sense, but if you don't know them and/or don't follow them, expect
some difficulty in life...

1221. Re: Enough already

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 04:37:20 UTC
From: "Bill, W7TI" <w7ti@jps.net>
Message-ID: <uopk6t05cfk9e8ereacd33m8b719erhg88@4ax.com>
Source record: 1471
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,alt.radio.family,rec.radio.cb

On 21 Jan 2001 03:20:42 GMT, "CitySlicker" <not_enuf_time@foolscorner.net>
wrote:

>Well you guys insist on cross posting your BS to this NG. I asked more than
>once to end it I am tired of wading through your nonsense to read what I
>come here for.

_____

Does the word "killfile" have any meaning to you? I too get tired of reading
posts complaining about posts. Consider yourself killfiled.

Bill, W7TI

1222. Re: Enough already

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 05:11:01 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nospam.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.g7hq1h0.pminews@ca.news.verio.net>
Source record: 1472
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On 21 Jan 2001 03:20:42 GMT, CitySlicker wrote:

>Well you guys insist on cross posting your BS to this NG. I asked more than
>once to end it I am tired of wading through your nonsense to read what I
>come here for.

Which group is "this NG"? I see your message cross-posted
into FOUR groups. Look at your headers and tell us which ones
to not find you in.

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

1223. Re: CA power crisis caused by internet

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 06:21:12 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <94dv4o$id4$0@208.207.71.169>
Source record: 1473

Phil Kane wrote:
>
>
A while back I watched a transformer
> switch-out and was heartened to see the crew hot-stick a line
> that they themselves cut out and grounded. The electrician
> installing a tap for a second subscriber on the premises entry
> lugs (the reason for the switch-out) went in and probed the
> meter-board even though he watched the transformer being hauled
> down from the pole and the secondary leads were clearly waving
> in the breeze.
>
> Take no chances, or as the ARRL pubs say "Switch to Safety".

Last week I noticed a tag on a electric utility truck that said
"If if isn't grounded it isn't dead". Good plan. HV can be insidious. We
had a rural firefighting crew that got tangled up with a downed HT line
that had fallen across a fence last year. Killed one and badly injured
another. Real Bumnmer.

> When my wife worked at the Dow Chemical plant in Pittsburg,
> CA she was horrified to see the cogeneration primary and the
> utility primary cross on the same pole....a disaster waiting to
> happen (and it did, with attendant fireworks).
>
> As I said, "properly designed"....

There's no substitute.

> > All that water flowing from the Delta down to Los Angles in the
> >California Aquaduct always seemed to be wasted energy since enroute it
> >could easily be generating electricity several times over. I know of one
> >reservoir enroute where water storage is shared with power generation.
>
> The California Aqueduct originates in the Oroville Dam (on the
> Feather River) where PG&E generates the hydro. There are
> several small hydro plants above there on the Feather River.
> Which one are you referring to?

The one at San Luis Reservoir, near Los Banos. A hydro plant is located
there, as evidenced by the transmission facilities located there. I
wasn't familar with the one at Oroville dam. When I have asked where the
aqueduct originated the answer I always got was "The Delta".
Hydro is a small percentage of the total generated, of course. Here
where there is a series of hydro dams on the White river it amounts to
only 5 percent of the total. And here it's mostly used for peaking.

> >Then down south of Bakersfield where the Valley runs into the mountains
> >it all has to be pumped, using a LOT of electricity of course, across
> >those mountains on the last leg of the journey to LA.
>
> IIRC most of the "hops" on the California Aqueduct are siphons,
> where the function of the pumps is to start the siphon action.
> My recollectuion is that the entire system is balanced to the
> point that even including the electricity necessary for the
> pumps, there is an excess of juice which is sold to the utilities.

All very interesting and again shows that things aren't always what
they seem.
I had noticed all that water moving south and, being from hydroelectric
country, had thought that a lot of generating capacity appeared to be
going unused. That made sense, given the cheap easy availability of
power until recent times. And the big pump station and huge tubes headed
up into the mountains south of Bakersfield sure look like power hogs. I
wasn't aware that siphoning was an option.

> >California has
> >done apretty good job of taking care of its water needs, but seems to
> >have sorta overlooked a stable supply for its longterm electrical
> >requirements.
>
> "Vote Yes on Water" - 1960 Prop. A - built that project.

You suppose the next promotion will be "Vote Yes on Juice"?

>
> >In the Upper Napa Valley there is a fair sized geothermal generating
> >plant online now.
>
> The Geysers is a very old plant that PG&E sold off because it was
> no longer cost-effective.

We've visited the Calistoga Geyser, and I recently read a real short
blurb in some news mag that caught my eye about a new geothermal
generating facility coming online in that area of the upper Napa valley.
It didn't give details. Looks like the increasing cost of fossil fuel
may renew interest in developing geothermal sources, maybe on the east
slope of the Sierras around Bishop? They seem to have lots of it in that
area, if it doesn't blow first.

> The last Amtrak stop before Oregon is Redding, which is quite
> a distance from the border. Do you take Amtrak? I make the
> rail trip between Portland and Oakland/San Francisco at least
> once a year, more if I can get someone else to foot the bill.

We made the Coast Starlight run from the SF area to Seattle a few
times when daughter and her family lived up there. Quite a scenic trip
through the Cascades, and Mount Shasta is visible for over 50 miles.
Really enjoyable.
Alas, the kids relocated to the Salt Lake City area.

> >The worrysome feature of California is that it always seemed to be
> >about 20 years ahead of the rest of the country in most areas of modern
> >life.

> That's why I moved to California directly I graduated from
> engineering school (where my major was electrical power
> generation and transmission) almost 45 years ago.

Once that was an attraction. Today, no. Seems that it peaked.
We were in the Bay area for a week in late November. Flew into Oakland
and drove out to Livermore. Traffic is unrelenting regardless of the
time of day or night, and you don't drive away from it when you leave
the city as you once did. It's everywhere, and it has steadily worsened
over the 20 years we've been visiting there. We took BART back into the
city for that side trip and left the rental car parked.
We didn't get out to Altamont Pass this trip, but in June when we were
there the wind-gen-mills were going full tilt. I hadn't heard that PG&E
was no longer buying their output. Evidently someone is.

Once we toyed with the idea of resettling somewhere in California in
retirement, but have abandoned the idea. It appears the best of it is
history. And if they don't get that power situation resolved the
unpleasant future is now.

> >That has at times seemed a bit scary.
>
> That's why we moved to Oregon in 1999 - Oregon is what
> the good in California was 40 years ago, and alas is no longer.

That's certainly plain to me. Seems it was a wise move.

73, Dick W0EX

1224. Re: "They oughta require a license....blah, blah, blah"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 06:26:39 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <020l6tgrcaqqmu7977klln4irdhclekk02@4ax.com>
Source record: 1474

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nospam.spam> wrote:
> Whether one has the necessary training and qualifications
> to interpret the results in a manner to be accepted as expert
> testimony is another matter.

As you have previously pointed out, the Feds don't really care about
our small potato violations, so what good would expert testimony do
anyway...

1225. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 06:31:22 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <94dvnq$id4$1@208.207.71.169>
Source record: 1475

Cecil wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > W1RFI wrote:
> > > Does saying "personal" instead of "name" or "handle" really need to be a
> > > "social error" in the amateur community?
> >
> > No, it doesn't need to be used at all. The user should have presense of
> > mind enough to learn a few conventions before he heels his own tongue.
> > If he doesn't he'e better be a fairly fast learner.
>
> Or what, Dick? Declare him a witch and burn him at the stake?

No, Nimrod. Or else some impatient sort will tell him that which he'd
have learned on his own if he wasn't such a clueless dip. They get more
than a good opportunity to learn. It's when they display skulls of
granite that the hammers come out. ANd you have no idea what kind of a
ham I am based on what happens here.

1226. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 06:36:27 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <94e01bkaa0@208.207.71.169>
Source record: 1476

Cecil wrote:
>
> W4JLE wrote:
> > For God's sake Ed, you are working so hard to be politically correct. I
> > guess if a kid is learning baseball, you should not point out he is running
> > the bases in the wrong direction for fear he will give up baseball?
>
> Would you call him a dumb $hit idiot in the process and give him 50
> lashes?

No, but you sure would gently set him straight. And if he broke down
bawling like a girl because of it you'd set him on the bench at least
until his tears dried.

We're talking about degree here. It's pretty obvious that
> some OFs simply want to keep the newcomers out of "their" sandbox.

Drawing conclusions based on our personal biases again are we? You
assume a lot from wild tales told in ways sure to elicit sympathy where
it isn't always truly deserved.

1227. Re: "They oughta require a license....blah, blah, blah"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 06:46:32 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <94e0k8$ll4$0@208.207.71.169>
Source record: 1477

Aaron Jones wrote:
>
> "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nospam.spam> wrote:
> > Whether one has the necessary training and qualifications
> > to interpret the results in a manner to be accepted as expert
> > testimony is another matter.
>
> As you have previously pointed out, the Feds don't really care about
> our small potato violations, so what good would expert testimony do
> anyway...

Basically becuz some are not so small....

1228. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 07:08:09 UTC
From: W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com>
Message-ID: <94e1te$3cd$1@iac5.navix.net>
Source record: 1478

Brian, We have had this conversation before. If you cannot address a message without the childish nonsense, don't bother. I don't attack you on a personal basis and would expect you to at least make the attempt to reciprocate.

--
Fred W4JLE NHI#1001
Executive Grand Pooba - No Hassle International
Doing away with all requirements for a Ham ticket
"We want, therefore we deserve"
Send your non-tax deductible donations today!

"Brian" <brianburke@my-deja.com> wrote in message
news:94dinfjbc1@nnrp1.deja.com...
> In article <94dfc2$jj4$1@iac5.navix.net>,
> "W4JLE" <Fred@w4jle.com> wrote:
> > For God's sake Ed, you are working so hard to be politically correct.
> I
> > guess if a kid is learning baseball, you should not point out he is
> running
> > the bases in the wrong direction for fear he will give up baseball?
> >
> > Give me a single reason we should be bending over and kissing some
> snot
> > nosed kids ass to get him active in ham radio! If they are interested,
> I
> > will bust my butt to help them.
>
> Too late, I think its already broke.
>
> > I have Elmered more than a few in my time, but at no point did I waste
> time
> > on anyone who had no interest.
> >
> > I had one guy wanted to be a ham and was having trouble with the code.
> It
> > took me a while to realize his problem was not the code, he did not
> know how
> > to read or write. I worked with him for over a year and he earned his
> > ticket. I remember him struggling to read to become a ham, then I
> listen to
> > all the cock and bull about "how tough it is on the children to get a
> > ticket".
> >
> > Give me a break!

> > --
> > Fred W4JLE NHI#1001
> > Executive Grand Pooper - No Hassle International
> > Doing away with all requirements for a Ham ticket
> > "We want, therefore we deserve"
> > Send your non-tax deductible donations today!
>
> "We think, therefore, we are more brillianter than everyone else."
>
> Brought to you by the tired old fart from the Jelly School of Inductive
> Reasoning.
>
>
> Sent via Deja.com
> http://www.deja.com/

1229. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 07:12:56 UTC
From: W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com>
Message-ID: <94e26e$3fo$1@iac5.navix.net>
Source record: 1479

Cecil, you know as well as I, that any remark that anyone ever heard on a repeater gets expanded to suit the argument at hand. I have in the past condemned "radio cops". Not all polite corrections are critical to someone's ego, at least not to the point that a trip to the nearest shrink is needed.

Some here, on the other hand, feel that the slightest remark is an attack on the self esteem of the poor darling.

We have seen this same nonsense carried to the point if you paddle a kids butt, it is now child abuse.

--
Fred W4JLE NHI#1001
Executive Grand Pooba - No Hassle International
Doing away with all requirements for a Ham ticket
"We want, therefore we deserve"
Send your non-tax deductible donations today!

"Cecil" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3A6A5957.FA0731DD@IEEE.org...
> W4JLE wrote:
> > For God's sake Ed, you are working so hard to be politically correct. I
> > guess if a kid is learning baseball, you should not point out he is
running
> > the bases in the wrong direction for fear he will give up baseball?
>
> Would you call him a dumb $hit idiot in the process and give him 50
> lashes? We're talking about degree here. It's pretty obvious that
> some OFs simply want to keep the newcomers out of "their" sandbox.
> --
> http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

1230. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 07:17:07 UTC
From: W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com>
Message-ID: <94e2e9$3m8$1@iac5.navix.net>
Source record: 1480

Nice to know your troll meter is working...

--
Fred W4JLE NHI#1001
Executive Grand Pooba - No Hassle International
Doing away with all requirements for a Ham ticket
"We want, therefore we deserve"
Send your non-tax deductible donations today!

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20010120140106.22806.00000193@ng-fm1.aol.com...
> >From: "W4JLE" Fred@w4jle.com
>
> >I should know better than to communicate with someone that is my
inferior...
>
> Now that looks like a bona fide attempt to capture someone's goat...
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

1231. Re: cellphone block

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 09:12:56 UTC
From: JC <jayc@j.s>
Message-ID: <3A6AA81D.621DED73@j.s>
Source record: 1481
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.policy

If this W4JLE jerk spent a little less time picking on people, his depression would improve.

W4JLE wrote:

> If this young lad spent a little less time on the phone, his English would
> improve.
>

1232. Re: CA power crisis caused by internet

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 10:41:20 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccoll@radiks.net>
Message-ID: <J%ya6.3539$AN.804830@nntp1.onemain.com>
Source record: 1482

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:94dv4o$id4$0@208.207.71.169...

> All very interesting and again shows that things aren't always what
> they seem.
> I had noticed all that water moving south and, being from hydroelectric
> country, had thought that a lot of generating capacity appeared to be
> going unused. That made sense, given the cheap easy availability of
> power until recent times. And the big pump station and huge tubes headed
> up into the mountains south of Bakersfield sure look like power hogs. I
> wasn't aware that siphoning was an option.

You tripped a trigger on a project I am about half-surprised hasn't
resurfaced lately. Back in the Nasser days the idea was to siphon water
out of the Med thru the coastal mountains and flood the Qatar Depression
in Western Egypt which is below sea level, recovering electric power on
the drop, creating a second Dead Sea for the mining potential, and raising
the humidity level in general behind the mountains.

May have been totally ridiculous (Gamel was good for the weird) but it
sure wasn't because it would flood valuable real estate.

Dick BK

1233. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 13:12:55 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A6AE057.A2F8F07A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 1487

Dick Carroll wrote:
> No, but you sure would gently set him straight.

"Set him straight"? Are you a chiropractor?
Sounds pretty painful.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

1234. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 13:14:49 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3A6AE09A.6303AA90@sccoast.net>
Source record: 1483

W4JLE wrote:
>
> For God's sake Ed, you are working so
> hard to be politically correct. I
> guess if a kid is learning baseball,
> you should not point out he is running
> the bases in the wrong direction for
> fear he will give up baseball?

But baseball has rules, Fred. And nobody is advocating that anyone ignore the rules relating to ham radio. Instead, what we're talking about is simple, somewhat pompus, traditions (unlike "those" other people, "we" don't say "handle" in ham radio).

And, to me, it seems a little silly to make that big of an issue out of something as simple as this. If a tradition is that worth-while, it will survive on its own with only minimal encouragement. If it isn't, then we probably shouldn't be making an issue out of it at all.

> Give me a single reason we should be
> bending over and kissing some snot
> nosed kids ass to get him active in
> ham radio! If they are interested, I
> will bust my butt to help them.

And I certainly hope you're not judging the interest of others based on whether they use the same words and phrases you do. If so, then I have a problem because I don't know what you use when talking on the radio (these things seem to vary around the country). Can you send me a list of acceptable, and banned, words and phrases?

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net

1235. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 13:18:48 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010121081848.10070.00000564@ng-cr1.aol.com>
Source record: 1484

>From: Aaron Jones nomail@nomail.com

> Do you think that a test that allows people to pass without knowing the
> material is a good test?? :-)

I have answered that question so many times that it is quite apparent that you are not willing to accept the answer. Either you have a comprehension problem, or you are yanking my chain. Either way, I can't help you.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1236. Re: cellphone block

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 13:19:16 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccoll@radiks.net>
Message-ID: <wjBa6.2563$ed.2374409@nntp2.onemain.com>
Source record: 1485
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"JC" <jayc@j.s> wrote in message news:3A6AA81D.621DED73@j.s...
> If this W4JLE jerk spent a little less time picking on people, his
> depression would improve.
>
> W4JLE wrote:
>
> > If this young lad spent a little less time on the phone, his English
would
> > improve.
> >
>

You know this whole discussion makes more sense if JC were a girl. There isn't a lot of sense in being 14 and female if you can't be a snot.

Dick

1237. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 13:21:37 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010121082137.10070.00000565@ng-cr1.aol.com>
Source record: 1486

>From: Cecil Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>If all hams were like you, the FCC would abolish the ARS.

Although I agree with Dick that new hams benefit from help from more
experienced hams, I was very fortunate; I received no help that has the "tone"
of some of the posts Dick has made here.

Perhaps Riley's recent statements about petty bickering can be applied to our
conduct off the air, too...

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1238. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 13:24:58 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A6AE329.7D55D5DF@IEEE.org>
Source record: 1493

W4JLE wrote:
> Some here, on the other hand, feel that the slightest remark is an attack on
> the self esteem of the poor darling.

What the heck difference does it make if a new ham or an old ham says
10-4 over a repeater? When someone asks me, "QSL?", I sometimes say
"10-4 Gud Buddy" with the proper quiver in my voice just for a laugh.
People who ask, "QSL?", over voice personally drive me up the wall
but this is a hobby, not the U. S. Marines. Why can't we have Elmers
instead of Radio Cops and Drill Sergeants?
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

1239. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 13:25:48 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010121082548.10070.00000567@ng-cr1.aol.com>
Source record: 1488

>From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

>They get more than a good opportunity to learn. It's when they display skulls
of
>granite that the hammers come out.

I have seen you take a hammer to people you don't even know, Dick; how do you know that all those hordes of people memorizing tests containing questions you have never looked at have skulls of granite?

>ANd you have no idea what kind of a ham I am based on what happens here.

Sure we do, Dick. You have described many of your on-the-air and VE escapades here, and, frankly, some of them appeared to me to have been pretty mean spirited. Do you really reserve such conduct ONLY for what happens here? Why would you feel that you don't feel to be appropriate on the air or in your in-person social dealings with hams is appropriate here? For most of the people here, what happens here is the only basis on which they can interpret and judge the worth of what you are saying.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1240. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 13:28:25 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A6AE3F9.648DA686@IEEE.org>
Source record: 1497

Dwight Stewart wrote:
> And I certainly hope you're not judging the interest of others based
> on whether they use the same words and phrases you do. If so, then I
> have a problem because I don't know what you use when talking on the
> radio (these things seem to vary around the country). Can you send me a
> list of acceptable, and banned, words and phrases?

A pet peeve of mine is when someone is 20 over 9 on SSB and asks,
"QSL?" I usually say, "No, I don't have any QSL cards". :-)
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

1241. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 13:29:02 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010121082902.10070.00000568@ng-cr1.aol.com>
Source record: 1489

>From: Aaron Jones nomail@nomail.com

>Well Ed, KN7ENT was the first call I ever used on the air (in 1957).
>I chose it because it was not yet found in the callbook, and because
>my best friends name was KENT... :-)

I think I finally understand at least one of the reasons for your anonymity.
It is too bad that there are things in your life that you are ashamed to admit
to. An anon post here really doesn't get it off your chest...

>And those who insist on breaking them, either on purpose
>or in ignorance, should not be surprised if they are treated
>differently...

I am not surprised; I saw such conduct in grammar school and the same people
are still with us.

Are you defending it, opposing it, or just not really interested in it
happening other than it being an amusing topic of conversation here?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1242. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 13:29:41 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010121082941.10070.00000569@ng-cr1.aol.com>
Source record: 1490

>From: Cecil Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>Dick has this delusion firmly set in his concrete brain.

Concrete, or granite? :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1243. Re: It's like this....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 13:31:13 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010121083113.10070.00000570@ng-cr1.aol.com>
Source record: 1491

>From: Brian brianburke@my-deja.com

>... which apparently is far more important than learning fellowship
> and mutual respect.

>At this point I think its probably OK to tell you to join the KMA club ...

Does that club promote fellowship and mutual respect?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1244. Re: It's like this....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 13:31:56 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010121083156.10070.00000571@ng-cr1.aol.com>
Source record: 1492

>From: Cecil Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>Of course, fellowship and mutual respect is impossible without Morse
>code. Where have you been, Brian?

He apparently promotes that you can demonstrate fellowship and mutual respect
with him by kissing him. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1245. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 13:32:15 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A6AE4DF.37CD6086@IEEE.org>
Source record: 1498

Dick Carroll wrote:
> It's when they display skulls of
> granite that the hammers come out. ANd you have no idea what kind of a
> ham I am based on what happens here.

It's pretty clear that your skull is made of granite and your basic
personality certainly comes through loud and clear. I would not
allow you to Elmer my child.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

1246. Dumb guys cancel other people's posts

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 13:34:43 UTC
From: kking@no-mail.com
Message-ID: <94eohjpjp0@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 1494
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Attempting to cancel someone else's post is really, really dumb because:

1. 80% of the news servers now ignore cancel messages, due to past abuse;

2. Automated software run by usenet admins flags such cancel messages as "suspicious" because critical header elements don't match. Suspicious messages are published in a summary which is available to everyone;

3. 99% of ISPs regard rogue cancels as a violation of their terms of service and will terminate the account of anyone caught issuing such cancel messages.

So, if you only catch around 20% of the news servers, trigger software which records your cancels in such a way that you can be traced by your ISP, and if your ISP is among the 99% who will terminate your account for such activity, who is the dumb guy?

1247. Re: "They oughta require a license....blah, blah, blah"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 13:36:02 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010121083602.10070.00000572@ng-cr1.aol.com>
Source record: 1495

>From: "Phil Kane"

> The <fingerprinting> technique was developed by a ham at
> Boeing who sold/gave it to the FCC in the early 1990s and
> AFAIK the program is available "on the market".

From the searchable database at http://www.arrl.org/tis/tisfind.html - search word "fingerprinting" :

Company
Motron Electronics
310 Garfield Street - Suite 4
Eugene, OR 97402
USA
Tel: 503-687-2118
Fax: 503-687-2492
http://www.motron.com/
Products and Services
COMPONENT>DTMF COMPONENT; REPEATER EQUIPMENT;
Notes: DTMF Decoders, transmitter fingerprinting, remote control and telemetry systems.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1248. Re: "They oughta require a license....blah, blah, blah"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 13:36:57 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010121083657.10070.00000573@ng-cr1.aol.com>
Source record: 1496

>From: Aaron Jones nomail@nomail.com

>As you have previously pointed out, the Feds don't really care about
>our small potato violations ...

Is that why they have put a FCC staffer onto amateur enforcement for about 3
years now?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1249. Re: CA power crisis caused by internet

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 13:37:58 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A6AE636.70324072@IEEE.org>
Source record: 1500

Phil Kane wrote:
> That's why we moved to Oregon in 1999 - Oregon is what
> the good in California was 40 years ago, and alas is no longer.

Is it Oregon where they have a sign that says, "Welcome to Oregon,
now go back to CA", or some such?
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

1250. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 13:46:07 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010121084607.10070.00000574@ng-cr1.aol.com>
Source record: 1499

>From: "W4JLE" Fred@w4jle.com

>For God's sake Ed, you are working so hard to be politically correct. I
>guess if a kid is learning baseball, you should not point out he is running
>the bases in the wrong direction for fear he will give up baseball?

>Give me a single reason we should be bending over and kissing some snot
>nosed kids ass ...

Is that the technique we can expect you to you when you "point out" that the young sportsman is doing something wrong? Would you at least do it privately, or would you think it best for "baseball" if you said that to him or her in front of the entire team.

Would you equally feel the need to correct him if his field "patter" used different words that the usual "swing, batter can't hit" or whatever words are in vogue with kids that decade? Isn't that a bit different than running the bases backwards? Now, if the ham had been using FM in the CW-only part of the band instead of choosing a synonym for name that you found offensive, perhaps more immediate action would have been in everyone's best interest.

Sorry, I will take "politically correct" over your verison of "building character." When I was a little boy, my mother never called it "policital correctness;" she called it "politeness," "manners" or "respect."

>If they are interested, I will bust my butt to help them.

Do you think the ham who studied almost 400 questions to get a license was "interested?" I sure hope that your help won't contain the words "snot nosed" or "kiss ass" over a petty "gaff" like "personal" instead of "name."

Frankly, I disagree with your assessment that not berating the new ham publically is bending over or kissing ass.

>then I listen to all the cock and bull about "how tough it is on the
>children to get a ticket".

Let's do a deja news search on the phrase you quoted. Care to guess what the one hit will be?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1251. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 13:46:56 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A6AE850.DCB2FFF5@IEEE.org>
Source record: 1504

W1RFI wrote:
>
> >From: Cecil Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>
> >Dick has this delusion firmly set in his concrete brain.
>
> Concrete, or granite? :-)

Well granite would mean he was born with it. I personally
think he chose to solidify it around the time he "arrived"
and started resting on his rosy red laurels a few decades
ago.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

1252. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 13:48:00 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010121084800.10070.00000575@ng-cr1.aol.com>
Source record: 1501

>From: "W4JLE" Fred@w4jle.com

>Brian, We have had this conversation before. If you cannot address a message
>without the childish nonsense, don't bother.

Some might feel using "snot-nosed kid" and "kiss my ass" in a post is also
childish nonsense.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1253. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 13:51:14 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010121085114.10070.00000576@ng-cr1.aol.com>
Source record: 1502

>From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

>No, but you sure would gently set him straight.

I don't think that the fellow who would use the terms "snot-nosed kid" and "kiss my ass" in a post about it would be "gentle."

>And if he broke down bawling like a girl

Only girls should cry?

> because of it you'd set him on the bench at least
>until his tears dried.

If my public, verbal abuse of a child set that child to tears, I think I would feel that I should do more than set him on a bench until he recovered from the public humiliation I had subjected him to.

Besides, the more likely effect is that the kid would give up baseball forever. Some coaches would feel it was worth the price.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1254. Re: Enough already

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 13:53:36 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010121085336.10070.00000577@ng-cr1.aol.com>
Source record: 1503

>From: Cecil Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>Your objection will only cause people who enjoy getting goats to
>just try even harder to get yours. Why not just use your newsreader
>kill file feature like I do? There is no way you or I can stop
>others from crossposting.

How would we feel if all of the CB newsgroup posts were cross-posted here? Do you think it would be disruptive?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1255. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 13:57:52 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A6AEADF.369B423D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 1505

W1RFI wrote:
> Is that the technique we can expect you to you when you "point out" that the
> young sportsman is doing something wrong? Would you at least do it privately,
> or would you think it best for "baseball" if you said that to him or her in
> front of the entire team.

Bullies invariably do their bullying in public, Ed, so as to strike
fear in the hearts of the multitude. Such people often put themselves
in a position of power over little kids because they are devoid of
power and respect among adults.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

1256. Re: Enough already

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 14:02:06 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A6AEBDE.BB8CC964@IEEE.org>
Source record: 1506

W1RFI wrote:
>
> >From: Cecil Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>
> >Your objection will only cause people who enjoy getting goats to
> >just try even harder to get yours. Why not just use your newsreader
> >kill file feature like I do? There is no way you or I can stop
> >others from crossposting.
>
> How would we feel if all of the CB newsgroup posts were cross-posted here? Do
> you think it would be disruptive?

How could rec.radio.amateur.policy possibly be any more disruptive
than it already is?
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

1257. Re: Enough already

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 14:18:19 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010121091819.18668.00000584@ng-da1.aol.com>
Source record: 1507

>From: Cecil Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>How could rec.radio.amateur.policy possibly be any more disruptive
>than it already is?

I think that I will let that one stand on its own merits.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1258. Re: Enough already

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 14:21:47 UTC
From: Keith Wood <kw@bctv.com>
Message-ID: <3A6AF07B.87AB21B0@bctv.com>
Source record: 1508

W1RFI wrote:
>
> >From: Cecil Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>
> >Your objection will only cause people who enjoy getting goats to
> >just try even harder to get yours. Why not just use your newsreader
> >kill file feature like I do? There is no way you or I can stop
> >others from crossposting.
>
> How would we feel if all of the CB newsgroup posts were cross-posted here? Do
> you think it would be disruptive?

How would we be able to tell them from 20wpm Extras?

1259. Re: Sound Familiar?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 14:28:18 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010121092818.18668.00000585@ng-da1.aol.com>
Source record: 1509

>From: Brian Kelly kelly@dvol.com

>> The ultrawideband folks are saying... naw, never mind. :-)\

>TRY me!

The short of it is that UWB technology uses very short pulses that have a resultant "baseband" bandwidth of several GHz. The frequency range is in the 1-10 GHz area.

Some of the tutorial and article statements I have seen imply that UWB cannot be detected by radio receivers. True enough if the source is far away, but not so if the source is close. Depending on its modulation characteristics, UWB can produce discrete modulation sidebands or can sound noiselike.

See http://www.uwb.org/aboutuwb.html

for links to more information.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1260. Re: It's like this....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 14:55:51 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <94et9m$h8c$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1510

In article <20010121083113.10070.00000570@ng-cr1.aol.com>,
w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:
> >From: Brian brianburke@my-deja.com
>
> >... which apparently is far more important than learning fellowship
> > and mutual respect.
>
> >At this point I think its probably OK to tell you to join the KMA
club ...
>
> Does that club promote fellowship and mutual respect?
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

Its Dick's club. Ask him.

Whenever I put on my "Dick Mask" nobody likes it. I don't even like it.
I just wanted to see if I can get the same pass he gets.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1261. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 15:04:51 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <94etqhhkb1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1511

In article <94e1te$3cd$1@iac5.navix.net>,
"W4JLE" <Fred@w4jle.com> wrote:
> Brian, We have had this conversation before. If you cannot address a
message
> without the childish nonsense, don't bother. I don't attack you on a
> personal basis and would expect you to at least make the attempt to
> reciprocate.

OK, I'll address your assertion that you want to hand select who gets a
radio license and who doesn't. That isn't going to happen in America.
Its the very "Lodge Hall" mentality that Len has railed against but
everyone denies. You are living proof it exists.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1262. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 15:08:49 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <94eu1vhui1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1512

In article <20010121084800.10070.00000575@ng-cr1.aol.com>,
w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:
> >From: "W4JLE" Fred@w4jle.com
>
> >Brian, We have had this conversation before. If you cannot address a
message
> >without the childish nonsense, don't bother.
>
> Some might feel using "snot-nosed kid" and "kiss my ass" in a post is
also
> childish nonsense.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

But who gets called on the carpet for KMA? These OFs get a pass until
someone else makes an issue. Then they often still get a pass.

OK, so no one seems to like it when I act like (a) Dick.

I'll go back to my old self.

73, Brian
>

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1263. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 15:23:04 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <94eusj$ih6$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1513

In article <94dvnq$id4$1@208.207.71.169>,
Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

> No, Nimrod. Or else some impatient sort will tell him that which he'd
> have learned on his own if he wasn't such a clueless dip. They get
more
> than a good opportunity to learn. It's when they display skulls of
> granite that the hammers come out. ANd you have no idea what kind of a
> ham I am based on what happens here.

No idea? None at all? If that were true, the only explanation is a
dual personality, like Jekyl/Hyde.

"...the hammers come out." Oh good grief. You tell us exactly the kind
of ham you are every day on rrap.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1264. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 15:31:04 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <94evbpiuh1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1514

In article <20010121082548.10070.00000567@ng-cr1.aol.com>,
w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:
> >From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
> >ANd you have no idea what kind of a ham I am based on what happens
here.
>
> Sure we do, Dick. You have described many of your on-the-air and VE
escapades
> here, and, frankly, some of them appeared to me to have been pretty
mean
> spirited. Do you really reserve such conduct ONLY for what happens
here? Why
> would you feel that you don't feel to be appropriate on the air or in
your
> in-person social dealings with hams is appropriate here? For most of
the
> people here, what happens here is the only basis on which they can
interpret
> and judge the worth of what you are saying.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

It goes back to the K3LT idea that even though we are (almost) all hams here, the idea of amateur brotherhood and fellowship can only be invoked with a cw key. Hans embraced it; Dick lives it.

73, Brian

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1265. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 15:43:56 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <94f03rjej1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1515

In article <20010121082137.10070.00000565@ng-cr1.aol.com>,
w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:
> >From: Cecil Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>
> >If all hams were like you, the FCC would abolish the ARS.
>
> Although I agree with Dick that new hams benefit from help from more
> experienced hams, I was very fortunate; I received no help that has
the "tone"
> of some of the posts Dick has made here.
>
> Perhaps Riley's recent statements about petty bickering can be applied
to our
> conduct off the air, too...
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

Ed, I heard that. Now that my Dick mask is off, perhaps I won't be so offensive and petty.

Here's to rational discussion!

Getting back to JLE and testing, I don't see why limiting the number of times you can take an exam would be a problem. Does retaking an element quarterly sound OK? Is annualy too long?

Also, Fred was advocating showing a log of contacts prior to upgrading. Although a log isn't required to be kept anymore, it really does fall back on good amateur practice (oops there's that silly idea again). Or merely have a year TIG?

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1266. Re: It's like this....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 15:51:15 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <94f0hhjqt1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1516

In article <20010121083156.10070.00000571@ng-cr1.aol.com>,
w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:
> >From: Cecil Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>
> >Of course, fellowship and mutual respect is impossible without Morse
> >code. Where have you been, Brian?
>
> He apparently promotes that you can demonstrate fellowship and mutual
respect
> with him by kissing him. :-)
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

No, not really. Dick mode: OFF.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1267. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 16:05:41 UTC
From: horseshoestew@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <94f1cikbj1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1519
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,alt.radio.family,rec.radio.cb

In article <t28a6.2182$E52.635055@news.uswest.net>,
"Keith McQueen" <kb7m@arrl.net> wrote:
> For once a constructive suggestion! My 11 year old has asked me
several
> times if I can find a ham radio technician text that is geared for
young
> people. So far I haven't found anything. Anybody for getting
something
> like this together? It doesn't need to talk down to the kids. Kids
are
> bright and intelligent and can understand amazing things. But it HAS
to be
> made interesting to THEM. If you could disguise it in a Nintendo
game it
> would work even better. If it were available for download for a free
or
> minimal cost so much the better. Now THAT would be a contribution!

I totally agree. Don't take the negative feedback here as what the
general ham population, or the FCC really wants. Remember - most of
these folks were against lowering the CW requirements. They are still
in the "block all change' mode.

------- Stewart - N0MHS --------
Wireless Entertainment/Communication Devices, Networks, and
Public Radio Services Information(MURS,FRS,GMRS,ARS,CB):
http://www.pubcel.com

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1268. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 16:10:59 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <94f1mfkmi1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1520

In article <94bbiv$7o8$0@208.206.142.99>,
Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>
>
> Aaron Jones wrote:
> >
> > "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nospam.spam> wrote:
> > > Actually there is an "official" APCO list
> >
> > The first published 10-code was in an APCO bulletin in January of
1940
>
> I have an APCO "National Police Communications Network Directory and
> Reference Guide" from 1945, and one from 1951. It's amazing how much
> changed in that six year period.
>
> Dick

Dick, it must have been traumatic. Do you recall if the police ops and
dispatchers who embraced the new 10-code were berated on the air?

How long did it take to make the switch over?

Brian

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1269. DUMBASSES who can't read (Was:Re: Dumb guys cancel other people's posts)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 16:12:07 UTC
From: KC8JBO <roger_kc8jbo@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <94f1ojkmv1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1521
Cross-posted to: news.admin.net-abuse.usenet,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

```
In article <94eohj$pjp$0@dosa.alt.net>,
abuse@bellsouth.net wrote:
>
> Attempting to cancel someone else's post is really, really dumb
because:
>
> 1. 80% of the news servers now ignore cancel messages, due to past
> abuse;
>
> 2. Automated software run by usenet admins flags such cancel messages
> as "suspicious" because critical header elements don't match.
> Suspicious messages are published in a summary which is available to
> everyone;
>
> 3. 99% of ISPs regard rogue cancels as a violation of their terms of
> service and will terminate the account of anyone caught issuing such
> cancel messages.
>
> So, if you only catch around 20% of the news servers, trigger software
> which records your cancels in such a way that you can be traced by
your
> ISP, and if your ISP is among the 99% who will terminate your account
> for such activity, who is the dumb guy?
>

Who is the DUMBASS who can't read or tell the difference between a
cancelled post and a followup to a post that was a parody of a cancel.
Learn to read, Republican!

--
73 de Roger, KC8JBO
EM99 |ARRL|VE [ARRL & W5YI]|ARES |RACES
Yaesu FT-920 |Inverted Vee @ 40 ft.
Yaesu FT-90R

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/
```

1270. Re: CA power crisis caused by internet

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 16:17:23 UTC
From: Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com>
Message-ID: <3A6B0B93.58755F27@dvol.com>
Source record: 1517

Dick Carroll wrote:

>
> The worrysome feature of California is that it always seemed to be
> about 20 years ahead of the rest of the country in most areas of modern
> life. That has at times seemed a bit scary. Today's crisis just
> emphasizes that feeling. You wonder who else is sitting that close to
> the edge.

>
We'll find out damned quick, this debacle has gotten the attention of the whole country. Over here on the Right Coast the "I toldja so!" opponents of deregulation are up the butts of the whole contorted structure for answers by the numbers. "Thanks for the wakeup call California!"
>
Interesting observation about one big difference between how they play the game here and how it's played in CA: NJ and PA are two of the few states which did not force the estabablished utilities to shed their generating facilities. Forthwith they took advantage of the opportunity to divest their loser plants and kept the moneymakers. The loser plants appear to be making money now under their new management which was not possible when they were managed by their fossilized previous owners. I'm not sure if I'm still involuntarily subsidizing the Three Mile Island facility or not.
>
The PA Public Utilities Commission has come roaring out of the woodwork and is defensively bleating "Our new regime saved PA consumers 2 billion plus $$ last year, you lucky citizens! We done good, the temps are in the 20s & 30s and the lights are still on!" Thirteen cents per Kwh here or whatever it is the lights damned well better still be on.
>

> Dick

>
w3rv

1271. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 16:19:50 UTC
From: Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com>
Message-ID: <3A6B0C26.1D6CAF7C@dvol.com>
Source record: 1518

W1RFI wrote:

> >From: Brian Kelly kelly@dvol.com
>
> >The youth factor associated with the 1951 Novice license happened under much
> >different conditions in much different days and I doubt anything like it will
> >ever
> >be repeated.
>
> Both for social reasons, Brian, and for the simple reason that the generation
> of hams who entered ham radio by that route does not seem to want tests to be
> made that simple again. :-)

>
For one obvious reason: There are no drop-dead regulatory incentives to upgrade knowledge and skills by getting on the air. So if ya don't wanna bother taking the apprentceship to get to be jouneyman you gotta take a jouneyman's-level exam to get the privs. I don't see anything wrong with that.
>

> The FCC is also not inclined to create a one-year, non-renewable license again,
> either.

>
Of course. I expect you'll agree that the FCC of those days was not the lame and disconnected FCC of today. In retrospect I suspect that what the old FCC actually bestowed on us amounted to a free pass onto the Novice bands for the "cost" of copying 5wpm plus passing the little ceremonial Novice writtens to get us into the game. That was carrot. So of course we all jumped in and got hooked. Then came the stick. Somehow I can visualize FCC thinking going something like "OK you little twits, we hooked you per our intentions, but if ya wanna stay on the bands you got 365 days to demonstrate to us that you took advantage of the opportunity we handed you on a silver platter to learn, upgrade or die". Typical thinking of those days. Today it's all carrots, sticks have become politically incorrect.
>

> >It's of some historical interest, it obviously left a big footprint,
> >there were a helluva lot of kids but for the biggest part the history is the
> >sum total value of it today.
>
> There are now more modes commonly available to hams, more stable and reliable
> technology, more frequencies easily used -- the license had to change.

>
I think what happened was that when the repeaters got on the air and 2m became heavily populated the Tech license became a lot more attractive than a Novice

license for the same 5wpm code test. A complete reversal from the situation in the 50s when the there was very little VHF activity vs. the HF Novice bands.
>
Too bad; that simple 20-question exam for the Novice brought a lot of people

> into it. What surprises me is that even with the entry-level being at least an
> order of magnitude more difficult and more complex, growth continued.

>
Ham radio became a lot more attractive between 1960 and, say 1980. VHF opened up via repeaters and inexpensive solid-state xcvrs, folk in general became a lot more technology-oriented, all hobby activities expanded, lotta forces which are still out there today. Unfortunately it looks like desktop computing is now eating into our market for the attention of the kinds of folk who became hams in earlier times.
>
>I don't

> think I would be a ham today if someone had handed me a 200+ page study guide
> and told me that this is what I had to know to be a beginner in ham radio. And
> if they then told me that it was "dumbed down" from that 4-page book THEY had
> to read...

>
It's not the 4-page book in itself, it's the "serve the appreticeship or go thru tougher testing pushups" thing. A bit of pro-quid-pro in play.
>

>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

>
w3rv

1272. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 16:20:16 UTC
From: Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com>
Message-ID: <3A6B0C40.ED7D9B4A@dvol.com>
Source record: 1522

W1RFI wrote:

> >The Harvey-Wells Bandmaster, 50 watts (807?), CW & AM, fairly compact, stood
> >on what would usually be the end of it's cabinet. About twice as high as wide,
> >sucked up very little desk space. Went to both 6m and 2m in addition to HF.
>
> Yes, it goes to 2 M. I have one in my shack.

>
Slick! I haven't seen or heard about one of those for probably 40 years. How'd you get it? VFO included? Might be worth some bucks.

>
> >>Died from an overdose of TVI...
>
> Then it is a darn good thing I never used it; it would not do for me to be
> causing any RFI. :-)

>
You did that to yourself!
>
Actually it isn't much if any worse than the rest of that generation of far-end boat anchors plus it only runs 50w vs. the Valiant I and some of the WRLs which ran 200-300w. All of 'em tore up the neighborhoods. I'd test the electrolytics, hang a good low-pass filter on it and take it out for a short walk in a wink.
>

>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

>
w3rv

1273. FCC Proposal for New Novice Class License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 16:52:17 UTC
From: horseshoestew@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <94f440$mh4$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1523
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.radio.family

Based on the inputs I have received, I have updated my proposal for a new introductory license to more closely reflect traditional Amateur license regulations, with minor modifications to reflect today's changing dynamics.

At this point, I would appreciate more constructive criticism. I understand that many of you are against change of any kind - but you must have something positive to say, or their must be something you can think of to improve things.

****
Proposal to FCC to reinstate the Novice license class in the Amateur Radio Service - REV A

In the late 1980's and early 1990's when the current Amateur Radio Service Technician Class license was conceived and implemented, it was an appropriate alternate introductory license class. However, due to the recent elimination of the Novice Class license, and as a result of improving technology; the Technician Class license no longer serves well as the only introductory license, as it is doing poorly in drawing young members into the Service. As a result of license restructuring, it is now actually harder for young people to obtain an Amateur license than it was before restructuring.

In this critical era of global competition, especially in the wireless communications arena, it is essential that we provide a means for properly educating our young people in RF communications operation and theory.

Today, technologies like the Family Radio Service, high-speed telephone & cable modems, the Internet, and inexpensive cellular telephones, have overshadowed the privileges of the Amateur Radio Service, and made the requirements for young beginners to obtain a Technician Class license out of date. Additionally, the Technician Class license has now evolved into a beginning and ending point for most Amateurs now entering the service, who are mostly interested in VHF/UHF communications, rather than HF communications. Incentive licensing has virtually been eliminated.

The need for a Service dedicated to the goal of teaching young radio users proper radio operation techniques and etiquette can clearly be seen in the disarray present on the 11 meter Citizen's Band Service frequencies. The fact is, the Citizen's Band has become the defacto introductory service for young people just beginning to learn to experiment with radio; yet the Citizen's Band is a very poor

environment for young people to be learning in.

Therefore, it is recommended that the Novice Class license reinstated in the Amateur Radio Service, with minor modifications to requirements and privileges to reflect the today's changing dynamics in radio technology and usage; and to expressly encourage young individuals to enter the Amateur Radio Service to improve their understanding of RF communications theory and operations, provide a healthy learning environment, and encourage radio experimentation.

On VHF and UHF frequencies, the privileges and restrictions will be the same as exists for the current grandfathered Novice Class license, with the addition of a small set of frequencies on the 70cm band, restricted to an output of 5W PEP.

On 70cm, Novice licensees would be restricted to voice communications on 5 20khz-spaced channels on 446.00, 446.02, 446.04, 446.06, and 446.08 Mhz; and digital communications up to 19,200bps on 1 simplex-only 60khz bandwidth channel on 446.14Mhz.

New Novice Class license holders would not have any privileges on HF frequencies.

Consistent with the implementation of the No Code Technician License, in which the existing Technician Class license holders were placed in a new class known as Technician Plus, existing Novice Class license holders would be placed in a new class known as Novice Plus. Novice Plus license holders would hold all the VHF/UHF privileges of the new Novice Class license, plus their existing HF privileges. Consistent with the manner in with Technician Class license holders may upgrade to Technician Plus by passing a 5wpm Morse Code examination, new Novice class licensees will also be allowed to upgrade to Novice Plus by passing a 5wpm Morse Code examination.

The new license class would have the following goals:

1) Encourage more young people to enter the Amateur Radio Service, by providing an entry-level ARS license class that includes privileges allowing reliable short-range voice and data communications.

2) Not significantly impact existing users of the affected Amateur Radio Service frequency bands.

3) Encourage basic knowledge of radio, electronics, operating principles and etiquette among a wider segment of the general population.

4) Take advantage of the success of the Family Radio Service, and provide a path for those young users interested in further radio experimentation.

The Novice license exam would consist of 25 elementary questions. Emphasis would be put on understanding the operational, technical, safety, etiquette and emergency questions that relate specifically to

the new Novice Class license privileges. All questions containing calculations would contain small integer(whole-number) input values and have relatively small integer results. Novice licensees would be required to have a general understanding of Ohm's Law and Power relations. They should be required to have a general understanding of how antenna length relates to wavelength; and have a knowledge of transmitter power, antenna gain, transmission line loss, and the ability to perform a simple ERP calculation would be required. General knowledge of simple resistive circuits, and their power dissipation, would be required. New Novice Class licensees will need to have a basic understanding of digital communication methods. Consistent with the final form of the old Novice Class license examination, knowledge of capacitors and inductors would not be required.

Stewart Teaze - N0MHS

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1274. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 17:02:40 UTC
From: Gene <webmaster@zylay.com>
Message-ID: <3A6B162F.A22FF5B5@zylay.com>
Source record: 1524
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,alt.radio.family,rec.radio.cb

horseshoestew@my-deja.com wrote:

> In article <t28a6.2182$E52.635055@news.uswest.net>,
> "Keith McQueen" <kb7m@arrl.net> wrote:
> > For once a constructive suggestion! My 11 year old has asked me
> several
> > times if I can find a ham radio technician text that is geared for
> young
> > people. So far I haven't found anything. Anybody for getting
> something
> > like this together? It doesn't need to talk down to the kids. Kids
> are
> > bright and intelligent and can understand amazing things. But it HAS
> to be
> > made interesting to THEM. If you could disguise it in a Nintendo
> game it
> > would work even better. If it were available for download for a free
> or
> > minimal cost so much the better. Now THAT would be a contribution!
>
> I totally agree. Don't take the negative feedback here as what the
> general ham population, or the FCC really wants. Remember - most of
> these folks were against lowering the CW requirements. They are still
> in the "block all change' mode.

I personally agree with holding on to the traditions. Instead of lowering the requirements to make it easier to get in, we should be making better study materials to make it easier to learn. No sense dumbing down. I'd love to write something like this myself, but just don't feel like I could doa good enough job on it to do itthe justice that it deserves.

1275. Re: Enough already

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 17:12:27 UTC
From: City_Slicker <notenuftime@foolscorner.net>
Message-ID: <94f59r$k6h@dispatch.concentric.net>
Source record: 1525
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

The CB group!!! Which of all the groups listed would be the least interested in this sort of post. I see that someone is continuing to cross post. Amazing how dumb a person can be when there aren't multiple choice answers.

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nospam.spam> wrote in message news:cuvyxnansvbet.g7hq1h0.pminews@ca.news.verio.net...
> On 21 Jan 2001 03:20:42 GMT, CitySlicker wrote:
>
> >Well you guys insist on cross posting your BS to this NG. I asked more than
> >once to end it I am tired of wading through your nonsense to read what I
> >come here for.
>
> Which group is "this NG"? I see your message cross-posted
> into FOUR groups. Look at your headers and tell us which ones
> to not find you in.
>
> --
> 73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP
>
>
>

1276. Re: Enough already

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 17:13:49 UTC
From: City_Slicker <notenuftime@foolscorner.net>
Message-ID: <94f5cd$jub@dispatch.concentric.net>
Source record: 1526
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,alt.radio.family,rec.radio.cb

Well I can tell by your sig that I won't be losing any sleep. Hard to killfile when it comes from so many forums.

"Bill, W7TI" <w7ti@jps.net> wrote in message news:uopk6t05cfk9e8ereacd33m8b719erhg88@4ax.com...
> On 21 Jan 2001 03:20:42 GMT, "CitySlicker" <not_enuf_time@foolscorner.net>
> wrote:
>
> >Well you guys insist on cross posting your BS to this NG. I asked more than
> >once to end it I am tired of wading through your nonsense to read what I
> >come here for.
>
> _____
>
> Does the word "killfile" have any meaning to you? I too get tired of reading
> posts complaining about posts. Consider yourself killfiled.
>
> Bill, W7TI

1277. Re: FCC Proposal for New Novice Class License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 17:15:52 UTC
From: "Steven J Robeson", K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <94f5g4nha1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1528
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.radio.family

In article <94f440$mh4$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
horseshoestew@my-deja.com wrote:

>At this point, I would appreciate more constructive criticism. I
>understand that many of you are against change of any kind - but you
>must have something positive to say, or their must be something you
>can think of to improve things.

Stewart, there was not ONE post of support for your Colt class, and
EVERYONE has stated and reiterated that the Technician Class is about
the easiest license to get in Ham Radio history.

If I see your proposals with an RM on it, I can promise you that I
will submit a vote of "no support" with the FCC, and in discussing this
idea of a NEW license class with some of my local acquaintences, I can
tell you there's no support WHATSOEVER for your proposals.

They are, at the BEST, weak. You forget that the people who will
have to administer this "license" are the VE's, and they DON'T want to
be bothered with a "license" that amounts to nothing more than FRS with
more power and external antennas.

I can't help but think that you are fishing for SOME kind of
support here, Stewart, but there's NONE. The Novice Class as it exists
is all but dead and there is NO interest in reviving it.

The ARRL said no. The FCC said no. The commenting public in
general said no. So what part of NO did you fail to comprehend?

More NG fodder is all you generated, Stewart.

73

Steve, K4YZ

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1278. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 17:18:30 UTC
From: City_Slicker <notenuftime@foolscorner.net>
Message-ID: <94f5l6$itu@dispatch.concentric.net>
Source record: 1527
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,alt.radio.family,rec.radio.cb

```
Please, continuing to cross post this thread will only cause problems for
the many non concerned participants in these forums.
Address your response to the proper NG. Thank you
"Gene" <webmaster@zylay.com> wrote in message
news:3A6B162F.A22FF5B5@zylay.com...
> horseshoestew@my-deja.com wrote:
>
> > In article <t28a6.2182$E52.635055@news.uswest.net>,
> > "Keith McQueen" <kb7m@arrl.net> wrote:
> > > For once a constructive suggestion! My 11 year old has asked me
> > several
> > > times if I can find a ham radio technician text that is geared for
> > young
> > > people. So far I haven't found anything. Anybody for getting
> > something
> > > like this together? It doesn't need to talk down to the kids. Kids
> > are
> > > bright and intelligent and can understand amazing things. But it HAS
> > to be
> > > made interesting to THEM. If you could disguise it in a Nintendo
> > game it
> > > would work even better. If it were available for download for a free
> > or
> > > minimal cost so much the better. Now THAT would be a contribution!
> >
> > I totally agree. Don't take the negative feedback here as what the
> > general ham population, or the FCC really wants. Remember - most of
> > these folks were against lowering the CW requirements. They are still
> > in the "block all change' mode.
>
> I personally agree with holding on to the traditions. Instead of lowering
> the requirements to make it easier to get in, we should be making better
> study materials to make it easier to learn. No sense dumbing down. I'd
love
> to write something like this myself, but just don't feel like I could doa
> good enough job on it to do itthe justice that it deserves.
>
>
```

1279. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 17:24:49 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <94f60r$nv0$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1529

In article <20010120135543.22806.00000190@ng-fm1.aol.com>,
w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:
> >From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
>
> >See? All the protestations from myself and others have had an impact.
>
> :-) Of course, Dick; they changed things because you got on rrap and
> "protested" a lot.

I'll go with the "and others" because the the things Dick protested went the other way in the restructuring. If Dick's protestations had any effect at all, it was to illustrate the absurdity of his positions.

73, Brian

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1280. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 17:27:34 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <94f65v$o1r$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1535

In article <20010120140106.22806.00000193@ng-fm1.aol.com>,
w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:
> >From: "W4JLE" Fred@w4jle.com
>
> >I should know better than to communicate with someone that is my
inferior...
>
> Now that looks like a bona fide attempt to capture someone's goat...
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

Well he can't have mine - Dick is borrowing it at the moment. :)

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1281. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 17:32:00 UTC
From: "Steven J Robeson", K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <94f6egoch1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1536
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.radio.family,rec.radio.cb

In article <94f1cikbj1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
horseshoestew@my-deja.com wrote:
>
Remember - most of
> these folks were against lowering the CW requirements. They are still
> in the "block all change' mode.

Not "block all change", Stewart. Almost everyone here was for
SOME kind of change.

The "change" you are suggesting offers NOTHING. For only 10 more
qustions on an exam than what you are suggesting, an applicant has
access to ALL Amateur allocations above 50MHz, all modes, and up to
1500W PEP.

There are ELEMENTARY SCHOOL KIDS who ROUTINELY pass the Technician
Class test. They typically pass the test with better scores and in
fewer attepmts than adults. Based on your proposal, the "Colt" class
offers nothing that FRS doesn't already offer, save for more power and
bigger antennas.

Go ahead and "submit" you proposals to the FCC, Stewart. Then they
can tell you "no" too.

73

Steve, K4YZ

--
"If You're Not A Ham....You're SPAM!"

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1282. Re: "They oughta require a license....blah, blah, blah"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 17:34:36 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <ka7m6t4dgm2dguthnbnrdc3sveh2o6p0qa@4ax.com>
Source record: 1530

w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:

>>From: Aaron Jones nomail@nomail.com
>>As you have previously pointed out, the Feds don't really care about
>>our small potato violations ...
>
>Is that why they have put a FCC staffer onto amateur enforcement for about 3
>years now?

One staffer in a bureaucracy the size of the FCC is hardly big potatoes... :-) But I was responding to Phil's post about the viability of ham witnesses for prosecuting ham violations in court, and so my reference to the "Feds" meant Federal Court, not the FCC. What do the federal prosecuting attorneys and federal judges think about bringing ham violations to court? Not much if I understood Phil's past posts correctly. The reason? They think that ham violations are small potatoes. Of course Phil used more lawyerly wording... :-)

1283. Re: It's like this....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 17:34:40 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <4a7m6tk7ph78p4fh1tapv05h9st014arcd@4ax.com>
Source record: 1531

w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:
>He [Brian] apparently promotes that you can
>demonstrate fellowship and mutual respect
>with him by kissing him. :-)

Post Grade:
Chain yanking A++
Subject matter F... :-)

1284. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 17:34:41 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <397m6tkr79bhiafj1nfug9smifqcfuu6na@4ax.com>
Source record: 1532

w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:
>I have answered that question so many times

I dutifully searched the archives for hours and
could not find your answer. :-) What would it hurt to write one more
little paragraph answering the question, instead of avoiding the
question over and over and over...

>that it is quite apparent that you
>are not willing to accept the answer.

So answer it for the group. Let them be the judge
in the debate (as usual)...

>Either you have a comprehension problem,

It's not like you to get nasty Ed... :-(

1285. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 17:34:43 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <n87m6torj0nip7i67607hlgj6n131b9mni@4ax.com>
Source record: 1533

w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:
>Concrete, or granite? :-) [Dick's brain]

Post Grade:
Chain Yanking A++
Subject matter F..... :-)

1286. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 17:34:44 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <o77m6t87jrvjl5651v0vl8i2i0n52o510q@4ax.com>
Source record: 1534

w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:
>I think I finally understand at least one of the reasons for your anonymity.
>It is too bad that there are things in your life that you are ashamed to admit
>to. An anon post here really doesn't get it off your chest...

Gosh Ed, the tone of your posts are starting to sound ominous. Have
things been going badly for you lately? I am not proud of some of the
wild things that I did as a teenager. However my bootlegging on CW
while waiting for my Novice license to come in the mail was certainly
one of the lesser of my infractions... :-)

Ask about my escapades in my 49 Chevy sometime... :-)

1287. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 17:47:16 UTC
From: Gene <webmaster@zylay.com>
Message-ID: <3A6B20A4.778FEC38@zylay.com>
Source record: 1537
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,alt.radio.family,rec.radio.cb

Sorry, I wasn't aware that it was cross-posted. as I'm not subscribed to the other groups.

City_Slicker wrote:

> Please, continuing to cross post this thread will only cause problems for
> the many non concerned participants in these forums.
> Address your response to the proper NG. Thank you
> "Gene" <webmaster@zylay.com> wrote in message
> news:3A6B162F.A22FF5B5@zylay.com...
> > horseshoestew@my-deja.com wrote:
> >
> > > In article <t28a6.2182$E52.635055@news.uswest.net>,
> > > "Keith McQueen" <kb7m@arrl.net> wrote:
> > > > For once a constructive suggestion! My 11 year old has asked me
> > > several
> > > > times if I can find a ham radio technician text that is geared for
> > > young
> > > > people. So far I haven't found anything. Anybody for getting
> > > something
> > > > like this together? It doesn't need to talk down to the kids. Kids
> > > are
> > > > bright and intelligent and can understand amazing things. But it HAS
> > > to be
> > > > made interesting to THEM. If you could disguise it in a Nintendo
> > > game it
> > > > would work even better. If it were available for download for a free
> > > or
> > > > minimal cost so much the better. Now THAT would be a contribution!
> > >
> > > I totally agree. Don't take the negative feedback here as what the
> > > general ham population, or the FCC really wants. Remember - most of
> > > these folks were against lowering the CW requirements. They are still
> > > in the "block all change' mode.
> >
> > I personally agree with holding on to the traditions. Instead of lowering
> > the requirements to make it easier to get in, we should be making better
> > study materials to make it easier to learn. No sense dumbing down. I'd
> love
> > to write something like this myself, but just don't feel like I could doa
> > good enough job on it to do itthe justice that it deserves.
> >
> >

1288. Re: Dumb guys cancel other people's posts

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 18:03:32 UTC
From: Ken C <mfineg@aol.com>
Message-ID: <UvFa6.1193$165.90153@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 1538
Cross-posted to: news.admin.net-abuse.usenet,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

I wish you guys would all go back to 3894.5 14.313 and 3.901
Not that I'm bothered by your postings, not at all !
It was just *alot more fun* listening to it live and in Technicolor
on the above frequencies till R.H. stepped in and killed ham
radio's Comedy Channel(s). How about ad least getting on every
Sunday afternoon for a little radio fun? Shit, it would be alot
better than listening to that screwball prozac-preacher's pontifications!
(the guy who's so batty, he chose a vanity callsign similar to kv4"fz"
retired call - unquestionable proof that this squirrel outside Atlanta is several
bricks short of a load or one paddle short in his rowboat...)
Please? Just a wee-bit of the "good old days" of .313 ? Ad least until OTK gets
back on and straightens the whole thing out.

"Kerry King" <kking@no-mail.com> wrote in message news:94eohjpjp0@dosa.alt.net...
>
> Attempting to cancel someone else's post is really, really dumb because:
>
> 1. 80% of the news servers now ignore cancel messages, due to past
> abuse;
>
> 2. Automated software run by usenet admins flags such cancel messages
> as "suspicious" because critical header elements don't match.
> Suspicious messages are published in a summary which is available to
> everyone;
>
> 3. 99% of ISPs regard rogue cancels as a violation of their terms of
> service and will terminate the account of anyone caught issuing such
> cancel messages.
>
> So, if you only catch around 20% of the news servers, trigger software
> which records your cancels in such a way that you can be traced by your
> ISP, and if your ISP is among the 99% who will terminate your account
> for such activity, who is the dumb guy?
>

1289. Re: Enough already

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 18:05:04 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A6B24D0.EC939FA5@IEEE.org>
Source record: 1539
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

City_Slicker wrote:
> The CB group!!! Which of all the groups listed would be the least interested
> in this sort of post. I see that someone is continuing to cross post.
> Amazing how dumb a person can be when there aren't multiple choice answers.

My newsreader doesn't automatically display to which groups my postings
are going. I have to spend time looking for them.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

1290. Re: FCC Proposal for New Novice Class License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 18:14:16 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <94f8tjqak1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1540

Horseshoestew said:

> ...there must be something you can think of to improve
> things.

Stew,

Here are my suggestions for changes to your idea.

License name: "Experimenter"
License term: 1 year, renewable four times in 1-year increments.
License test: 15 questions from current "Technician" pool.
Frequencies: All current and future amateur allocations above 30MHz.
Power: 200W output.
Modes: All authorized amateur modes.
Callsigns: From same sequential pool as current Techs and Generals.

73, Hans, K0HB
--
"We are fellow travelers on a journey between two
eternities, and it's a trip far too brief for me
to be concerned about your speed at the Code of
Morse."

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1291. Re: FCC Proposal for New Novice Class License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 18:25:06 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <94f9hsqps1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1541
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.radio.family

Stew,

Here are my suggestions for changes to your idea.

License name: "Experimenter"

License term: 1 year, renewable four times in 1-year increments.

License test: 15 questions from current "Technician" pool.

Frequencies: All current and future amateur allocations above 30MHz.

Power: 200W output.

Modes: All authorized amateur modes.

Callsigns: From same sequential pool as current Techs and Generals.

73, Hans, K0HB
--
"We are fellow travelers on a journey between two
eternities, and it's a trip far too brief for me
to be concerned about your speed at the Code of
Morse."

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1292. Re: "They oughta require a license....blah, blah, blah"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 18:39:39 UTC
From: Jerry Oxendine <joxendi@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <3A6B2CEB.49D3@bellsouth.net>
Source record: 1564

Mr. southpark,

Then I suggest you go over to rec.radio.cb and find those "troublesome"
posts by me. There IS a lot of controversy over there and you need to
concentrate your smart remarks towards Aaron Voobner, Mr. Scott, et al.
I am not involved, mister.

Jerry
K4KWH

southpark_meskin@my-deja.com wrote:
>
> In article <3A689357.3A2A@bellsouth.net>,
> joxendi@bellsouth.net wrote:
> > Len,
> >
> > I don't know about "officially" requiring a license, but I have asked
> > for licenses at hamfests on transceivers and amplifiers. Yes, some of
> > 'em got mad, but, knowing that Riley H. and company were roaming the
> > premises, I wouldn't take the risk of selling to a CBer (found that
> out
> > because the person{s} told me so).
> >
> > I DO think that cash or equivilent prizes should be substituted to
> non-
> > hams at hamfests instead of handing out IC706MKIIGs to the general
> pub-
> > lic. Some of these items are sure to end up being used illegally.
> Some
> > hamfests do this, others don't---but I wish they would. Could be the
> > source of that "mysterious" kerchunker on 2M is a handheld won by a
> per-
> > son without a clue as to the laws governing its use.
> >
> > Jerr
> > K4KWH
> >
> > Len Over 21 wrote:
> > >
> > > In article <3A662EB5.79A21E16@dvol.com>, Brian Kelly
> <kelly@dvol.com> writes:
> > >
> > > >> There is no time machine to go back to undo the past. There
> > > >> is the possibility that the existing and future FCC can solve
> > > >> some problems in US civil radio. Support the FCC in

> > > >> regulation of radio...or become lawless vigilantes who are
> > > >> outnumbered by others. There is no honor or respect in
> > > >> vigilanteism.
> > > >
> > > >Indeed and agreed. Probable factoid: The FCC would much prefer
> dealing
> > > >with some inane but basically harmless freebanders than they would
> a
> > > >phlanx of amateur (in the more common sense) "helper" frequency
> cops up
> > > >their butts.
> > >
> > > A problem with any vigilante group of self-styled "cops" occurs
> > > when they run into another vigilante group having different
> > > ideas of what is "best." Nobody wins except the Real cops.
> > >
> > > Remember that CB users outnumber radio amateurs by a
> > > considerable ratio.
> > >
> > > didit
> >
>
> senior jerry he want to be the radio policia all over the land out
> there. He makes mucho the troubles for the cb peoples
>
> Sent via Deja.com
> http://www.deja.com/

1293. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 19:02:06 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010121140206.21669.00000530@ng-mj1.aol.com>
Source record: 1542

>From: Aaron Jones nomail@nomail.com

>w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:

>>Concrete, or granite? :-) [Dick's brain]

>Post Grade:
>Chain Yanking A++
>Subject matter F..... :-)

I don't know; I thought of it as more of a funny that honest-to-goodness chain yanking. It was a joke because one of Dick's recent posts berated granite-headed hams, you see? Perhaps you missed it.

It would appear that you are the resident expert chain-yanking analyzer; can you help by explaining the subleties to us?

Thanks.

Ed

1294. Re: "They oughta require a license....blah, blah, blah"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 19:03:56 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010121140356.21669.00000531@ng-mj1.aol.com>
Source record: 1543

>From: Aaron Jones nomail@nomail.com

>What do the federal prosecuting attorneys and federal judges think
>about bringing ham violations to court? Not much if I understood
>Phil's past posts correctly.

I don't think much of bringing ham violations to court, either, Aaron. If all amateur rules violations were trundled into the court system, I wonder if any rules changes would be the result?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1295. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 19:04:30 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010121140430.21669.00000532@ng-mj1.aol.com>
Source record: 1544

>From: Aaron Jones nomail@nomail.com

>It's not like you to get nasty Ed... :-(

You are correct.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1296. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 19:06:31 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010121140631.21669.00000534@ng-mj1.aol.com>
Source record: 1545

>From: Aaron Jones nomail@nomail.com

>Ask about my escapades in my 49 Chevy sometime... :-)

And ask me about that guard rail incident in South Windsor, CT. :-)

> Gosh Ed, the tone of your posts are starting to sound ominous.

What, for bringing any mention of your anonymity into a discussion? If you feel that anonymity is so ominous that we dare not even mention it, perhaps you should do the honorable thing. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI>

1297. Re: DUMBASSES who can't read (Was:Re: Dumb guys cancel other people's posts)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 19:13:33 UTC
From: Stagger Lee <SLee@houston.net>
Message-ID: <3A6B34DD.37E1DAF@houston.net>
Source record: 1546
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

And who was the DUMBASS who didn't look carefully at the followup line
on the post which started this thread? As a result, KC8JBO also sent
his followup to news.admin.net-abuse.usenet in addition to r.r.a.m/p. I
can read, so I've trimmed the groups back!

Bwa hahahahaha!

KC8JBO wrote:

> Who is the DUMBASS who can't read or tell the difference between a
> cancelled post and a followup to a post that was a parody of a cancel.
> Learn to read, Republican!

1298. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 19:17:12 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010121141712.21669.00000536@ng-mj1.aol.com>
Source record: 1547

>From: Brian Kelly kelly@dvol.com

>> Both for social reasons, Brian, and for the simple reason that the
>> generation of hams who entered ham radio by that route does not
>> seem to want tests to be made that simple again. :-)

>For one obvious reason: There are no drop-dead regulatory incentives to
>upgrade knowledge and skills by getting on the air. So if ya don't wanna
> bother taking the apprentceship to get to be jouneyman you gotta take a
> jouneyman's-level exam to get the privs. I don't see anything wrong with
that.

Nor do I. Although I believe that the details should be improved, I think the
growth of the Amateur Radio Service in the days since that very simple
entry-level test was replaced by the more complex VE Novice or Tech tests
demonstrates that the tests never needed to be that simple.

>Today it's all carrots, sticks have become politically incorrect.

I have never felt hit by a stick at any point in my ham experiences. At all
times, whether I entered ham radio and whether I continued it by upgrading was,
and still is, voluntary. IMHO, it runs past the "mores" of today; hitting
prospective hams with a stick is not the best way to get them to participate.

>Unfortunately it looks like desktop computing is now eating
>into our market for the attention of the kinds of folk who became hams
> in earlier times.

Perhaps so. Although surfing the internet is no more than appliance operating
in any sense of the word. Some of those who may have become hams could be
attracted to some of the web-application programming things, but that has been
a "challenge" to us, albeit in a slightly different form, ever since the first
home computer was available. I think that we can take the growth rate of
amateur radio over that time as an indication of its relative appeal.

>>I don't think I would be a ham today if someone had handed me a 200+
>>page study guide and told me that this is what I had to know to be a beginner

>>in ham radio. And if they then told me that it was "dumbed down" from
>>that 4-page book THEY had to read...

>It's not the 4-page book in itself, it's the "serve the appreticeship or go
>thru tougher testing pushups" thing. A bit of pro-quid-pro in play.

Perhaps, but even in 1963, it was not necesary to be a Novice, or even take the
Novice test, before being a General and earning all amateur priveleges.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1299. Re: Enough already

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 19:22:30 UTC
From: City_Slicker <notenuftime@foolscorner.net>
Message-ID: <94fctm$iac@dispatch.concentric.net>
Source record: 1548
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Well it may be time to upgrade. Ignorance is no excuse. Isn't that what I hear preached regarding FCC rules and CB's?

"Cecil" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:3A6B24D0.EC939FA5@IEEE.org...
> City_Slicker wrote:
> > The CB group!!! Which of all the groups listed would be the least interested
> > in this sort of post. I see that someone is continuing to cross post.
> > Amazing how dumb a person can be when there aren't multiple choice answers.
>
> My newsreader doesn't automatically display to which groups my postings
> are going. I have to spend time looking for them.
> --
> http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

1300. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 19:23:12 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010121142312.21669.00000537@ng-mj1.aol.com>
Source record: 1549

>From: Brian brianburke@my-deja.com

>Getting back to JLE and testing, I don't see why limiting the number of
>times you can take an exam would be a problem. Does retaking an element
>quarterly sound OK? Is annualy too long?

The FCC used to require 30 days, if memory served. Of course, it was almost always more than 30 days between test sessions in any particular city. I could live with that. I would support a rules change that required a reasonable waiting period between retests of a failed element.

>Also, Fred was advocating showing a log of contacts prior to upgrading.
> Although a log isn't required to be kept anymore, it really does fall
>back on good amateur practice (oops there's that silly idea again). Or
>merely have a year TIG?

It has been over 20 years since the FCC dropped the logging requirement. Can we trace any problems in the Amateur Radio Service to the lack of logging? Since I have been a ham, showing a log of contacts has not been a requirement to obtain a license that grants all amateur priveleges. When I was a General, renewal required, if memory serves, that a ham make a statement that he or she operated a minimum number of hours. There was also a "time in grade" requirement to upgrade to Extra, but I already had all priveleges, so I felt little or no need.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1301. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 19:26:17 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010121142617.21669.00000538@ng-mj1.aol.com>
Source record: 1550

>From: Gene webmaster@zylay.com

>I personally agree with holding on to the traditions. Instead of lowering
>the requirements to make it easier to get in, we should be making better
>study materials to make it easier to learn. No sense dumbing down. I'd love
>to write something like this myself, but just don't feel like I could doa
>good enough job on it to do itthe justice that it deserves.

I don't think any individual could. What you can do is to send your input to the QPC about what material in the tests you don't believe to be relevant, what needs to be improved and as much of the work as you CAN do justice to. They are working on the Extra questions right now, and have asked for input. If you and I are not smart enough to do it, let's not leave it to the 3 QPC folks to do alone. We won't get as good a result as if we all chip in.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1302. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 19:39:30 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <94fdti$q9b$0@208.207.71.150>
Source record: 1551

W1RFI wrote:
>
> >From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
>
> >They get more than a good opportunity to learn. It's when they display skulls
> of
> >granite that the hammers come out.
>
> I have seen you take a hammer to people you don't even know, Dick; how do you
> know that all those hordes of people memorizing tests containing questions you
> have never looked at have skulls of granite?

So now you'd hold me to keeping constant watch on upgrades to the
question pool? You seem more than willing to just ignore anything that
is negative. I stated that if there are any substantial percentage of
questions in the pool such as the few you posted then that shows some
imoprovement in things. It doesn't mean that the system has been
overhauled.

>
> >ANd you have no idea what kind of a ham I am based on what happens here.
>
> Sure we do, Dick. You have described many of your on-the-air and VE escapades
> here, and, frankly, some of them appeared to me to have been pretty mean
> spirited.

Really? Could I ask you to review some of them here so that I might
consider them for change? I KNOW that is incorrect and blatently false
and your stature has just dropped considerably in my view, Ed. On the
other hand I'd imagine that of Burke & co. has improved accordingly, so
your mission may be showing some signs of success. It is particularly
offensive that you should assert that my "escapades" as a VE to be
meanspirited. That is as false as any prevarication ever has been. In
EVERY instance of any issue whatever I ALWAYS went as far in favor of
the applicant as the rules would allow in their most liberal
interpretation, and I would fully invite anyone to simply ask any
applicant who ever tested with my team that question. That attitude cost
me a lot of extra work since many applicants travelled long distance to
test with our team, having heard of our astute fairness as opposed to
other teams who were not.
The fact that you would make such an assertion without any even
marginal evidence is revealing. You evidently want to cast me in a
negative light for puposses of advancing The Agenda. OK, so be it. I can
live with that,m false as it is. I know how much of an outright lie it
really is and that is sufficient.

> Do you really reserve such conduct ONLY for what happens here? Why
> would you feel that you don't feel to be appropriate on the air or in your
> in-person social dealings with hams is appropriate here?

Do you really have to ask??? After the drubbing the Freebanders posting here have laid out on anyone who supports any sort of code test? There is no doubt of it, therre are many llcensed hams who are also Freebanders. It's a fact often proven by the FCC. You think they just keep quite about the code? Some of them have even obliquely admitted it right here.
What you are doing is demonstrating clearly the future planning of the League, whether you know it or not. The policy fo the League is becoming more and more clear as all this progresses. Yes, it may be your personal opinion. That doesn't mean it isn't also that of officialdom. It more clearly shows that it is.

For most of the
> people here, what happens here is the only basis on which they can interpret
> and judge the worth of what you are saying.

Well what I am saying is not obscure. Hams should have sense and initiative to get to know ham radio and what it consists of, rather than just bringing only their own wants and wishes and forcing the rest of the hobby to conform to their
wishes. But that is far to out of touch with the PC world of today. The league is falling right in line in the ongoing effort to keep up the bottom line. So be it.

1303. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 19:43:25 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <94fe4t$q9b$1@208.207.71.150>
Source record: 1552

Cecil wrote:
>
Why can't we have Elmers
> instead of Radio Cops and Drill Sergeants?

We used to have them before so many newcomers arrived comp[lete with
chips on their shoulders because of the code.

1304. Re: cellphone block

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 19:58:27 UTC
From: Jerry Oxendine <joxendi@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <3A6B3F63.18D4@bellsouth.net>
Source record: 1565
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Richard,

I tend to agree. While he/she may have a valid "legal" point, I can't help but notice how *badly* kids are treated these days. You know, the "necessary" car at 16, money to buy huge amps for their stereos, pagers, cell phones, more money to "slam" their cars, put funky lights underneath them, hydraulics. I mean, what's 20 grand these days? My, my, how badly they are treated! I hope we never have another depression to contend with. What would they do without all those "necessities"? To see the most recent generations deprived of such would scare me to death. Really! How would they react to having to WALK to school or (HORRORS!) ride a school bus, do without a cell phone, or a phone altogether. Tragic.

The sad thing is, that the abundance of "things" and electronic media has helped in the decline of education. I mean, when it seems that everything is just *there* for the picking, why does one need an education? For the kids coming up today, they have no concept of hardship or the inability to get a decent job. It's all out there, right? They have never really had to work for anything--not all, but most. Parents just hand out money and goods. Instead of coming home from school, and feeding the chickens, gathering eggs, slopping the hogs, watering livestock, many come home to an empty house, a pop-in pizza, and Nintendo. Anything the kids do is OK, and don't the teacher DARE try to keep order or respond to impertinence. It would seem that the rules require that if a teacher comes under attack, he/she must stand there and not dare defend him/herself. I'm glad that I didn't do what I started to do for a career: English teacher. I wouldn't have lasted long in today's environment! The first time a kid attempted to smack me, he'd better have filed a flight plan, cuz he'd be going for a short "flight"! LOL! So my career choice (railroad) was the better one!

Cell phones in school? I may be missing something, but I don't see the need for kids to have them at school. Again, the person *may* have a legal gripe against the school. However, I wonder if it is a matter of resolving a legitimate gripe, OR just a way of one-upping "authority".

Jerry

Richard McCollum wrote:
>
> "JC" <jayc@j.s> wrote in message news:3A6AA81D.621DED73@j.s...
> > If this W4JLE jerk spent a little less time picking on people, his
> > depression would improve.
> >

> > W4JLE wrote:
> >
> > > If this young lad spent a little less time on the phone, his English
> would
> > > improve.
> > >
> >
>
> You know this whole discussion makes more sense if JC were a girl. There
> isn't a lot of sense in being 14 and female if you can't be a snot.
>
> Dick

1305. Re: FCC Proposal for New Novice Class License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 20:00:14 UTC
From: Jim Weir <jim@rst-engr.com>
Message-ID: <ctfm6t8a1hlicl41pfg4enni2gkd4rgs68@4ax.com>
Source record: 1553

K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org>
shared these priceless pearls of wisdom:

->License name: "Experimenter"
->License term: 1 year, renewable four times in 1-year increments.

->73, Hans, K0HB

I don't agree with the fundamental premise, but if it is to be, this is the way
it should be.

Jim
Jim Weir, VP Eng. RST Eng. WX6RST
A&P, CFI, and other good alphabet soup

1306. Re: Before responding to the Colt thread.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 20:10:44 UTC
From: RanHefner <ranhefner@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <94ffo0vtr1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1554
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <94biur$59q$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
Steven J Robeson, K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com> wrote:

> And unless I miss something, you have no name. At least he puts

You are missing many things. Cross-posting is for brain-dead people that have a over-emphasized imagination that their opinions should be transmitted all over the world. Just post it where it belongs. the alt.family.radio newsgroup is really an FRS newsgroup. FRS is NOT a hobby radio service. If you don't understand the word "hobby" as it pertains to radio services, have someone explain it to you.

Condensed version: Cross-linked messages are lame. FRS is not a hobby service.

--
Randy A. Hefner
http://talk.to/frs
http://go.to/qx3

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1307. Re: DUMBASSES who can't read (Was:Re: Dumb guys cancel other people's posts)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 20:13:42 UTC
From: KC8JBO <roger_kc8jbo@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <94ffti$vv8$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1555
Cross-posted to: news.admin.net-abuse.usenet,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <3A6B34DD.37E1DAF@houston.net>,
Faggot Weewee <SLee@houston.net> wrote:
> And who was the DUMBASS who didn't look carefully at the followup line
> on the post which started this thread? As a result, KC8JBO also sent
> his followup to news.admin.net-abuse.usenet in addition to r.r.a.m/p.

So fucking what, cocksucking clod????

>I can read, so I've trimmed the groups back!

Restored, coward.

> Bwa hahahahaha!

Your drunken mother fucking you up the ass again, Georgie??

> KC8JBO wrote:
>
> > Who is the DUMBASS who can't read or tell the difference between a
> > cancelled post and a followup to a post that was a parody of a
cancel.
> > Learn to read, Republican!
>

--
73 de Roger, KC8JBO
EM99 |ARRL|VE [ARRL & W5YI]|ARES |RACES
Yaesu FT-920 |Inverted Vee @ 40 ft.
Yaesu FT-90R

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1308. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 20:26:56 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010121152656.00445.00000828@nso-bj.aol.com>
Source record: 1557

In article <3A6AEADF.369B423D@IEEE.org>, Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>W1RFI wrote:
>> Is that the technique we can expect you to you when you "point out" that
>the
>> young sportsman is doing something wrong? Would you at least do it
>privately,
>> or would you think it best for "baseball" if you said that to him or her in
>> front of the entire team.
>
>Bullies invariably do their bullying in public, Ed, so as to strike
>fear in the hearts of the multitude. Such people often put themselves
>in a position of power over little kids because they are devoid of
>power and respect among adults.

Unfortunate truism demonstrated by a few in here.

That may be the source of the continuing mantra of "getting
the young involved in amateur radio."

Such are at a loss to handle adult major-league players
from another "club." It is easy to cow children, to belittle
them. Gives them a feeling of Power, of Control, of
Turf Ownership. Doesn't work with adults not intimidated
by their self-professed "superiority."

didit

1309. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 20:26:57 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010121152657.00445.00000829@nso-bj.aol.com>
Source record: 1556

In article <o77m6t87jrvjl5651v0vl8i2i0n52o510q@4ax.com>, Aaron Jones
<nomail@nomail.com> writes:

>w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:
>>I think I finally understand at least one of the reasons for your anonymity.
>
>>It is too bad that there are things in your life that you are ashamed to
>admit
>>to. An anon post here really doesn't get it off your chest...
>
>Gosh Ed, the tone of your posts are starting to sound ominous. Have
>things been going badly for you lately? I am not proud of some of the
>wild things that I did as a teenager. However my bootlegging on CW
>while waiting for my Novice license to come in the mail was certainly
>one of the lesser of my infractions... :-)
>
>Ask about my escapades in my 49 Chevy sometime... :-)

Did that '49 Chevy have anonymous license plates, too?

didit

1310. Re: Sound Familiar?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 20:26:57 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010121152657.00445.00000830@nso-bj.aol.com>
Source record: 1559

In article <20010121092818.18668.00000585@ng-da1.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>>From: Brian Kelly kelly@dvol.com
>
>>> The ultrawideband folks are saying... naw, never mind. :-)\
>
>>TRY me!
>
>The short of it is that UWB technology uses very short pulses that have a
>resultant "baseband" bandwidth of several GHz. The frequency range is in the
>1-10 GHz area.

It might be easier to think of it as "ultimate" DSSS.

>Some of the tutorial and article statements I have seen imply that UWB cannot
>be detected by radio receivers. True enough if the source is far away, but
>not so if the source is close. Depending on its modulation characteristics,
UWB
>can produce discrete modulation sidebands or can sound noiselike.

That assumes that only narrowband, conventional receivers are used to monitor the wideband signal. The RF energy is literally spread so wide across the baseband spectrum that the energy in a tiny fraction of the spectrum is very low.

You cannot really explain this "UWB" without first going through a tutorial on direct-sequence spread spectrum basics. The narrowband concept of radio is too fixed in most minds to accept UWB immediately.

1947 was a pivotal year in radio-electronics. Not only did Harvey and Wells come out with their multiband transmitter [:-)], but the transistor was invented and a young genius named Claude Shannon came up with the relationship of noise, bandwidth, and information rate. While the rest of the radio world followed "Shannon's Law," amateurs were seldom aware that it applied to amateur radio. That may be because Shannon started off using TTY as the base for his analysis. Everyone (well, most...) "knows" that amateur radio is all about CW on HF, therefore anything that started off with TTY in 1947 can't be any good.... :-)

didit

1311. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 20:26:58 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010121152658.00445.00000831@nso-bj.aol.com>
Source record: 1558

In article <3A6B0C40.ED7D9B4A@dvol.com>, Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com> writes:

>W1RFI wrote:
>
>> >The Harvey-Wells Bandmaster, 50 watts (807?), CW & AM, fairly compact,
>stood
>> >on what would usually be the end of it's cabinet. About twice as high as
>wide,
>> >sucked up very little desk space. Went to both 6m and 2m in addition to
>HF.
>>
>> Yes, it goes to 2 M. I have one in my shack.
>
>Slick! I haven't seen or heard about one of those for probably 40 years.
>How'd you get it? VFO included? Might be worth some bucks.

I had to do a web search for the item due to lack of memory on
anything but the name. :-)

Designed (!) in 1947 for "'all' the amateur bands," it looks like
a classic kluge with a front panel layout straight out of 1930.
Using an 807 as a final "on up to 148 Mc [sic]," it probably
has zilch efficiency above 30 MHz.

Messrs Harvey and Wells never produced a receiver according
to the website and the company ceased in 1960. They never
produced any SSB transmitter...explaining some of the lack of
product recognition.

If this particular product is so wonderful that it becomes a
notable exception to a general rule, then I would think that
some ARRL Lab moonlighting with test equipment can
exemplify its bona fides as an "all band" transmitter.

Boatanchor stuff is nice nostalgia material. Long-timers can
wax enthusiastic until the sun shines brightly on the polish
but very little of the old stuff can glow visibly against the
brilliant light of newer, state-of-the-art equipment.

didit

1312. Re: Will you let them take away your guns?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 20:31:49 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <94fgvmrd1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1560

In article <20010120104138.00714.00003153@nso-md.aol.com>,
yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote:

> Jim, there is such a thing as right and wrong, and I'm intelligent
> enough to be able to make that distinction. If you are not, then
> I can understand the problem you're having in understanding my
> post.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Jim may have taken an oath to defend and protect the constitution
against all enemies, foreign or domestic at some time in the distant
past. I don't think he realized the gravity of that oath. And unless
he's revoked it, it probably still stands.

Imagine Jim trying to call CQ with three missing front teeth. Give him
a pass on that self inflicted beating. Brotherhood and fellowship and
all that feel good stuff in DeSoto's paper.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1313. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 20:56:51 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <94fief$1un$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1562

In article <94fe4t$q9b$1@208.207.71.150>,
Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>
>
> Cecil wrote:
> >
> Why can't we have Elmers
> > instead of Radio Cops and Drill Sergeants?
>
> We used to have them before so many newcomers arrived comp[lete with
> chips on their shoulders because of the code.

Chip? Because you cannot provide a single rational argument to keep the
code, we have a chip? The FCC agrees, so the FCC must also have a chip.

Now the ARRL asks yet again to substantiate keeping the code
requirement. I hope you don't trot out the same lame excuses.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1314. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 20:58:16 UTC
From: xjim@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <94fih5$1vg$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1561

> >In 1973, I found the License Manuals completely inadequate for study of the
> >concepts that the radio amateur really needs to know in order to
> >understand what he is doing,
>
> Absolutely correct. But they were adequate for the study of the concepts
> needed to pass the tests.

> Then, as now, there clearly was a lot to learn after passing the tests and
> being given the priveleges -- a lifetime of learning for me, anyway. If all
> there was to ham radio was the test I took, either that test would have taken a
> lifetime to complete, or ham radio would not be of any interest to me.
>

And here we come to the point of my argument. There is much more to being a ham than being a Novice. The Novice ticket should be what it was meant to be- a quick entry level ticket that allows one to do the investigations and polish their craft with hands on experience with other hams before graduating to far greater priveliges as a real ham. The Code requirement was much more fun and doable with others to practice with, and one would obtain much of it in the Novice bands.

The Tech license questions I do admit are not technically simple, however the testing proceedures have been greatly simplified to the point of instant gratification and conveys "all the priveleges that anyone would want" in a day or two without requiring any further advancement in the craft. In my opinion, an attractive dead end that completely invalidates incentive licensing and the "Basis and Purpose" of Amateur Radio.

You must admit this had the effect of splitting Amateur radio into two factions; The Techs who felt there was really nothing more to ham radio, and the rest who wondered why these people didn't want to join the Ham fraternity (which seems to be almost gone now except for a few that remember what it was like to just be hams).

In my opinion, there should be a "beginner's" ticket that is restricted in band priveledges and only good for a year or two, that requires on the air experience and some further investigation (maybe like elective merit badges?) before upgrading and being accepted into the mainstream.

Let's face it; in order to be accepted as one of the crowd, you at least have to have something in common.

Also, I not accept the notion since we are all born "equal in the eyes of GOD" that we are all the same and thus should be able to have anything we want. If that made sense, how come I'm not a Millionaire? I really want to be a Millionaire but no one will give me a million dollars! It's just not fair! Of course the fact that I'm not much good at making a million dollars should have no bearing...

Jim, ac6tk

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1315. Re: DUMBASSES who can't read (Was:Re: Dumb guys cancel other people's posts)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 21:24:56 UTC
From: Stagger Lee <SLee@houston.net>
Message-ID: <3A6B53A8.233EB498@houston.net>
Source record: 1563
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

KC8JBO wrote:

> So fucking what, cocksucking clod????

Don't look now, but you fell into the trap again. Wasn't your original jeer about people who can't read? So far, yours are the ONLY posts showing up in the news.admin news groups, where the Usenet admins hang out, and that was due to your own gaffe (Note to others: the word is not spelled "gaff", as was done in another thread).

I do have to admit that your command of English is impeccable, though. It fits you well.

1316. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 21:26:10 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <94fk5b$3bo$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1566

In article <94fdti$q9b$0@208.207.71.150>,
Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>
>
> W1RFI wrote:

> > Do you really reserve such conduct ONLY for what happens here? Why
> > would you feel that you don't feel to be appropriate on the air or
in your
> > in-person social dealings with hams is appropriate here?
>
> Do you really have to ask???

Well, YES.

> After the drubbing the Freebanders posting
> here have laid out on anyone who supports any sort of code test?

What freebanders? Name them.

There
> is no doubt of it, therre are many llcensed hams who are also
> Freebanders.

Name them. Are they from you're circle of friends?

> It's a fact often proven by the FCC.

Name them.

> You think they just keep quite about the code?

What are you talking about? Who'se keeping "quite" about the code? For
what purpose. I may have to start calling you The Riddler.

> Some of them have even obliquely admitted it right here.

Name them.

> What you are doing is demonstrating clearly the future planning of
the
> League, whether you know it or not. The policy fo the League is
becoming
> more and more clear as all this progresses. Yes, it may be your
personal
> opinion. That doesn't mean it isn't also that of officialdom. It more
> clearly shows that it is.

I would certainly hope that the League advocates brotherhood and fellowship among amateurs, rather than constantly berating newcomers and beating on them like red-headed stepchildren.

> For most of the
> > people here, what happens here is the only basis on which they can interpret
> > and judge the worth of what you are saying.
>
> Well what I am saying is not obscure.

Perhaps unintelligible?

Hams should have sense and
> initiative to get to know ham radio and what it consists of,

I can only imagine your yuteful days as a beginner. Maybe that is why you carry such a huge chip on your shoulder.

> rather than
> just bringing only their own wants and wishes and forcing the rest of
> the hobby to conform to their
> wishes. But that is far to out of touch with the PC world of today. The
> league is falling right in line in the ongoing effort to keep up the
> bottom line. So be it.

No Dick, you're absolutely right. The best way to ensure the future of the ARS is to stomp the life out of any new person who'se learning the ropes or has any new idea. After all, they must conform to your wishes and your wishes only. To hell with simply operating within the scope of Part 97.

By the way, if you're not in the ARRL Lodge, what Lodge are you from?

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1317. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 21:35:54 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <94fknq$3r2$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1568

In article <20010121142312.21669.00000537@ng-mj1.aol.com>,
w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:
> >From: Brian brianburke@my-deja.com
>
> >Getting back to JLE and testing,
>
> The FCC used to require 30 days, if memory served.
snip
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

Welp, JLE had his chance to comment on the nprm or whatever it actually was several years ago. I wonder what his comments were. He's welcome to propose his changes, but I don't think the FCC will entertain his Lodge entrance requirement to the amateur service.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1318. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 21:39:48 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <94fkv3$3tf$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1567

In article <94fk5b$3bo$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com> wrote:

> beating on them like red-headed stepchildren.

Do you advocate beating on red-headed stepchildren? If so, why?

Do you have any red-headed stepchildren? Do you beat on them?

Are you a red-headed step-child?

73, de Hans, K0HB
--
"We are fellow travelers on a journey between two
eternities, and it's a trip far too brief for me
to be concerned about your speed at the Code of
Morse."

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1319. Re: FCC Proposal for New Novice Class License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 21:50:44 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <94fljh$4f8$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1569
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.radio.family

In article <94f9hsqps1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org> wrote:
> Stew,
>
> Here are my suggestions for changes to your idea.
>
> License name: "Experimenter"
>
> License term: 1 year, renewable four times in 1-year increments.
>
> License test: 15 questions from current "Technician" pool.
>
> Frequencies: All current and future amateur allocations above 30MHz.
>
> Power: 200W output.
>
> Modes: All authorized amateur modes.
>
> Callsigns: From same sequential pool as current Techs and
Generals.

Addendum to above:

HF Priveleges: Applicants who also pass a 5WPM Morse code exam would
have HF privs equivalent to current General licensees,
subject to 200W power limitation.

73, Hans, K0HB
--
"We are fellow travelers on a journey between two
eternities, and it's a trip far too brief for me
to be concerned about your speed at the Code of
Morse."

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1320. Re: cellphone block

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 22:09:56 UTC
From: W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com>
Message-ID: <94fmoe$t5n$1@iac5.navix.net>
Source record: 1570
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.policy

That's it, we hab now upset babykins and her will stomp her widdle feet
around the newsgroup.

--
Fred W4JLE NHI#1001
Executive Grand Pooba - No Hassle International
Doing away with all requirements for a Ham ticket
"We want, therefore we deserve"
Send your non-tax deductible donations today!

"JC" <jayc@j.s> wrote in message news:3A6AA81D.621DED73@j.s...
> If this W4JLE jerk spent a little less time picking on people, his
> depression would improve.
>
> W4JLE wrote:
>
> > If this young lad spent a little less time on the phone, his English
would
> > improve.
> >
>

1321. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 22:29:10 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <94fnrmsqi0@208.207.71.164>
Source record: 1571

W1RFI wrote:
>
> >From: Cecil Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>
> >If all hams were like you, the FCC would abolish the ARS.
>
> Although I agree with Dick that new hams benefit from help from more
> experienced hams, I was very fortunate; I received no help that has the "tone"
> of some of the posts Dick has made here.
>
> Perhaps Riley's recent statements about petty bickering can be applied to our
> conduct off the air, too...

So your opinion is that when a CBer gets a minimal ham radio license
and brings his entire repertoire with him, steadfastedly refusing any
hint of change by way of dropping at least most of the "ling" and sort
of rubs in everyone's face, then we hams should just shrug and give it
all up. We see. You're beginning to look like a limp noodle yourself.
I know of two meter repeaters which have been abandoned to them, and
the hams just moved and put up another repeater. If you think I'm the
only ham who sees it this way you're head is deep in the sand.

1322. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 22:30:28 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <94fnu4sqi1@208.207.71.164>
Source record: 1572

Brian wrote:
\
> "...the hammers come out." Oh good grief. You tell us exactly the kind
> of ham you are every day on rrap.
>

Getcher helmet on

1323. Re: CW is not Continious weeping!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 22:30:45 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010121173045.02997.00001141@nso-mg.aol.com>
Source record: 1573

In article <20010120135543.22806.00000190@ng-fm1.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>>I'llhave to sign into the HQ website and check out the current question
>pool.
>
>Have you really been "protesting" and insulting people without having looked
>at the pools?

Cut him some slack, please, Ed. It's a Fast Pace there at QPC Hq. They change every two years. :-)

didit

1324. Re: CA power crisis caused by internet

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 22:30:46 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010121173046.02997.00001142@nso-mg.aol.com>
Source record: 1574

In article <94dv4o$id4$0@208.207.71.169>, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
writes:

<massive snip...>

> Once we toyed with the idea of resettling somewhere in California in
>retirement, but have abandoned the idea. It appears the best of it is
>history. And if they don't get that power situation resolved the
>unpleasant future is now.

Dickie, you can always move to Los Angeles. No problems
with LA municipal Department of Water and Power
electricity. No outages, no shortages, ten cents a KWHR
for residences. Good future for LA.

Of course, there's earthquakes here. But...you know all
about earthquakes, once reading a book on the subject.

On the other hand, maybe you could "reactivate" that CW
net into the LAPD...you know, the one the LAPD didn't
know about until you "revealed" it to everyone? :-)

didit

1325. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 22:33:04 UTC
From: xjim@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <94fo31$6mp$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1575

>The Tech license questions I do admit are not technically simple, however the testing proceedures have been greatly simplified to the point of instant gratification and conveys "all the priveleges that anyone would want" in a day or two without requiring any further advancement in the craft. In my opinion, an attractive dead end that completely invalidates incentive licensing and the "Basis and Purpose" of Amateur Radio.

And the "Basis and Purpose" clause, 97.1 leads me to wonder how CW mode could be considered invalid.

If we stop to consider that CW only requires the least expensive, simplest to construct and is completely compatible with SSB reception, while being more reliable in terms of signal to noise ratio, how could it be that it has been banned for ships at sea and from other government circuits that claim to be for Emergency back-up?

Perhaps a ship at sea that cannot afford (or maintain) Satellite linked e-mail and weather fax is not worthy of rescue?

How do they resolve this inconsistancey?

Perhaps if there were at least a code test for SOS, the point would be made.

Jim, ac6tk

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1326. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 22:43:39 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <5epm6t43qpvt1qp2eoif39078nf387k5b2@4ax.com>
Source record: 1576

w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:

>>From: Aaron Jones nomail@nomail.com
>> Gosh Ed, the tone of your posts are starting to sound ominous.
>
>What, for bringing any mention of your anonymity into a discussion?

Do you think that my conduct would improve if I gave my call? Do you doubt that I am a ham? And if I were not a ham would it make a difference? Are you proud of the way some of the call letter identified hams here represent themselves and ham radio? Isn't it better to judge a person by his conduct and ideas rather than by whether he has call letters and/or is willing post them or not? We have discussed my anonymity here ad nauseum. That's not a problem for me. Continue the discussion as long as you like. I will respond to any and all of your concerns. But all of the answers can be found in deja.com many times over...

The ominous tone of your post that I was referring to was your use of the personal comment: "It is too bad that there are things in your life that you are ashamed to admit to." How many things in my life do you know about that I am ashamed of? And if I won't admit to them how do you know about them? And why is it too bad? That was simply a personal attack Ed, plain and simple. As I said, that's not like you, some others here maybe, but not you... :-(

1327. Re: Before responding to the Colt thread.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 22:47:56 UTC
From: Stagger Lee <SLee@houston.net>
Message-ID: <3A6B671C.CEB9937C@houston.net>
Source record: 1577
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy

RanHefner wrote:

> You are missing many things. Cross-posting is for brain-dead people
> that have a over-emphasized imagination that their opinions should be
> transmitted all over the world.

I love it when clueless people try and tell other people how to live
their Usenet lives. They have been the same for many, many years.

You clearly have no idea about the history or the intent of Usenet, and
you sure as heck don't realize why crossposting was invented at the
outset of Usenet.

I'm not going to bother to tell you why crossposting is STILL
necessary. You should have read the FAQs by now.

BAH!!

1328. Re: Before responding to the Colt thread.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 23:17:25 UTC
From: RanHefner <ranhefner@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <94fqlv$8on$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1578
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <3A6B671C.CEB9937C@houston.net>,
Stagger Lee <SLee@houston.net> wrote:
>
> I love it when clueless people try and tell other people how to live
> their Usenet lives. They have been the same for many, many years.
>
> You clearly have no idea about the history or the intent of Usenet,
and
> you sure as heck don't realize why crossposting was invented at the
> outset of Usenet.
>

Clueless? I simply stated that those who cross-post are nimrods! Has
NOTHING to do with the mechanics and history of the usenet.

> I'm not going to bother to tell you why crossposting is STILL
> necessary. You should have read the FAQs by now.
>

Thanks! It would be a bother.

--
Randy A. Hefner
http://talk.to/frs
http://go.to/qx3

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1329. Re: DUMBASSES who can't read (Was:Re: Dumb guys cancel other people's posts)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 23:40:07 UTC
From: KC8JBO <roger_kc8jbo@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <94fs0m$9q8$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1579
Cross-posted to: news.admin.news-abuse.usenet,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <3A6B53A8.233EB498@houston.net>,
Faggot WeeWee <SLee@houston.net> wrote:
>
>
> KC8JBO wrote:
>
> > So fucking what, cocksucking clod????
>
> Don't look now, but you fell into the trap again. Wasn't your
original
> jeer about people who can't read? So far, yours are the ONLY posts
> showing up in the news.admin news groups, where the Usenet admins hang
> out, and that was due to your own gaffe (Note to others: the word is
not
> spelled "gaff", as was done in another thread).

Maybe I gon't give a fuck which groups the thread is crossposted to,
did you ever think about that?? No, you're too busy smoking crack
cocaine.

> I do have to admit that your command of English is impeccable, though.
> It fits you well.
>

An another anonymous pompous ass does another drive-by.
Get back to fondling the neighbor's kids, pedo.

--
73 de Roger, KC8JBO
EM99 |ARRL|VE [ARRL & W5YI]|ARES |RACES
Yaesu FT-920 |Inverted Vee @ 40 ft.
Yaesu FT-90R

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1330. Re: DUMBASSES who can't read (Was:Re: Dumb guys cancel other people's posts)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 23:40:36 UTC
From: KC8JBO <roger_kc8jbo@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <94fs1k$9qk$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1580
Cross-posted to: news.admin.news-abuse.usenet,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <3A6B53A8.233EB498@houston.net>,
Faggot WeeWee <SLee@houston.net> wrote:
>
>
> KC8JBO wrote:
>
> > So fucking what, cocksucking clod????
>
> Don't look now, but you fell into the trap again. Wasn't your
original
> jeer about people who can't read? So far, yours are the ONLY posts
> showing up in the news.admin news groups, where the Usenet admins hang
> out, and that was due to your own gaffe (Note to others: the word is
not
> spelled "gaff", as was done in another thread).

Maybe I gon't give a fuck which groups the thread is crossposted to,
did you ever think about that?? No, you're too busy smoking crack
cocaine.

> I do have to admit that your command of English is impeccable, though.
> It fits you well.
>

And another anonymous pompous ass does another drive-by.
Get back to fondling the neighbor's kids, pedo.

--
73 de Roger, KC8JBO
EM99 |ARRL|VE [ARRL & W5YI]|ARES |RACES
Yaesu FT-920 |Inverted Vee @ 40 ft.
Yaesu FT-90R

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1331. Re: Suzy Steals Toilet Paper

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-21 23:56:59 UTC
From: KC8JBO <roger_kc8jbo@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <94ft08ame1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1582
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.fan.furry,alt.test

In article <3A6B5BB2.A2E39BFE@houston.net>,
Stagger Lee <SLee@houston.net> wrote:
> Buzzsaw wrote:
>
> > Atlanta, GA (AP)--- Suzy Da Pig's plan to drive off with a
truckload of
> > stolen toilet paper went straight down the toilet.
>
> Poor thing. One wonders what would drive someone to such desperation
> over toilet paper. Suzy must be very troubled, and charitable people
> should really find a way to try and help out.
>
> Do you think that a toilet paper drive would help out? Concerned
> amateurs could simply mail a package to Suzy and eliminate the
middleman
> that so often burdens the act of charitable giving.
>
> This is just an idea, because I'm sure that there are many clever
people
> out there who can come up with some way to help Suzy. Let's discuss
> ways to help Suzy out; it is in the best traditions of amateur radio.
> -- SL
>

Maybe you two can beg and get a brain to share between you......

--
73 de Roger, KC8JBO
EM99 |ARRL|VE [ARRL & W5YI]|ARES |RACES
Yaesu FT-920 |Inverted Vee @ 40 ft.
Yaesu FT-90R

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1332. Re: FCC Proposal for New Novice Class License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 00:07:30 UTC
From: W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com>
Message-ID: <94ftud$45n$1@iac5.navix.net>
Source record: 1581
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.radio.family

My proposal to eliminate any requirements for a license will obviate any
need for a colt class.

Besides I am still upset that my last submission, while being assigned an RM
was not adopted.
--
Fred W4JLE NHI#1001
Executive Grand Pooba - No Hassle International
Doing away with all requirements for a Ham ticket
"We want, therefore we deserve"
Send your non-tax deductible donations today!

<Steven J Robeson>; "K4YZ" <k4yz@my-deja.com> wrote in message
news:94f5g4nha1@nnrp1.deja.com...
> In article <94f440$mh4$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
> horseshoestew@my-deja.com wrote:
>
> >At this point, I would appreciate more constructive criticism. I
> >understand that many of you are against change of any kind - but you
> >must have something positive to say, or their must be something you
> >can think of to improve things.
>
> Stewart, there was not ONE post of support for your Colt class, and
> EVERYONE has stated and reiterated that the Technician Class is about
> the easiest license to get in Ham Radio history.
>
> If I see your proposals with an RM on it, I can promise you that I
> will submit a vote of "no support" with the FCC, and in discussing this
> idea of a NEW license class with some of my local acquaintences, I can
> tell you there's no support WHATSOEVER for your proposals.
>
> They are, at the BEST, weak. You forget that the people who will
> have to administer this "license" are the VE's, and they DON'T want to
> be bothered with a "license" that amounts to nothing more than FRS with
> more power and external antennas.
>
> I can't help but think that you are fishing for SOME kind of
> support here, Stewart, but there's NONE. The Novice Class as it exists
> is all but dead and there is NO interest in reviving it.
>
> The ARRL said no. The FCC said no. The commenting public in
> general said no. So what part of NO did you fail to comprehend?
>
> More NG fodder is all you generated, Stewart.

>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4YZ
>
>
>
> Sent via Deja.com
> http://www.deja.com/

1333. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 00:17:38 UTC
From: W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com>
Message-ID: <94fue3$4g1$1@iac5.navix.net>
Source record: 1585

Dwight, as I posted earlier, I don't care what words you use as long as they are ones that a person would say in front of their mother (assuming she is not a Jerry Apringet reject)

My objection is to the over sensitive, feel good nonsense that ANY criticism is bad and will cause the little darling to fold up their tents and go home.

--
Fred W4JLE NHI#1001
Executive Grand Pooba - No Hassle International
Doing away with all requirements for a Ham ticket
"We want, therefore we deserve"
Send your non-tax deductible donations today!

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote in message news:3A6AE09A.6303AA90@sccoast.net...
> W4JLE wrote:
> >
> > For God's sake Ed, you are working so
> > hard to be politically correct. I
> > guess if a kid is learning baseball,
> > you should not point out he is running
> > the bases in the wrong direction for
> > fear he will give up baseball?
>
>
> But baseball has rules, Fred. And nobody is advocating that anyone
> ignore the rules relating to ham radio. Instead, what we're talking
> about is simple, somewhat pompus, traditions (unlike "those" other
> people, "we" don't say "handle" in ham radio).
>
> And, to me, it seems a little silly to make that big of an issue out
> of something as simple as this. If a tradition is that worth-while, it
> will survive on its own with only minimal encouragement. If it isn't,
> then we probably shouldn't be making an issue out of it at all.
>
>
> > Give me a single reason we should be
> > bending over and kissing some snot
> > nosed kids ass to get him active in
> > ham radio! If they are interested, I
> > will bust my butt to help them.
>
>
> And I certainly hope you're not judging the interest of others based

> on whether they use the same words and phrases you do. If so, then I
> have a problem because I don't know what you use when talking on the
> radio (these things seem to vary around the country). Can you send me a
> list of acceptable, and banned, words and phrases?
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net

1334. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 00:20:55 UTC
From: W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com>
Message-ID: <94fue5$4g1$2@iac5.navix.net>
Source record: 1584

I am a 90's kind of guy now Brian, I am proposing getting rid of any thing
that will stand in the way of anyone's desires as being insensitive.

--
Fred W4JLE NHI#1001
Executive Grand Pooba - No Hassle International
Doing away with all requirements for a Ham ticket
"We want, therefore we deserve"
Send your non-tax deductible donations today!

"Brian" <brianburke@my-deja.com> wrote in message
news:94fknq$3r2$1@nnrp1.deja.com...
> In article <20010121142312.21669.00000537@ng-mj1.aol.com>,
> w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:
> > >From: Brian brianburke@my-deja.com
> >
> > >Getting back to JLE and testing,
> >
> > The FCC used to require 30 days, if memory served.
> snip
> > 73,
> > Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
> Welp, JLE had his chance to comment on the nprm or whatever it actually
> was several years ago. I wonder what his comments were. He's welcome
> to propose his changes, but I don't think the FCC will entertain his
> Lodge entrance requirement to the amateur service.
>
>
> Sent via Deja.com
> http://www.deja.com/

1335. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 00:22:15 UTC
From: W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com>
Message-ID: <94fugj$4h2$1@iac5.navix.net>
Source record: 1583

Mostly just to piss you off Cecil.

--
Fred W4JLE NHI#1001
Executive Grand Pooba - No Hassle International
Doing away with all requirements for a Ham ticket
"We want, therefore we deserve"
Send your non-tax deductible donations today!

"Cecil" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3A6AE329.7D55D5DF@IEEE.org...
> W4JLE wrote:
> > Some here, on the other hand, feel that the slightest remark is an
attack on
> > the self esteem of the poor darling.
>
> What the heck difference does it make if a new ham or an old ham says
> 10-4 over a repeater? When someone asks me, "QSL?", I sometimes say
> "10-4 Gud Buddy" with the proper quiver in my voice just for a laugh.
> People who ask, "QSL?", over voice personally drive me up the wall
> but this is a hobby, not the U. S. Marines. Why can't we have Elmers
> instead of Radio Cops and Drill Sergeants?
> --
> http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

1336. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 00:27:44 UTC
From: W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com>
Message-ID: <94fuqt$4os$1@iac5.navix.net>
Source record: 1586

I could be wrong, but it is doubtful I said A**, I most likely said
hindparts or butt as is my usual response. I do indulge in the occasional
"piss me off", but I cringe as I write it.

--
Fred W4JLE NHI#1001
Executive Grand Pooba - No Hassle International
Doing away with all requirements for a Ham ticket
"We want, therefore we deserve"
Send your non-tax deductible donations today!

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20010121084800.10070.00000575@ng-cr1.aol.com...
> >From: "W4JLE" Fred@w4jle.com
>
> >Brian, We have had this conversation before. If you cannot address a
message
> >without the childish nonsense, don't bother.
>
> Some might feel using "snot-nosed kid" and "kiss my ass" in a post is also
> childish nonsense.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
>

1337. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 00:29:23 UTC
From: W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com>
Message-ID: <94futu$4qi$1@iac5.navix.net>
Source record: 1587

Thank you for the response.

--
Fred W4JLE NHI#1001
Executive Grand Pooba - No Hassle International
Doing away with all requirements for a Ham ticket
"We want, therefore we deserve"
Send your non-tax deductible donations today!

"Brian" <brianburke@my-deja.com> wrote in message
news:94etqhhkb1@nnrp1.deja.com...
> In article <94e1te$3cd$1@iac5.navix.net>,
> "W4JLE" <Fred@w4jle.com> wrote:
> > Brian, We have had this conversation before. If you cannot address a
> message
> > without the childish nonsense, don't bother. I don't attack you on a
> > personal basis and would expect you to at least make the attempt to
> > reciprocate.
>
> OK, I'll address your assertion that you want to hand select who gets a
> radio license and who doesn't. That isn't going to happen in America.
> Its the very "Lodge Hall" mentality that Len has railed against but
> everyone denies. You are living proof it exists.
>
>
> Sent via Deja.com
> http://www.deja.com/

1338. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 00:39:18 UTC
From: W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com>
Message-ID: <94fvgi$55u$1@iac5.navix.net>
Source record: 1588

No Brian, I have reevaluated my position. You. Ed, and Cecil have convinced me I need to be a sensitive 90's kind of guy. This caused me to create "No Hassle International". My goal is now to remove any restrictions that a newcomer may find demeaning, hazing, or might have a chance, no matter how slight, of damaging their self esteem.

I am now on a holy crusade, With the FCC's help, we can set up tables at the mall and pass out Extra Class licenses as people walk by. We are guaranteed growth and many new young people to keep Amateur radio alive.

I thank you all for causing me to realize my insensitive ways. How could I possibly be such a dolt as to expect anyone to learn something, and treating a radio service that everyone has a "right" to as a privilege. Mea Culpa Mea Culpa Mea Culpa.

If only I can receive the absolution from all the CBers and children, I have caused any moment of agony, I will sleep so much better.

--
Fred W4JLE NHI#1001
Executive Grand Pooba - No Hassle International
Doing away with all requirements for a Ham ticket
"We want, therefore we deserve"
Send your non-tax deductible donations today!

"Brian" <brianburke@my-deja.com> wrote in message
news:94etqhhkb1@nnrp1.deja.com...
> In article <94e1te$3cd$1@iac5.navix.net>,
> "W4JLE" <Fred@w4jle.com> wrote:
> > Brian, We have had this conversation before. If you cannot address a
> message
> > without the childish nonsense, don't bother. I don't attack you on a
> > personal basis and would expect you to at least make the attempt to
> > reciprocate.
>
> OK, I'll address your assertion that you want to hand select who gets a
> radio license and who doesn't. That isn't going to happen in America.
> Its the very "Lodge Hall" mentality that Len has railed against but
> everyone denies. You are living proof it exists.
>
>
> Sent via Deja.com
> http://www.deja.com/

1339. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 01:07:08 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010121200708.10077.00000642@ng-cr1.aol.com>
Source record: 1589

>From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

>So your opinion is that when a CBer gets a minimal ham radio license
>and brings his entire repertoire with him, steadfastedly refusing any
>hint of change by way of dropping at least most of the "ling" and sort
>of rubs in everyone's face, then we hams should just shrug and give it
>all up. We see.

No, my opinion is that there is no reason to publically berate a new ham
because he doesn't choose exactly the language you would use.

Do you really see things in such extremes, or do you blow them up out of
proportion because you believe it makes your point.

>You're beginning to look like a limp noodle yourself.

A petty insult that does not make your point, either.

>I know of two meter repeaters which have been abandoned to them, and
>the hams just moved and put up another repeater.

Are you really telling me that a group of hams put up a repeater, found it
taken over by "them" and so they put up another repeater, and just gave the
first one away? Sounds like another exaggeration to make a point to me.

> If you think I'm the only ham who sees it this way you're head is deep in the
sand.

No, I do not believe that you are the only ham who believes as you do. I do
believe that you represent only a relatively small number of hams. I don't
believe that most hams think that because I have an opinion that it is
inappropriate to publically berate a newcomer over a minor point that I am
advocating letting vast hordes of CBers run over ham radio and use CB lingo on
the air instead of ham lingo.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1340. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 01:09:43 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010121200943.10077.00000643@ng-cr1.aol.com>
Source record: 1590

>From: Brian brianburke@my-deja.com

>Welp, JLE had his chance to comment on the nprm or whatever it actually
>was several years ago. I wonder what his comments were. He's welcome
>to propose his changes, but I don't think the FCC will entertain his
>Lodge entrance requirement to the amateur service.

Restructuring would have been an ideal time to bring up the issue. I haven't read every comment; the lack of a waiting period may have been brought up by someone. It would appear that either hams didn't think it an issue or the FCC didn't think there was any problem that needed solving.

I guess the doom-and-gloom contingent is down one point on this one. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1341. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 01:20:32 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010121202032.10077.00000644@ng-cr1.aol.com>
Source record: 1591

>From: xjim@my-deja.com

>And here we come to the point of my argument. There is much more to
>being a ham than being a Novice.

Yes, and there is mouch more to being a ham than being an Extra, too.

>Novice ticket should be what it
>was meant to be- a quick entry level ticket that allows one to do the
>investigations and polish their craft with hands on experience with
>other hams before graduating to far greater priveliges as a real ham.

The Novice ticket was not that in 1963; it was quite possible to skip the Novice, and the Novice test altogether and get a General. A drive to the FCC office, a written and code test, a three week wait for the license and instant priveleges, No need to graduate -- one could be there -- 1963.

>The Code requirement was much more fun and doable with others to
>practice with, and one would obtain much of it in the Novice bands.

Yes, they would. Now, have the pro-code folks in 2001 been making it sound like it is fun and doable? >The Tech license questions I do admit are not technically simple,
>however the testing proceedures have been greatly simplified to the
>point of instant gratification and conveys "all the priveleges that
>anyone would want" in a day or two without requiring any further
>advancement in the craft.

Just like it was in 1963. One could take the Tech or General with no previous experience.

>In my opinion, there should be a "beginner's" ticket that is restricted
>in band priveledges and only good for a year or two, that requires on
>the air experience and some further investigation (maybe like elective
>merit badges?) before upgrading and being accepted into the mainstream.

Did you make this suggestion to the FCC? What did they have to say about your comments in the Report and Order?

>Let's face it; in order to be accepted as one of the crowd, you at
>least have to have something in common.

Man, the things we have in common are so much more than our differences that I don't even know where to begin.

>Also, I not accept the notion since we are all born "equal in the eyes
>of GOD" that we are all the same and thus should be able to have
>anything we want.

I do believe that we are equal in the eyes of God, but that means that we have an equal opportunity to live the path that has been placed before us. I don't know anyone personally who believes that we are all the same and thus should be able to have anything we want. This seems to center around this forum; can you tell me who you think believes this way and whether you think that their belief is held by a majority of hams?
>If that made sense, how come I'm not a Millionaire?

Perhaps you could ask the God you cited in your post.

>I really want to be a Millionaire but no one will give me a million
>dollars! It's just not fair! Of course the fact that I'm not much
>good at making a million dollars should have no bearing...

Oh, now I think we know who believes this way. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1342. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 01:23:49 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010121202349.10077.00000645@ng-cr1.aol.com>
Source record: 1592

>From: xjim@my-deja.com

>If we stop to consider that CW only requires the least expensive,
>simplest to construct

What percentage of CW operation do you think is carried on usign the least expensive, simplest equipment vs using the new-fangled, microprocessor controlled transceiver?

>while being more reliable in terms of signal to noise ratio, how could
>it be that it has been banned for ships at sea and from other
>government circuits that claim to be for Emergency back-up?

I lack your expertise in determining what emergency equipment should be on ships, but in my humble opinion, they probably make the choice in terms of reliability. If I were on a sinking ship, I would trust that they would have a satellite rescue system instead of a 500-kHz Morse transmitter.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI
73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1343. Re: FCC Proposal for New Novice Class License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 01:25:38 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010121202538.10077.00000646@ng-cr1.aol.com>
Source record: 1593

>From: "W4JLE" Fred@w4jle.com

>My proposal to eliminate any requirements for a license will obviate any
>need for a colt class.

Now we know you aren't serious. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1344. Re: Sound Familiar?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 01:37:05 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010121203705.10077.00000648@ng-cr1.aol.com>
Source record: 1594

>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)

>It might be easier to think of it as "ultimate" DSSS.

That would be a reasonable analogy.

>>Depending on its modulation characteristics, UWB
>>can produce discrete modulation sidebands or can sound noiselike.

>That assumes that only narrowband, conventional receivers are used
>to monitor the wideband signal. The RF energy is literally spread so
>wide across the baseband spectrum that the energy in a tiny fraction
>of the spectrum is very low.

Yes, it is very low, Len, but very low can be used quite effectively for communications. Run a few calculations. Start with 30 dBm UWB spread over 1 GHz bandwidth, 10 dBi antenna gain on transmit, 20 dBi antenna gain on receive, a 6 dB receiver noise figure, a 1 kHz receiver bandwidth and a frequency of 1200 MHz and a separation of 0.1 kM. The result is:

Frequency = 1200 MHz
Total transmit power = 1 watt
Transmit spread = 1000 MHz
Receiver bandwidth = 1000 Hz
Transmit power in 1 Hz = -60 dBm/Hz
Transmit power in 1000 Hz = -30 dBm
Transmit antenna gain = 10 dBi
Receive antenna gain = 20 dBi
Distance to receiver = .1 km
Free-space pathloss = -74.03362 db
System loss (path loss +/- antenna gains) = -44.03362 dB
Total loss (path loss +/- antenna gains - spreading loss) = -104.0336 dB
Specified receive system Noise Figure = 6 dB (includes external noise)
Calculated receive system sensitivity in 1000 Hz bandwidth = -138 dBm
Received noise in receiver bandwidth = -74.03362 dBm
Received noise in receiver bandwidth = S 9
Receive system noise floor increase in dB = 63.96638 dB

Put that UWB transmitter on a good location and go out to 10 kM and you are still hearing -114 dBm in a 1 kHz bandwidth narrowband receiver under the conditions I stipulated.

Put a 0 dBm UWB transmitter in the house next door, 0 dBi gain antenna, 30 meters separation and you receive -104 dBm under the stipulated conditions.

I am not necessarily advocating that UWB should not be allowed, but the oft-cited lack of interference because the signal is spread out over such a

wide frequency range does not mean that it won't be heard by narrowband receivers.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

Press any key to continue
,

1345. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 01:40:06 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010121204006.10077.00000649@ng-cr1.aol.com>
Source record: 1595

>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)

>If this particular product is so wonderful that it becomes a
>notable exception to a general rule, then I would think that
>some ARRL Lab moonlighting with test equipment can
>exemplify its bona fides as an "all band" transmitter.

Gosh, I don't remember anyone saying that it was "wonderful," Len, but I could have missed the point. I do know that this ARRL Lab rat has not put his on the air yet.

>Boatanchor stuff is nice nostalgia material. Long-timers can
>wax enthusiastic until the sun shines brightly on the polish
>but very little of the old stuff can glow visibly against the
>brilliant light of newer, state-of-the-art equipment.

I agree. If I am going to do any moonlighting with test equipment, it will be to compare the Elecraft K2 to an old Collins S line receiver. I will wager that famous lobster dinner if I get to pick the side I want to be on. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1346. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 01:42:02 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010121204202.10077.00000650@ng-cr1.aol.com>
Source record: 1596

>From: Aaron Jones

>The ominous tone of your post that I was referring to was your use of
>the personal comment: "It is too bad that there are things in your
>life that you are ashamed to admit to." How many things in my life do
>you know about that I am ashamed of? And if I won't admit to them how
>do you know about them? And why is it too bad? That was simply a
>personal attack Ed, plain and simple. As I said, that's not like you,
>some others here maybe, but not you... :-(

You are correct. I apologize.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1347. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 01:44:12 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010121204412.10077.00000651@ng-cr1.aol.com>
Source record: 1597

>From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

>We used to have <Elmers> before so many newcomers arrived comp[lete with
>chips on their shoulders because of the code.

Even if a new ham doesn't want to learn code, there are still many things that you could help teach him or her. Code is my favorite mode, so you can bet your bottom dollar I am going to do a commercial for it with any new ham that I help with his or her 2 meter ground plane or 75-meter dipole. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1348. Re: FCC Proposal for New Novice Class License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 01:46:21 UTC
From: W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com>
Message-ID: <94g3e9$7hi$1@iac5.navix.net>
Source record: 1598

I am serious as a heart attack, as I posted in a message to Brian. You, Brian and Cecil have made me change my ways, I am now a new sensitive creation of the 90's. I spend every minute seeking absolution for my old ways that erroneously thought rewards should come from effort.

Little did I realize that I was simply building monuments to my own ego by depriving someone of what they wanted simply because I worked to gain the same privileges.

I have seen the light, and as soon as the FCC sees things my way, I will be the first to set up a table at the mall to pass out Extra class licenses to any and all that want them. Our ranks will swell and Amateur radio will be saved.

We don't need no stinkin' colt license.
--
Fred W4JLE NHI#1001
Executive Grand Pooba - No Hassle International
Doing away with all requirements for a Ham ticket
"We want, therefore we deserve"
Send your non-tax deductible donations today!

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20010121202538.10077.00000646@ng-cr1.aol.com...
> >From: "W4JLE" Fred@w4jle.com
>
> >My proposal to eliminate any requirements for a license will obviate any
> >need for a colt class.
>
> Now we know you aren't serious. :-)
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

1349. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 01:48:08 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010121204808.10077.00000654@ng-cr1.aol.com>
Source record: 1599

>From: Brian brianburke@my-deja.com

>Now the ARRL asks yet again to substantiate keeping the code
>requirement. I hope you don't trot out the same lame excuses.

I hope that both you and Dick told them what you think.

So far, none of the Directors that are as much friends as Directors have gotten home yet; I don't have the skinny on the Board meeting. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1350. Re: FCC Proposal for New Novice Class License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 02:01:18 UTC
From: zeno333@mindspring.com
Message-ID: <94g47p$6pv$1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 1600
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.radio.family

Saying it is out of date is one thing..it is also the one thing that you would have to expand upon and "prove" to the FCC...

In article <94f440$mh4$1@nnrp1.deja.com>, horseshoestew@my-deja.com wrote:

> Today, technologies like the Family Radio Service, high-speed telephone
> & cable modems, the Internet, and inexpensive cellular telephones, have
> overshadowed the privileges of the Amateur Radio Service, and made the
> requirements for young beginners to obtain a Technician Class license
> out of date.

1351. Re: DUMBASSES who can't read (Was:Re: Dumb guys cancel other people's posts)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 02:18:31 UTC
From: DX405 <lightnin9@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <94g5rknmk1@dagobah.blueriver.net>
Source record: 1651
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Finally got out of the trailer park to go to the public library, huh Roger.
So did mommy give you the car keys to get there. She probably even drove you
there. So where did you learn to cuss like that Roger, did your mommy teach
you to cuss like that.
"KC8JBO" <roger_kc8jbo@my-deja.com> wrote in message
news:94fs0m$9q8$1@nnrp1.deja.com...
> In article <3A6B53A8.233EB498@houston.net>,
> Faggot WeeWee <SLee@houston.net> wrote:
> >
> >
> > KC8JBO wrote:
> >
> > > So fucking what, cocksucking clod????
> >
> > Don't look now, but you fell into the trap again. Wasn't your
> original
> > jeer about people who can't read? So far, yours are the ONLY posts
> > showing up in the news.admin news groups, where the Usenet admins hang
> > out, and that was due to your own gaffe (Note to others: the word is
> not
> > spelled "gaff", as was done in another thread).
>
> Maybe I gon't give a fuck which groups the thread is crossposted to,
> did you ever think about that?? No, you're too busy smoking crack
> cocaine.
>
> > I do have to admit that your command of English is impeccable, though.
> > It fits you well.
> >
>
> An another anonymous pompous ass does another drive-by.
> Get back to fondling the neighbor's kids, pedo.
>
> --
> 73 de Roger, KC8JBO
> EM99 |ARRL|VE [ARRL & W5YI]|ARES |RACES
> Yaesu FT-920 |Inverted Vee @ 40 ft.
> Yaesu FT-90R
>
>
> Sent via Deja.com
> http://www.deja.com/

1352. Re: Top ten problems being a Glendale, WV ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 02:20:15 UTC
From: DX405 <lightnin9@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <94g5usnml1@dagobah.blueriver.net>
Source record: 1653
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Hey Roger, why do you have such a fixation on child molesters. Do you have some skeletons in your closet, loser

"KC8JBO" <roger_kc8jbo@my-deja.com> wrote in message news:94c820ilk1@nnrp1.deja.com...

> In article <3A68F56E.E46FF77B@houston.net>,
> Stagger Lee <SLee@houston.net> wrote:
> > Top ten problems being a Glendale, WV ham
>
> Projecting your lifestyle onto others... Child molester?????
> --
> 73 de Roger, KC8JBO
> EM99 |ARRL|VE [ARRL & W5YI]|ARES |RACES
> Yaesu FT-920 |Inverted Vee @ 40 ft.
> Yaesu FT-90R
>
>
> Sent via Deja.com
> http://www.deja.com/

1353. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 02:30:34 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <94g60a$5co$0@208.207.71.164>
Source record: 1652

W1RFI wrote:
>
> >From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
>
> >So your opinion is that when a CBer gets a minimal ham radio license
> >and brings his entire repertoire with him, steadfastedly refusing any
> >hint of change by way of dropping at least most of the "ling" and sort
> >of rubs in everyone's face, then we hams should just shrug and give it
> >all up. We see.
>
> No, my opinion is that there is no reason to publically berate a new ham
> because he doesn't choose exactly the language you would use.

Making assumptions again ED? Where did I say that *I* publically berate
any new ham or anyone else "because he doesn't choose exactly the
language I'd use"?
I *didn't*,I *don't*, never have, don' expectd I ever will. We both
know that it is sometimes done. That doesn't mean that I have done or
ever would do it. I like the others just move to another repeater. I
might just put tone control on it and fail to give the miscreant the
code,it he continues to flaunt his CB background in every ham's face.
That sort of behavior doesn't seem to bother you a bit.
And: I thought it was you who said that what happens on this NG doesn't
reflect reality in ham radio. Changed your mind, I see.

>
> Do you really see things in such extremes, or do you blow them up out of
> proportion because you believe it makes your point.

Another poster mentioned that sometimes newcomers are corrected on the
air and suddenly you leap to their protection whether or not it is
needed or even wanted. I made the comment that when they refuse to learn
how to act on ham radio that's when the hammers come out, and suddenly
I'm an ogre. Time to get hour head on straight Ed, it ain't me that's
the problem. And that remark about my nefarous activity as a VE in the
face of the facts which are 180 degrees out is way beyond anything I
have ever heard done to any newbie on the air. I guess only newcomers
are subject to being offended and they by the slighest effort to help
them being misinterpreted at harsh criticism! Amazing! IF this is what
the hobby is coming to, I think I'll take my grandson and go fishing. If
ham radio is turning into nothing but a PC feel good sideshow where
honest efforts to help a new ham by offering advise -and I don't mean
the sort of crapthat Paranoid Burke worries incessantly about- then you
won't have to worry about me intruding in your utopian fun. I'll be
somewhere doing something I can enjoy and it won't be in the middle of

that nonsense.
I gotta decide by April whether or not to renew my ARRL membership.
Gotta tell ya, it doesn't look to promising right now. Oh, I'll keep my
ticket, that's not going away. Been a ham way too long to just hand it
over to the Fragile Ego CBers, but I can sure hang out somewhere I don't
have to worry about running into any of them. You won't find the Burkes
where it takes any effort to use the resident modes.

1354. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 02:48:25 UTC
From: "Steven J Robeson", K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <94g71nimt1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1655

In article <20010121152658.00445.00000831@nso-bj.aol.com>,
lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:

> Boatanchor stuff is nice nostalgia material. Long-timers can
> wax enthusiastic until the sun shines brightly on the polish
> but very little of the old stuff can glow visibly against the
> brilliant light of newer, state-of-the-art equipment.

If it still could, then the "new stuff" wouldn't flourish. It
wouldn't be necessary. Why do you find it necesssary to TRY and gloat
on the obvious, Lennie?

--
"If You're Not A Ham....You're SPAM!"

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1355. Re: Enough already

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 02:59:35 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <94g7mn$96b$0@208.206.142.95>
Source record: 1654

W1RFI wrote:
>
> >From: Cecil Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>
> >Your objection will only cause people who enjoy getting goats to
> >just try even harder to get yours. Why not just use your newsreader
> >kill file feature like I do? There is no way you or I can stop
> >others from crossposting.
>
> How would we feel if all of the CB newsgroup posts were cross-posted here? Do
> you think it would be disruptive?

I'd feel like some idjut like Cecil deliberately added their NGs to some
response post just to stir things up. Not the first time either.

1356. Re: Before responding to the Colt thread.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 03:00:13 UTC
From: "Steven J Robeson", K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <94g7ns$j7f$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1656
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <94ffo0vtr1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
RanHefner <ranhefner@my-deja.com> wrote:

> Condensed version: Cross-linked messages are lame.

Probably. But that you have found your way to rrap AND
alt.radio.family is evidnece it happens. You could of as easily sent
me an e mail.

>FRS is not a hobby service.

If you read the basis and purpose of BOTH Citizen's Band (of which
FRS is part and parcel of) and the Amatuer Radio Service, you would NOT
find the word "HOBBY" in either, yet both are used for that purpose.

That they are used for that purpose is obvious. That includes
FRS. You may not wish to apply that word (hobby)to it, but that's
exactly what a great many people use it for.

73

Steve, K4YZ

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1357. Re: Top ten problems being a Glendale, WV ham

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 03:21:40 UTC
From: KC8JBO <roger_kc8jbo@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <94g901$k5a$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1657
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <94g5usnml1@dagobah.blueriver.net>,
Baby-raper and AIDS carrier "DX405" <lightnin9@hotmail.com> wrote:
> Hey Roger, why do you have such a fixation on child molesters. Do you
have
> some skeletons in your closet, loser

No, I;ve been checking out your picture on the known child molesters
webpage...you've got quite a record of it, fuckhead.

> "KC8JBO" <roger_kc8jbo@my-deja.com> wrote in message
> news:94c820ilk1@nnrp1.deja.com...
> > In article <3A68F56E.E46FF77B@houston.net>,
> > Stagger Lee <SLee@houston.net> wrote:
> > > Top ten problems being a Glendale, WV ham
> >
> > Projecting your lifestyle onto others... Child molester?????
> > --
> > 73 de Roger, KC8JBO
> > EM99 |ARRL|VE [ARRL & W5YI]|ARES |RACES
> > Yaesu FT-920 |Inverted Vee @ 40 ft.
> > Yaesu FT-90R
> >
> >
> > Sent via Deja.com
> > http://www.deja.com/
>
>

--
73 de Roger, KC8JBO
EM99 |ARRL|VE [ARRL & W5YI]|ARES |RACES
Yaesu FT-920 |Inverted Vee @ 40 ft.
Yaesu FT-90R

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1358. Re: DUMBASSES who can't read (Was:Re: Dumb guys cancel other people's posts)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 03:27:06 UTC
From: KC8JBO <roger_kc8jbo@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <94g9a5$kh7$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1659
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

```
In article <94g5rk$nmk$1@dagobah.blueriver.net>,
PEDOPHILE "DX405" <lightnin9@hotmail.com> wrote:
> Finally got out of the trailer park

DUMBFUCK, I live in a house, not the welfare assisted "housing" you
currently live in, you know the one where you keep your CHEAP-ASSED
radios, the ones that were made in Hong Kong.......

>to go to the public library, huh Roger.

Don't need to, however, you need to learn ENGLISH skills, because most
people put a question mark after the end of a question. But, you never
finished school, did you, drug-dealer to kids????

> So did mommy give you the car keys to get there. She probably even
>drove you there.

No, but I gave the 5 dollars to your mommy when I fucked her, it was
all that truck stop whore was worth.

>So where did you learn to cuss like that Roger, did your mommy teach
> you to cuss like that.

Where did you learn to suck that kiddie dick??? Oh, that's right your
drunken, alcoholic bastard father used to teach it to you, to keep you
in the family business.

> "KC8JBO" <roger_kc8jbo@my-deja.com> wrote in message
> news:94fs0m$9q8$1@nnrp1.deja.com...
> > In article <3A6B53A8.233EB498@houston.net>,
> > Faggot WeeWee <SLee@houston.net> wrote:
> > >
> > >
> > > KC8JBO wrote:
> > >
> > > > So fucking what, cocksucking clod????
> > >
> > > Don't look now, but you fell into the trap again. Wasn't your
> > original
> > > jeer about people who can't read? So far, yours are the ONLY
posts
> > > showing up in the news.admin news groups, where the Usenet admins
hang
> > > out, and that was due to your own gaffe (Note to others: the word
```

is
> > not
> > > spelled "gaff", as was done in another thread).
> >
> > Maybe I gon't give a fuck which groups the thread is crossposted to,
> > did you ever think about that?? No, you're too busy smoking crack
> > cocaine.
> >
> > > I do have to admit that your command of English is impeccable,
though.
> > > It fits you well.
> > >
> >
> > An another anonymous pompous ass does another drive-by.
> > Get back to fondling the neighbor's kids, pedo.
> >
> > --
> > 73 de Roger, KC8JBO
> > EM99 |ARRL|VE [ARRL & W5YI]|ARES |RACES
> > Yaesu FT-920 |Inverted Vee @ 40 ft.
> > Yaesu FT-90R
> >
> >
> > Sent via Deja.com
> > http://www.deja.com/
>
>

--
73 de Roger, KC8JBO
EM99 |ARRL|VE [ARRL & W5YI]|ARES |RACES
Yaesu FT-920 |Inverted Vee @ 40 ft.
Yaesu FT-90R

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1359. Re: Suzy Steals Toilet Paper

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 03:33:07 UTC
From: KC8JBO <roger_kc8jbo@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <94g9lj$km8$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1660
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.fan.madonna,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.test

In article <3A6B89F0.B6053CFB@houston.net>,
PEDOPHILE Faggot WeeWee <SLee@houston.net> wrote:
> KC8JBO wrote:
>
> >
> > Maybe you two can beg and get a brain to share between you......
> >
>
> Why did you cross post to alt.fan.furry and alt.test? I think I know
> why, but you didn't get it right yet.

I x-posted to alt.fan.furry because I knew that you like those gerbils
up your FATASS..alt.test was to piss you off....lol!!!!!
FUCKWIT. Hope you enjoy it, choad swallower.

> In the meantime, watch out that the capybaras don't get you. -- SL

Be sure to remove that gerbil from your well-reamed ass, it'll enjoy
the oxygen.

--
73 de Roger, KC8JBO
EM99 |ARRL|VE [ARRL & W5YI]|ARES |RACES
Yaesu FT-920 |Inverted Vee @ 40 ft.
Yaesu FT-90R

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1360. Re: VHF history (long) (was: any ideas on HOw to learn Morse

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 03:35:34 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <94g9q6kvf1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1661

Steven J Robeson, K4YZ wrote:

> ....this lying twerp.

Len Anderson and I have found many reasons to disagree over the
past several years, but I cannot recall any instance where I felt
he was lying.

73, de Hans, K0HB
--
"We are fellow travelers on a journey between two
eternities, and it's a trip far too brief for me
to be concerned about your speed at the Code of
Morse."

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1361. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 03:39:13 UTC
From: Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com>
Message-ID: <3A6BAB61.145FA7B3@dvol.com>
Source record: 1658

>
>
> Boatanchor stuff is nice nostalgia material. Long-timers can
> wax enthusiastic until the sun shines brightly on the polish
> but very little of the old stuff can glow visibly against the
> brilliant light of newer, state-of-the-art equipment.

>
The Bandmaster was in the ham magazine ads when I was just getting interested in radio, well before I became a Novice. It just sparked some very old memories, that's all. I'm not into boat anchors any more than I'm interested in collecting antiques in general. Momentarily interesting but no thankew. I recently saw an an SX-88 bid up to $2,800 in e-bay, spare me. Every piece of ham gear I actually use is solid state stuff including an NRD-545 which has 40-bit DSP at the IF level. I happen to have a Collins 75S-3B and a Drake R4-B which are getting a bit long of tooth but they both still have better ears than the current crop of lower end xcvrs.
>
Running an 807 on 2m was definitely a stretch but it did put more of a signal on the band than a lot of the popular 50s 2m xcvrs like the Benton Harbor Lunchboxes and Gonsets, etc. Plus it was 100% modulated AM, not the lame screen modulated crap which was more common.

>
> didit

>
w3rv

1362. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 04:07:36 UTC
From: Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com>
Message-ID: <3A6BB208.9D03BE79@dvol.com>
Source record: 1662

W1RFI wrote:

> >From: Brian Kelly kelly@dvol.com
>
> Nor do I. Although I believe that the details should be improved, I think the
> growth of the Amateur Radio Service in the days since that very simple
> entry-level test was replaced by the more complex VE Novice or Tech tests
> demonstrates that the tests never needed to be that simple.

>
That's a matter of opinion, a discussion which could go on forever. What is not a matter of opinion is the obvious fact that Novice test worked very well in it's timeframe. Ham testing has been a cyclic thing. It's run from the much easier days of the 50s to the Draconian Incentive Licensing maneuver to the nocode ticket, etc. They all worked in their timefarmes. I just don't want to see the tests eventually watered down to to the point where they permit what would amount to a free pass to the bands just to prop up the license count.
>

> >Today it's all carrots, sticks have become politically incorrect.
>
> I have never felt hit by a stick at any point in my ham experiences. At all
> times, whether I entered ham radio and whether I continued it by upgrading was,
> and still is, voluntary. IMHO, it runs past the "mores" of today; hitting
> prospective hams with a stick is not the best way to get them to participate.

>
That one year or hit the wall was definitely a stick IF you wanted to stay on the air. Which of course was strictly optional.
>

>
> Perhaps so. Although surfing the internet is no more than appliance operating
> in any sense of the word. Some of those who may have become hams could be
> attracted to some of the web-application programming things, but that has been
> a "challenge" to us, albeit in a slightly different form, ever since the first
> home computer was available.

>
Computers in fact are a big asset to ham radio these days in several respects, the damned things are almost becoming a necessity.
>

> I think that we can take the growth rate of
> amateur radio over that time as an indication of its relative appeal.

>
I agree. I'm not wringing my hands over the imminent death of ham radio.

>
> Perhaps, but even in 1963, it was not necesary to be a Novice, or even take the
> Novice test, before being a General and earning all amateur priveleges.

>
No, It wasn't necessary, none of it was "necessary" but it got a lot of new hams on the air who have not have bothered otherwise. You could have gone straight to the Extra for that matter and some people did. My neighbor AF3F was a avid CBer in the 70s who got a whiff of ham radio in my shack, the only license he's ever held is his 20wpm Extra.
>
The writtens never were any kind of big deal back then, the thrash over the writtens didn't start until the question pool nonsense came into play.
>
Certainly in my own (lame) case as a kid I made good use of that first year on the air. I had junk equipment which needed constant debugging from which I picked up a lot of on-the-fly technical skills. I'm not sure if I'd have pursued ham radio if I had to take the 13wpm test out of the box. Thousands jumped on the new opportunity to get up to 13wpm on the air. Instant gratification leads to learning in the right setting. Which was the bottom-line design intent of the original Novice ticket.
>

>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

>
w3rv

1363. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 04:24:34 UTC
From: Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com>
Message-ID: <3A6BB602.A55ED886@dvol.com>
Source record: 1663

W1RFI wrote:

>
> I agree. If I am going to do any moonlighting with test equipment, it will be
> to compare the Elecraft K2 to an old Collins S line receiver. I will wager
> that famous lobster dinner if I get to pick the side I want to be on. :-)

>
Cute.
>
I'll provide my high-number Meatball 3B with it's 200Hz filter.
>
The K2 will have a better front end but when you move down the chain and run into
the filters it'll be all over for the K2.
>
The K2 is a puzzlement. The thing has a kilowatt receiver and a five watt
transmitter in the same box.
>

> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

>
w3rv

1364. Re: Before responding to the Colt thread.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 04:28:47 UTC
From: qrm2000@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010121232847.22244.00000258@ng-de1.aol.com>
Source record: 1664

>>
>> If you respond to the Colt License Proposal thread, please drop
>> alt.radio.family from the header.

>
> Be glad to. It's not a serious proposal anyway, Stewart is just
>Teazing you.
>

Thanks, "Dixie". And I think you're correct..... :)

QRM

1365. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 04:35:34 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <f5en6t4ho3k8d85m1db2ifani5t314s98d@4ax.com>
Source record: 1665

w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:
>You are correct. I apologize.

Thank you. Apology accepted... :-)

1366. Re: CA power crisis caused by internet

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 04:45:56 UTC
From: noralisa@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <94gdu3$o4l$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1666

mindspring, incase you haven't noticed Californians are contributing
huge amounts of money to our economy by coming up here...and as far as
I am concerned they are welcome!
In rticle <3A6AE636.70324072@IEEE.org>,
Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> Phil Kane wrote:
> > That's why we moved to Oregon in 1999 - Oregon is what
> > the good in California was 40 years ago, and alas is no longer.
>
> Is it Oregon where they have a sign that says, "Welcome to Oregon,
> now go back to CA", or some such?
> --
> http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca
>

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1367. Re: CA power crisis caused by internet

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 05:23:13 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net>
Message-ID: <3A6BC3C1.319F4CFA@ovis.net>
Source record: 1667

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <94dv4o$id4$0@208.207.71.169>, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
> writes:
>
> <massive snip...>
>
> > Once we toyed with the idea of resettling somewhere in California in
> >retirement, but have abandoned the idea. It appears the best of it is
> >history. And if they don't get that power situation resolved the
> >unpleasant future is now.
>
> Dickie, you can always move to Los Angeles. No problems
> with LA municipal Department of Water and Power
> electricity. No outages, no shortages, ten cents a KWHR
> for residences. Good future for LA.
>
> Of course, there's earthquakes here. But...you know all
> about earthquakes, once reading a book on the subject.
>
> On the other hand, maybe you could "reactivate" that CW
> net into the LAPD...you know, the one the LAPD didn't
> know about until you "revealed" it to everyone? :-)
>
> didit

The above is Len debating civilly. No use of the diminutive in naming individuals, condescension or ridicule. Mr. Civil.

Thanks for the illustration.

Dave K8MN

1368. Re: Enough already

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 05:36:44 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A6BC6EC.9BC0B98@IEEE.org>
Source record: 1670

Dick Carroll wrote:
> I'd feel like some idjut like Cecil deliberately added their NGs to some
> response post just to stir things up. Not the first time either.

The only time I recall changing NGs is to redirect Morse code arguments
away from r.r.a.a onto r.r.a.p where they belong.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

1369. Re: CA power crisis caused by internet

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 05:42:16 UTC
From: W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com>
Message-ID: <94gh8kgko1@iac5.navix.net>
Source record: 1668

Dave, it is not nice to pick on older people. Len's "old timers" disease sometimes causes him to strike back without thinking.

What I took as mean spirited responses to my messages turned out to be caused by the lateness of his social security check.

It appears he had no money to purchase a new box of depends, and the overflowing contents happened to get intertwined with his messages.

--
Fred W4JLE NHI#1001
Executive Grand Pooba - No Hassle International
Doing away with all requirements for a Ham ticket
"We want, therefore we deserve"
Send your non-tax deductible donations today!

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@ovis.net> wrote in message
news:3A6BC3C1.319F4CFA@ovis.net...
> Len Over 21 wrote:
> >
> > In article <94dv4o$id4$0@208.207.71.169>, Dick Carroll
<dixie@townsqr.com>
> > writes:
> >
> > <massive snip...>
> >
> > > Once we toyed with the idea of resettling somewhere in California in
> > >retirement, but have abandoned the idea. It appears the best of it is
> > >history. And if they don't get that power situation resolved the
> > >unpleasant future is now.
> >
> > Dickie, you can always move to Los Angeles. No problems
> > with LA municipal Department of Water and Power
> > electricity. No outages, no shortages, ten cents a KWHR
> > for residences. Good future for LA.
> >
> > Of course, there's earthquakes here. But...you know all
> > about earthquakes, once reading a book on the subject.
> >
> > On the other hand, maybe you could "reactivate" that CW
> > net into the LAPD...you know, the one the LAPD didn't
> > know about until you "revealed" it to everyone? :-)
> >
> > didit
>

> The above is Len debating civilly. No use of the diminutive in naming
> individuals, condescension or ridicule. Mr. Civil.
>
> Thanks for the illustration.
>
> Dave K8MN

1370. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 05:45:52 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net>
Message-ID: <3A6BC910.D882CC0E@ovis.net>
Source record: 1669

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3A6B0C40.ED7D9B4A@dvol.com>, Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com> writes:
>
> >W1RFI wrote:
> >
> >> >The Harvey-Wells Bandmaster, 50 watts (807?), CW & AM, fairly compact,
> >stood
> >> >on what would usually be the end of it's cabinet. About twice as high as
> >wide,
> >> >sucked up very little desk space. Went to both 6m and 2m in addition to
> >HF.
> >>
> >> Yes, it goes to 2 M. I have one in my shack.
> >
> >Slick! I haven't seen or heard about one of those for probably 40 years.
> >How'd you get it? VFO included? Might be worth some bucks.
>
> I had to do a web search for the item due to lack of memory on
> anything but the name. :-)
>
> Designed (!) in 1947 for "'all' the amateur bands," it looks like
> a classic kluge with a front panel layout straight out of 1930.
> Using an 807 as a final "on up to 148 Mc [sic]," it probably
> has zilch efficiency above 30 MHz.
>
> Messrs Harvey and Wells never produced a receiver according
> to the website and the company ceased in 1960. They never
> produced any SSB transmitter...explaining some of the lack of
> product recognition.
>
> If this particular product is so wonderful that it becomes a
> notable exception to a general rule, then I would think that
> some ARRL Lab moonlighting with test equipment can
> exemplify its bona fides as an "all band" transmitter.
>
> Boatanchor stuff is nice nostalgia material. Long-timers can
> wax enthusiastic until the sun shines brightly on the polish
> but very little of the old stuff can glow visibly against the
> brilliant light of newer, state-of-the-art equipment.
>
> didit

Len, you are the crabgrass in the lawn of rrac.

The Bandmaster was as much of an "all band" rig as one could get at the time of its production. No, it wasn't efficient above 30 MHz but it worked. It may not have had the best electrical design but it was a mechanical marvel with its right angle drive. It is also very compact. The matching VFO was designed with a slanted panel and a nice flat and low rectangular area where the transmitter could perch atop the VFO. I have two, one of them with the VFO. I'd be happy to sell you one so that you can spend hours admiring it. With luck, you'll be able to get a license and use it on the air.

Yes, the company did produce at least one receiver.

You can tell the '57 Chev collectors that their rides are deficient but I doubt you'll get any of 'em to trade them in on a new Taurus or an Intrepid.

Would you like me to send you a copy of "Now You're Talking"?

Dave K8MN

1371. Re: Enough already

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 06:04:02 UTC
From: W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com>
Message-ID: <94gihfhfl1@iac5.navix.net>
Source record: 1671
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt,binaries.sex.beastiality

What are you doing posting this crap in alt.binaries.sex.bestiality ?

--
Fred W4JLE NHI#1001
Executive Grand Pooba - No Hassle International
Doing away with all requirements for a Ham ticket
"We want, therefore we deserve"
Send your non-tax deductible donations today!

"Cecil" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3A6BC6EC.9BC0B98@IEEE.org...
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > I'd feel like some idjut like Cecil deliberately added their NGs to some
> > response post just to stir things up. Not the first time either.
>
> The only time I recall changing NGs is to redirect Morse code arguments
> away from r.r.a.a onto r.r.a.p where they belong.
> --
> http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

1372. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 07:43:14 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nospam.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.g7jgdj7.pminews@ca.news.verio.net>
Source record: 1672

On Sun, 21 Jan 2001 07:24:58 -0600, Cecil wrote:

>Why can't we have Elmers instead of Radio Cops and Drill Sergeants?

More "jargon". When the term started, I was working for a
supervisor named Elmer who was a ham. He was a much better ham
than a supervisor, but what the heck, his idea of ham radio
was CW on HF. He could copy 40 wpm in Japanese Kona code and
had the paper to prove it. My first thought on hearing "Elmer"
so used was "why Elmer".... <ggg>

I still do my share of "Elmering" though but I don't call it that.

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

1373. Re: VHF history (long) (was: any ideas on HOw to learn Morse

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 09:44:08 UTC
From: "Steven J Robeson", K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <94gvd8$56n$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1673

In article <94g9q6kvf1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org> wrote:

> Len Anderson and I have found many reasons to disagree over the
> past several years, but I cannot recall any instance where I felt
> he was lying.

Perhaps because you have not been paying attention, Hans. One
characteristic you and Lennie the Licenseless seem to share is
selective memory. Especially when it serves an on-going rant.

73

Steve, K4YZ

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1374. Re: FCC Proposal for New Novice Class License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 09:52:34 UTC
From: meghertz@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <94gvt1$5ip$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1674
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.radio.family

In article <94f440$mh4$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
horseshoestew@my-deja.com wrote:

> On 70cm, Novice licensees would be restricted to voice communications
> on 5 20khz-spaced channels on 446.00, 446.02, 446.04, 446.06, and
> 446.08 Mhz; and digital communications up to 19,200bps on 1 simplex-
> only 60khz bandwidth channel on 446.14Mhz.

You might as well specify this as "a sub-band from 446.0 to 446.2MHz"
and then they'll be able to use European FRS-style 500mW 'PMR446'
radios :o)

http://www.geocities.com/rf-man/pmr446

MegHz

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1375. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 10:42:15 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <94h2q6$7lm$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1675

In article <94fvgi$55u$1@iac5.navix.net>,
"W4JLE" <Fred@w4jle.com> wrote:
> No Brian, I have reevaluated my position. You. Ed, and Cecil have
convinced
> me I need to be a sensitive 90's kind of guy. This caused me to create
"No
> Hassle International". My goal is now to remove any restrictions that
a
> newcomer may find demeaning, hazing, or might have a chance, no matter
how
> slight, of damaging their self esteem.

This is reminiscient of Cecil's conversion resulting from Eric June's
persuasive arguments.

> I am now on a holy crusade, With the FCC's help, we can set up tables
at the
> mall and pass out Extra Class licenses as people walk by. We are
guaranteed
> growth and many new young people to keep Amateur radio alive.
>
> I thank you all for causing me to realize my insensitive ways. How
could I
> possibly be such a dolt as to expect anyone to learn something, and
treating
> a radio service that everyone has a "right" to as a privilege. Mea
Culpa Mea
> Culpa Mea Culpa.
>
> If only I can receive the absolution from all the CBers and children,
I have
> caused any moment of agony, I will sleep so much better.
>
> --
> Fred W4JLE NHI#1001
> Executive Grand Pooba - No Hassle International
> Doing away with all requirements for a Ham ticket
> "We want, therefore we deserve"
> Send your non-tax deductible donations today!

NHI 1001? Mike Deignan might ask you to produce a membership list
showing 1001 members.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1376. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 10:50:42 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <94h3a1$821$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1676

In article <94fue5$4g1$2@iac5.navix.net>,
"W4JLE" <Fred@w4jle.com> wrote:
> I am a 90's kind of guy now Brian, I am proposing getting rid of any
thing
> that will stand in the way of anyone's desires as being insensitive.

> > Welp, JLE had his chance to comment on the nprm or whatever it
actually
> > was several years ago. I wonder what his comments were. He's
welcome
> > to propose his changes, but I don't think the FCC will entertain his
> > Lodge entrance requirement to the amateur service.

So what did you propose?

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1377. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 12:10:55 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010122071055.21640.00000697@ng-fy1.aol.com>
Source record: 1677

>From: Brian Kelly kelly@dvol.com

> I just don't want to see the tests eventually watered down to to the point
> where they permit what would amount to a free pass to
>the bands just to prop up the license count.

Nor do I, Brian. To the contrary; I have oft' said that the tests need improvements like questions about the fundamentals of modern radio technology and more questions on the formulae type questions. I have been having long talks with Bart Jahnke, ARRL's rep on the QPC, to find out what it would take to make it happen.

>That one year or hit the wall was definitely a stick IF you wanted to stay on
>the air. Which of course was strictly optional.

I didn't feel hit by it. If I hadn't been so lazy, I would have studied the 16-page study guide and practiced Morse code real hard and been a General right from the get-go.

Even then, I think the incentive of wanting more frequencies was more responsible for my upgrading to General than was the 1-year term for the Novice license.

I know two career Novices, who have renewed that license for years. Is amateur radio harmed in any way by their presence in our ranks? If we hit them with a stick, they simply won't renew next time. In what way would that benefit amateur radio?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1378. Re: FCC Proposal for New Novice Class License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 12:16:33 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010122071633.21640.00000698@ng-fy1.aol.com>
Source record: 1678

>From: "W4JLE" Fred@w4jle.com

>I have seen the light, and as soon as the FCC sees things my way ...

I will believe that you are serious about the changes you propose when I see you file a request for rulemaking with the FCC. If it gets as far as an NPRM, expect most hams who file comments to oppose it.

It looks to me like another version of "if you won't play the game my way, I am going to take my ball and go home."

The only problem with that is you don't own the ball. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1379. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 12:34:14 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010122073414.21640.00000699@ng-fy1.aol.com>
Source record: 1679

>From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

>So now you'd hold me to keeping constant watch on upgrades to the
>question pool?

If you are going to criticize the pools and the people who take exams derived from them, I believe that you should have at least looked at the pools before you did, yes.

>You seem more than willing to just ignore anything that
>is negative.

Not true, Dick; I have posted my own opinions about what is wrong with the question pools and amateur radio. I just don't think I have to take a positon that the entire process if somehow not of any use because there are a few things that should be made better.

>> Sure we do, Dick. You have described many of your on-the-air and VE
>> escapades here, and, frankly, some of them appeared to me to have
>>been pretty mean spirited.

>It is particularly offensive that you should assert that my "escapades" as
>a VE to be meanspirited. That is as false as any prevarication ever has
>been. In EVERY instance of any issue whatever I ALWAYS went as far
>in favor of the applicant as the rules would allow in their most liberal
>interpretation, and I would fully invite anyone to simply ask any
>applicant who ever tested with my team that question. That attitude cost
>me a lot of extra work since many applicants travelled long distance to
>test with our team, having heard of our astute fairness as opposed to
>other teams who were not.

I agree; my choice of words could very well give people the wrong impression that you did not conduct yourself as a VE honorably. I do not think that you would do anything inappropriate in the admiminstration of the tests. I just can't imagine how the attitudes you project here could not have been present at the sessions, however; why would you treat people any differently here than you do in person?

> What you are doing is demonstrating clearly the future planning of the
>League, whether you know it or not.

Now, could that fall into the same "outright lie" category as the words I chose about your VE testing? If ARRL is smart enough to realize that there is some merit to some of my views, I will be pleased, but, IMHO, that outcome is not at all certain. That is the reason I posted here several times that it is important for people to make their views known about this to their Director, and I hope that YOU did, too, Dick.

> The policy fo the League is becoming more and more clear as all this
> progresses. Yes, it may be your personal opinion. That doesn't
> mean it isn't also that of officialdom.

I hope you are correct, but if ARRL were to adopt the positions I have offered are best, it would not be because I posted them here.

> The league is falling right in line in the ongoing effort to keep up the
> bottom line. So be it.

I can name a lot of things the ARRL would not do if the "bottom line" were the only concern it had, Dick. You can go to the ARRL's annual reports and note that the bottom line is zero every year; the amount of revenues is directly related to what the ARRL can do. This year, I wouldn't be surprised if the ARRL will run on a slight deficit. I hope so, because one of the things on the plate is an additional ARRL staffer, who will be tasked with undertaking some of the work involving RFI to hams. Between powerlines and Part 15 devices and upcoming technologies like digital cable, home phone networking, home power-line networking, xDSL, Blueetooth and a number of others, things are not looking good for HF or microwave allocations. As one who wants to see this work get done, I am glad that some attention is paid to the finances, Dick.

But if you really think the "bottom line" is the only "agenda," why did the League not support one license class with a requirement to sign one's name on the application? It proposed something that was more than the FCC, and apparently many in the Amateur Community, was willing to accept. IMHO, that proposal was influenced very much by the input of hams like you, in tandem with input from hams like Cecil or Brian. The ARRL's position was a compromise position that included your point of view as one of its components. If your response is "bottom line" and "agenda," and you put that response into your input to your Director (would you treat us any differently than you treat him?), how do you think that such a response to ARRL's past actions will affect its future actions?

73,
Ed Hare,W1RFI
>
>
>
>
>
>

1380. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 12:39:53 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010122073953.21622.00000747@ng-fy1.aol.com>
Source record: 1680

>From: Brian Kelly kelly@dvol.com

>The K2 will have a better front end but when you move down the chain and run
>into the filters it'll be all over for the K2.

Maybe. I think the skirt selectivity of the old Collins may be better than some modern rigs, but certainly not all modern rigs. Care to stack the skirts of the Collins up against the IC-756PRO?

I also want to look at what is still a problem for many modern rigs -- in band IMD, ie, the intermodulation that occurs when two signals are present simultaneously in the receiver passband. Most current equipment doesn't do very well in that regard and I want to see how the old Collins S line did.

Actually, I am pretty serious about all this. I have asked our test engineer to get a few of those old receivers and take a look at them.

>The K2 is a puzzlement. The thing has a kilowatt receiver and a five watt
>transmitter in the same box.

I do know that 5 watts was the design goal. It was intended to be a QRP rig. The designers can't help if if they happened to design a receiver that is better than most. :-) And do remember, "better" is a relative term. It does indeed have superior dynamic range characteristics, but it also lacks many of the features that hams buy "big" rigs to have. For most hams, with modest antennas, features are more important than dynamic range.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1381. Re: "They oughta require a license....blah, blah, blah"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 14:09:01 UTC
From: "Leland C. Scott" <no-spam@junk-mail.net>
Message-ID: <t6ofo3m2rpk83c@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 1681

"Jerry Oxendine" <joxendi@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
news:3A6B2CEB.49D3@bellsouth.net...
> Mr. southpark,
>
> Then I suggest you go over to rec.radio.cb and find those "troublesome"
> posts by me. There IS a lot of controversy over there and you need to
> concentrate your smart remarks towards Aaron Voobner, Mr. Scott, et al.
> I am not involved, mister.

Jerry if you post anything there - you are involved, like it or not.

--
Leland C. Scott
KC8LDO

1382. Re: "They oughta require a license....blah, blah, blah"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 14:10:27 UTC
From: "Leland C. Scott" <no-spam@junk-mail.net>
Message-ID: <t6ofqtfd67s256@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 1682

<southpark_meskin@my-deja.com> wrote in message
news:94djdmjrq1@nnrp1.deja.com...
> senior scott he give the cb peoples lots of the troubles over there.
> He no good.

To bad for the CBers.

--
Leland C. Scott
KC8LDO

1383. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 14:45:39 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <94hh2hikv1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1683

In article <94f1cikbj1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
horseshoestew@my-deja.com wrote:

> Don't take the negative feedback here as what the general ham
> population, or the FCC really wants. Remember - most of
> these folks were against lowering the CW requirements.
> They are still in the "block all change' mode.

Stew,

To set the record straight, here are some of the changes I
have recommended to the FCC.

During the "restructuring" NPRM period I recommended that
the number of licenses be reduced from 6 to 2. The FCC met
met me halfway, and reduced it to 4.

I recommended the top CW test speed ought to be 5WPM. The
FCC agreed.

I supported the vanity call sign system. The FCC agreed.

I have recently supported a recommendation that Novices be
granted the same CW priveleges as Generals. The FCC has not
yet ruled on that idea.

So much for "against lowering the CW requirements" and "block
all change mode".

The reason your "Colt" idea has gained no traction among seasoned
amateurs is because it is duplicative of the current Technician
class, and because it would segregate new licensees in an RF ghetto,
remote from mainstream Amateur Radio.

73, Hans, K0HB
--
"We are fellow travelers on a journey between two
eternities, and it's a trip far too brief for me
to be concerned about your speed at the Code of
Morse."

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1384. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 15:12:40 UTC
From: double_hat_trick@mydeja.com
Message-ID: <3a6c4dd2.40867581@news.pacbell.net>
Source record: 1684
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,alt.radio.family,rec.radio.cb

On Sat, 20 Jan 2001 21:37:58 -0500, Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com>
wrote:

>Beautiful.
>>
>w3rv

Ditto!

-Jeff

1385. Re: CA power crisis caused by internet

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 15:22:31 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <94hj7n$oa1$0@208.206.142.73>
Source record: 1685

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> Len Over 21 wrote:
> >
> > In article <94dv4o$id4$0@208.207.71.169>, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
> > writes:
> >
> > <massive snip...>
> >
> > > Once we toyed with the idea of resettling somewhere in California in
> > >retirement, but have abandoned the idea. It appears the best of it is
> > >history. And if they don't get that power situation resolved the
> > >unpleasant future is now.
> >
> > Dickie, you can always move to Los Angeles. No problems
> > with LA municipal Department of Water and Power
> > electricity. No outages, no shortages, ten cents a KWHR
> > for residences. Good future for LA.
> >
> > Of course, there's earthquakes here. But...you know all
> > about earthquakes, once reading a book on the subject.
> >
> > On the other hand, maybe you could "reactivate" that CW
> > net into the LAPD...you know, the one the LAPD didn't
> > know about until you "revealed" it to everyone? :-)
> >
> > didit
>
> The above is Len debating civilly. No use of the diminutive in naming
> individuals, condescension or ridicule. Mr. Civil.
>
> Thanks for the illustration.
>
> Dave K8MN

Dave, most readers here long ago dropped his posts from their reading list anyway. He has nothing of any consequence whatever to say, never has, only drivel and venomous garbage. It's real easy to just toggle past his entries in the traffic list, and the only time I ever read anything by him is when it is quoted by someone else. Nothing to says bothers me and none of it is anything that I would want to read since I learned long ago what his game is.
Ol' No CW Testicles never has had anything constructive *to* say here, never will. Nuthin' but venom. I ain't buying. NOT sorry either.

Move to Los Angles????
HAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA!!!!
Funneeeeeeeeeeeeee!

He's insane.

BTW I just checked my utility statment from last month,out of curiousity since it's been some time since I last did. Electricity cost was 7.2 cents per KW... and it's been so long since I've had a power outage I don't even remember it.

Good to see you back, Dave.

Dick W0EX

1386. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 15:25:12 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <94hjco$oa1$1@208.206.142.73>
Source record: 1686

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> Len, you are the crabgrass in the lawn of rrac.

> Would you like me to send you a copy of "Now You're Talking"?

What he *really* needs is a copy of ARRL's "How to Learn the
Radiotelegraph Code".

Dick

1387. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 15:28:26 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <94hjiq$oa1$2@208.206.142.73>
Source record: 1687

Phil Kane wrote:
>
> On Sun, 21 Jan 2001 07:24:58 -0600, Cecil wrote:
>
> >Why can't we have Elmers instead of Radio Cops and Drill Sergeants?
>
> More "jargon". When the term started, I was working for a
> supervisor named Elmer who was a ham. He was a much better ham
> than a supervisor, but what the heck, his idea of ham radio
> was CW on HF. He could copy 40 wpm in Japanese Kona code and
> had the paper to prove it. My first thought on hearing "Elmer"
> so used was "why Elmer".... <ggg>
>
> I still do my share of "Elmering" though but I don't call it that.
>

Every time I see or hear Elmer I think of that lil' pudgy guy who
chases
Bugs Bunny with his shotgun...."That Wascally Wabbit!".....

1388. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 15:29:44 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <94hjl8$oa1$3@208.206.142.73>
Source record: 1688

Don't bother Fred....Brian's 'handle' broke off long ago

Brian wrote:
>
> In article <94fvgi$55u$1@iac5.navix.net>,
> "W4JLE" <Fred@w4jle.com> wrote:
> > No Brian, I have reevaluated my position. You. Ed, and Cecil have
> convinced
> > me I need to be a sensitive 90's kind of guy. This caused me to create
> "No
> > Hassle International". My goal is now to remove any restrictions that
> a
> > newcomer may find demeaning, hazing, or might have a chance, no matter
> how
> > slight, of damaging their self esteem.
>

1389. Re: Enough already

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 15:39:44 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A6C5440.B91F2D84@IEEE.org>
Source record: 1689

W4JLE wrote:
> What are you doing posting this crap in alt.binaries.sex.bestiality ?

Too bad you typoed alt,binaries.sex.bestiality :-)
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

1390. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 15:45:52 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <94hkje$m1p$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1690

In article <94fdti$q9b$0@208.207.71.150>,
Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

> The league is falling right in line in the ongoing effort
> to keep up the bottom line.

Without bequests and donations (and many times with them) the
ARRL bottom line is usually $zero or a negative number.

73, Hans, K0HB
--
"We are fellow travelers on a journey between two
eternities, and it's a trip far too brief for me
to be concerned about your speed at the Code of
Morse."

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1391. Re: VHF history (long) (was: any ideas on HOw to learn Morse

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 15:49:30 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <94hkq7mbo1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1691

In article <94gvd8$56n$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
Steven J Robeson, K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com> wrote:

> One characteristic you and Lennie the Licenseless seem to share is
> selective memory.

Deja-news has an excellent memory. Please use it to substantiate your
allegations that there are liars on r.r.a.p.

Good luck on this one now!

73, Hans, K0HB
--
"We are fellow travelers on a journey between two
eternities, and it's a trip far too brief for me
to be concerned about your speed at the Code of
Morse."

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1392. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 16:09:04 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <94hlunnhg1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1693

In article <20010120014523.22779.00000700@nso-fa.aol.com>,
lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
>
> Anyone who wants to go back to 1958 is nuts!
>

Hey, I'll go back! In 1958 I was a college freshman, and Peggy Sue
Loudermilk (with a body to make a Baptist preacher sweat) was a regular
visitor in the back seat of my 51 Pontiac hardtop.

73, Hans, K0HB
--
"We are fellow travelers on a journey between two
eternities, and it's a trip far too brief for me
to be concerned about your speed at the Code of
Morse."

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1393. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 16:14:00 UTC
From: j1aguiar@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010122111400.18775.00000734@ng-da1.aol.com>
Source record: 1692

Anyone who thinks that FRS or what ever you want to call it is ever going to capture the imaginations of younger people must be having an illusion of some sort, it ain't gonna happen.Walkie talkies have been around for a while. Most of these little toys will soon be found at most yard sales, how ever for the price they are asking they may just sit in a broom closet a bit longer than most junk.
Lets face it, amateur radio is going out faster than anyone cares to admit. Family radio has found a place among hunters and hikers and that is about as far as its going to go. J1

1394. Re: The Real Bill Clinton Legacy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 16:33:37 UTC
From: darrell earnshaw <Darrell.Earnshaw@eng.Sun.COM>
Message-ID: <3A6C60E1.866D983E@eng.Sun.COM>
Source record: 1694
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
> W6DKN wrote:
> >
> > Apparently you haven't been reading this
> > newsgroup for very long...
>
> I don't think he has read the newsgroup at all. Just glancing through
> the subject headers, at this very moment there are discussions about
> prisons, the California power crisis, cellphones, gay web sites, top ten
> most popular alchoholic beverages, and Jesse Jackson. Its not about
> politics - he just didn't like what I said.
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net

Not quite true, Dwight. (In fact, I may actually agree with some of your observations, but that isn't the point.) The frustration arises from what appears to be fairly intelligent people suddenly loosing it and feeling the need (or perhaps craving) to post a subject which has absolutely nothing to do with the charter of the newsgroup. I can only see two reasons for doing this: (1) they're trying to provoke a reaction by deliberately posting something that will offend/irrtate somebody, or (2) they're so emotional about a subject that they feel an uncontrollable urge to make some statement, however inappropriate the forum. If it's case number 2, then there's plenty of appropriate newsgroups out there, and hey, go for it!

In response to W6DKN's comment: you're partly correct, I have been off this particular NG for some time. However, I don't see the logic in the statement that because somebody posts an OT message, it's therefore okay for everyone else to follow suite. Curiously, this NG seems to be particularly affected, whereas posts to the more technical NGs seem to pretty much stay on topic -- although I will agree that not always 100%.

Sorry for the BW guys,

73, Darrell.

1395. Re: FCC Proposal for New Novice Class License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 16:48:31 UTC
From: Jim Weir <jim@rst-engr.com>
Message-ID: <itoo6t8iuua5ons5gf65vba0efa58omqbs@4ax.com>
Source record: 1695

w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI)
shared these priceless pearls of wisdom:

->
->The only problem with that is you don't own the ball. :-)

Ed, mostly I agree with you. In this case, I suggest that you go back and reread the document that begins, "We the people..." to figure out whether or not we own the ball and have given the temporary right to make the rules of the ball game so long as the rulemakers are in accord with our collective wishes.

Jim
Jim Weir, VP Eng. RST Eng. WX6RST
A&P, CFI, and other good alphabet soup

1396. Re: CA power crisis caused by internet

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 16:50:43 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <h7po6tsqtmvccvus4comqus86neb4lgvvi@4ax.com>
Source record: 1696

Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>I just checked my utility statment from last month...
>Electricity cost was 7.2 cents per KW...

The power company here has time of day rates. You can save money by shifting your heavy usage to the cheaper hours. According to what I've read, people respond better to the economic carrot than to the altruistic conservation requests. Although... they might respond more enthusiastically to the blackout stick... :-)

1397. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 16:50:44 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <c6po6tkmqco4o348boom4e9b55gn5hku4d@4ax.com>
Source record: 1697

w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:
>I know two career Novices, who have renewed that license for years. Is amateur
>radio harmed in any way by their presence in our ranks?

Do you also think that it does no harm to the hobby for a ham to get a
license to simply operate, and never improve himself technically?

>If we hit them with a stick, they simply won't renew next time.

Never hit old timers, even old time Novices, with a stick. :-)
Grandfathering is always the best policy when making changes...

1398. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 16:50:46 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <16po6t8ku7lklfrtqujq2dl52hl45c8umq@4ax.com>
Source record: 1698

w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:
>I do know that 5 watts was the design goal. [for the K2]
>It was intended to be a QRP rig.

Elecraft offers a 50 watt amp as an internal module option. (A 100 watt module is under consideration according to the web site.) It takes the place of the autotuner and/or battery modules, neither of which could likely handle 50 watts... :-)

1399. Black helicopters (WAS:Re: No-code kills)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 16:55:10 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <94hol9$q30$2@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1601

In article <3A65AF3A.34DE0EC9@IEEE.org>,
Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:

> Dang Dick, it was a joke about "them" trying to "get" all the paranoid
> PCTA folk. Seen any black helicopters lately?

Black helicopters full of jack booted thugs are on the way. They are
equipped with an ARRL mind control device. You will soon learn
what becomes of those who expose the PTCA. Resistance is futile.

OOOOOPPPPPS -- BREAKING NEWS FLASH!!!!

Due to recent budget cuts at ARRL headquarters there are no longer
any black helicopters or jack booted thugs on the ARRL payroll. Also,
the mind control device was recently reposessed by the Newington bank.

73, Hans, K0HB

--
"We are fellow travelers on a journey between two
eternities, and it's a trip far too brief for me
to be concerned about your speed at the Code of
Morse."

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1400. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 17:02:20 UTC
From: Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com>
Message-ID: <3A6C679C.E04DEDFD@dvol.com>
Source record: 1699

W1RFI wrote:

> >From: Brian Kelly kelly@dvol.com
>
> >The K2 will have a better front end but when you move down the chain and run
> >into the filters it'll be all over for the K2.
>
> Maybe. I think the skirt selectivity of the old Collins may be better than
> some modern rigs, but certainly not all modern rigs. Care to stack the skirts
> of the Collins up against the IC-756PRO?

>
I've never listened with a 756, oughta be an interesting comparison. 'Druther see
comparisons with the TS-1000 series and the TS-2000. Being a K'Wood kinda guy . .
.
>

> I also want to look at what is still a problem for many modern rigs -- in band
> IMD, ie, the intermodulation that occurs when two signals are present
> simultaneously in the receiver passband. Most current equipment doesn't do very
> well in that regard and I want to see how the old Collins S line did.

>
Now yer cookin', big issue. Comparisons of IMD might be an interesting horse race
between the pricey old rcvrs like an S3-B vs a 756. I manned the graveyard shft on
20cw last Field Day with a beat-up solid-state clunker, FT-440 or something like
that, I'll swear my old S-40B had less IMD than that xcvr has. Drove me batty.
>

> Actually, I am pretty serious about all this. I have asked our test engineer
> to get a few of those old receivers and take a look at them.

>
Great, the idea has been floating around for awhile, good to see it coming to life.
Should attract a lot of attention. Lab tests of a late model S-3B and a Sherwood
Drake R4-C vs. whatever might prove to be real eye-openers and reality checks.
>

> >The K2 is a puzzlement. The thing has a kilowatt receiver and a five watt
> >transmitter in the same box.
>
> I do know that 5 watts was the design goal. It was intended to be a QRP rig.
> The designers can't help if if they happened to design a receiver that is
> better than most. :-)

>
Was not "accidental" . . they busted their butts on it. The K1 is a much more

"balanced" design as far as the rx and tx meeting realistic qrp functionality needs are concerned. If they had a nine-position bandswitch on the K-1 I'd probably go for one.
>

> And do remember, "better" is a relative term. It does
> indeed have superior dynamic range characteristics, but it also lacks many of
> the features that hams buy "big" rigs to have.

>
When I picked up my trusty old used TS-940 I toted up a total of *75* connectors, knobs and buttons. Not counting more contols lurking in menus. And after all that it still doesn't have a simple bandswitch. Once I get the thing hooked up and running I use the same 6-8 controls I used in 1960 for the most part. And the 940 goes back twenty years, the current xcvrs have even more "great features". Utter insanity, VCR controller think. The K2 interface makes a lot more sense to me in this respect.
>

> For most hams, with modest
> antennas, features are more important than dynamic range.

>
Button diddlers. Not for this cw dx contester. The bloody signals of the locals around here gotta be in the miilivolt range on 80 at dx contest time.
>

> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

>
w3rv

1401. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 17:03:23 UTC
From: Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com>
Message-ID: <3A6C67DB.4AEF71D5@dvol.com>
Source record: 1700

W1RFI wrote:

> >From: Brian Kelly kelly@dvol.com
>
> Nor do I, Brian. To the contrary; I have oft' said that the tests need
> improvements like questions about the fundamentals of modern radio technology
> and more questions on the formulae type questions.

>
I'd be a bit leery about giving algebra tests. The world has gotten really lame
when it comes to math.
>

> I didn't feel hit by it.

>
I sure did, so did gobs of others.
>

> If I hadn't been so lazy, I would have studied the
> 16-page study guide and practiced Morse code real hard and been a General right
> from the get-go.

>
Conversely, as a Novice I was already on the air and having a ball with 5wpm while
you would have been still droning away with w1aw practice sessions to get from 5 to
13wpm. There wasn't no better way to get the speed up than when you got a 10wpm
response to a 5wpm CQ. Adrenalin rush, sweat, sweat, copy, copy. Heh-heh!
>

> Even then, I think the incentive of wanting more frequencies was more
> responsible for my upgrading to General than was the 1-year term for the Novice
> license.

>
Abolutely no question about that. That particular FCC had reasons for sticking the
Novices in otherwwise sparsley populated segments. I couldn't wait to get outta
those bands and go play with the big boyz after I'd acquired the skills to deal
with them. Fact is that the Incentive Licensing gambit was far more a stick and
carrot thing than the old drop-dead Novice ticket was and Incentive Licensing
happened 17 years after the Novice ticket was introduced.
>

> I know two career Novices, who have renewed that license for years. Is amateur
> radio harmed in any way by their presence in our ranks?

>
Of course not.
>
>If we hit them with a

> stick, they simply won't renew next time.

>
As has the rest of life the fundamental FCC philosophies behind the tests changed. The FCC in those days took an agressive, proactive stance with respect to promoting upgrading as witnessed by the time limit they put on Novices back then along with the later partitioning of four HF bands by license class. It was sticks & carrots galore and that's simply the way it was *then*, historical fact. Since then the FCC has opted to change the ballgame in many ways so now Novices can go on being Novices forever. There is an uncountable number of mindsets, regulations, policies, etc. everywhere in life which "worked" in 1968, let alone in 1951 which don't fly today. I'm not passing judgement on any of it here.
>

> In what way would that benefit
> amateur radio?

>
Obviously wouldn't.
>

>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

>
w3rv

1402. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 17:19:32 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <0tqo6t85bt6tgq5lqtisnmichehi4fp9u6@4ax.com>
Source record: 1602

Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com> wrote:

>w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:
>>I do know that 5 watts was the design goal. [for the K2]
>>It was intended to be a QRP rig.
>
>Elecraft offers a 50 watt amp as an internal module option. (A 100
>watt module is under consideration according to the web site.) It
>takes the place of the autotuner and/or battery modules, neither of
>which could likely handle 50 watts... :-)

I looked closer at the Elecraft web site after I made this post and
discovered that I was in error. Apparently they don't offer this amp
option yet. The specs list says it would be available in Q4 of 2000
but it's not yet on the price list. Too bad because 50 watts would be
ideal for all around CW operation...

1403. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 17:35:00 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <94hr03$sb8$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1603

In article <c6po6tkmqco4o348boom4e9b55gn5hku4d@4ax.com>,
Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com> wrote:

> Do you also think that it does no harm to the hobby for a ham to get a
> license to simply operate, and never improve himself technically?

I'm sure there are some of those folks around. Perhaps they are
contributing in some of the other "Basis and Purpose" points in 97.1.

Do you think they are harming the Amateur Radio service if they
get involved in ARES, Skywarn and similar endeavors -- 97.1(a)?

Do you think they are harming the Amateur Radio service if they
concentrate on advancing the communications phase of their
skills -- 97.1(c)?

Would they harm the Amateur Radio service if they participate in
SET or Field Day, or local drills to expand the reservoir of
trained operators -- 97.1(d)?

Is there some harm to the Amateur Radio service if they are
involved in DX ragchewing and make some friends with folks
from other cultures -- 97.1(e)?

Or is anything other than technical topics harmful to the Amateur
Radio service?

73, de Hans, K0HB
--
"We are fellow travelers on a journey between two
eternities, and it's a trip far too brief for me
to be concerned about your speed at the Code of
Morse."

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1404. Re: Before responding to the Colt thread.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 17:39:07 UTC
From: RanHefner <ranhefner@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <94hr7q$sn9$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1604
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <94g7ns$j7f$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
Steven J Robeson, K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com> wrote:
>
> If you read the basis and purpose of BOTH Citizen's Band (of which
> FRS is part and parcel of) and the Amatuer Radio Service, you would
NOT
> find the word "HOBBY" in either, yet both are used for that purpose.
>

Steve, being an amateur radio operator, I think you know what is meant by hobby. With amateur radio, you may experiment by building your own equipment, toy with antennas and try numerous means of communications. The FRS and CB services are NOT set-up with these luxuries. They are not a hobby service in the sense that amateur radio is, but rather a consumer oriented radio service where you purchase and make no modifications to and transmit as intended with "off-the-shelf" equipment.

--
Randy A. Hefner
http://talk.to/frs
http://go.to/qx3

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1405. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 18:01:08 UTC
From: Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com>
Message-ID: <3A6C7564.92313EB9@dvol.com>
Source record: 1605

Aaron Jones wrote:

> w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:
> >I know two career Novices, who have renewed that license for years. Is amateur
> >radio harmed in any way by their presence in our ranks?
>
> Do you also think that it does no harm to the hobby for a ham to get a
> license to simply operate, and never improve himself technically?
>
> >If we hit them with a stick, they simply won't renew next time.
>
> Never hit old timers, even old time Novices, with a stick. :-)

>
They cheerfully hit us with sticks and we responded as predicted. Doan do that today though, the weenies will just whine and suck their thumbs instead of rising to the challenge.
>
w3rv

1406. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 18:08:14 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A6C770E.ABB7A818@IEEE.org>
Source record: 1607

Aaron Jones wrote:
> Do you also think that it does no harm to the hobby for a ham to get a
> license to simply operate, and never improve himself technically?

What's wrong with having good operators? They're more valuable than
I am during emergencies.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

1407. Re: Will you let them take away your guns?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 18:10:39 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A6C779F.C9B747E@uci.edu>
Source record: 1606

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> In article <3A68CB17.A30F2F15@uci.edu>, Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> writes:
>
> >
> >> In such a situation, an armed response by law-abiding citizens would
> >> definitely be in order....
> >
> >You gotta be nuts, Larry.
>
> Jim:
>
> Do me a favor? As your punishment for deliberately truncating my
> quote,

I did not change the meaning of what you said, Larry.

> in order to mask its complete meaning, make a nice, tight
> fist, and slam it into your mouth at high velocity. Continue to do
> so until at least three teeth are completely dislodged.

You first.

> Here's what I really said:

> "In such a situation, an armed response by law-abiding citizens would
> definitely be in order to prevent the armed environmentalists, convicted
> felons, abortion rights activists, and Ku Klux Klansmen from *actually*
> shooting our elected Congressmen and Senators."

Please explain how that's different than "an armed response by
law-abiding citizens..."

> >The guys in the Revolutionary War, and World Wars I and II did. So if I
> >was in the military, I guess I would have to also.

> Don't look now, Jim, but nobody who ever fought in any U.S. war as
> a U.S. serviceperson ever died for baby killers, tree huggers, or
> violent racists.

Don't look now Larry, but they fought for all Americans. Whether it
helps your debate point or not.

> >Right. So as long as it's a group you happen to agree with, it's
> >constitutional for them to start an armed rebellion. That's what I
> >thought.

> Jim, there is such a thing as right and wrong, and I'm intelligent
> enough to be able to make that distinction.

But you're not the judge, Larry. You're not A judge. You don't get to
decide when armed rebellions are legal and when they are not. You can
pretty well figure that none of them are.

> If you are not, then I can understand the problem you're having in understanding > my post.

I understand it perfectly. I'm just not as narrow minded as you are.
It is you who doesn't understand that you are wrong. You might wanna
check with your dad the attorney about whether it's legal for people to
stand on the steps of the Capitol with guns. Let us know what he says
about that.

73, Jim AC6XG

1408. Re: FCC Proposal for New Novice Class License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 18:11:38 UTC
From: horseshoestew@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <94ht4h$uh7$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1608
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.radio.family

In article <94f5g4nha1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
Steven J Robeson, K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com> wrote:
> In article <94f440$mh4$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
> horseshoestew@my-deja.com wrote:
>
> >At this point, I would appreciate more constructive criticism. I
> >understand that many of you are against change of any kind - but you
> >must have something positive to say, or their must be something you
> >can think of to improve things.
>
> Stewart, there was not ONE post of support for your Colt class

Not true.

> and
> EVERYONE has stated and reiterated that the Technician Class is about
> the easiest license to get in Ham Radio history.

The old Novice was the easiest.

------- Stewart - N0MHS --------
Wireless Entertainment/Communication Devices, Networks, and
Public Radio Services Information(MURS,FRS,GMRS,ARS,CB):
http://www.pubcel.com

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1409. Re: FCC Proposal for New Novice Class License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 18:15:42 UTC
From: horseshoestew@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <94htc3$um2$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1610
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.radio.family

In article <94gvt1$5ip$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
meghertz@hotmail.com wrote:
> In article <94f440$mh4$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
> horseshoestew@my-deja.com wrote:
>
> > On 70cm, Novice licensees would be restricted to voice
communications
> > on 5 20khz-spaced channels on 446.00, 446.02, 446.04, 446.06, and
> > 446.08 Mhz; and digital communications up to 19,200bps on 1 simplex-
> > only 60khz bandwidth channel on 446.14Mhz.
>
> You might as well specify this as "a sub-band from 446.0 to 446.2MHz"
> and then they'll be able to use European FRS-style 500mW 'PMR446'
> radios :o)

That definatetly is food for thought.

> http://www.geocities.com/rf-man/pmr446
>
> *MegHz*
>
> Sent via Deja.com
> http://www.deja.com/
>

--
------- Stewart - N0MHS --------
Wireless Entertainment/Communication Devices, Networks, and
Public Radio Services Information(MURS,FRS,GMRS,ARS,CB):
http://www.pubcel.com

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1410. Re: Will you let them take away your guns?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 18:15:48 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A6C78D4.D6882937@uci.edu>
Source record: 1609

Brian wrote:
> I don't think he realized the gravity of that oath. And unless
> he's revoked it, it probably still stands.

What ever are you talking about Brian?

1411. Re: Before responding to the Colt thread.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 18:21:29 UTC
From: horseshoestew@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <94htmu$v3t$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1611
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <94hr7q$sn9$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
RanHefner <ranhefner@my-deja.com> wrote:
> In article <94g7ns$j7f$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
> Steven J Robeson, K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com> wrote:
> >
> > If you read the basis and purpose of BOTH Citizen's Band (of
which
> > FRS is part and parcel of) and the Amatuer Radio Service, you would
> NOT
> > find the word "HOBBY" in either, yet both are used for that purpose.
> >
>
> Steve, being an amateur radio operator, I think you know what is meant
> by hobby. With amateur radio, you may experiment by building your own
> equipment, toy with antennas and try numerous means of communications.
> The FRS and CB services are NOT set-up with these luxuries. They are
> not a hobby service in the sense that amateur radio is, but rather a
> consumer oriented radio service where you purchase and make no
> modifications to and transmit as intended with "off-the-shelf"
> equipment.

Ahh, but CB radio DOES allow external antennas, and the fact is MANY
people ARE using it as a hobby. My opinion is that it is a very poor
place for kids to be learning about radio.

> --
> Randy A. Hefner
> http://talk.to/frs
> http://go.to/qx3
>
> Sent via Deja.com
> http://www.deja.com/
>

--
------- Stewart - N0MHS --------
Wireless Entertainment/Communication Devices, Networks, and
Public Radio Services Information(MURS,FRS,GMRS,ARS,CB):
http://www.pubcel.com

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1412. Re: Will you let them take away your guns?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 18:37:04 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A6C7DD0.B6453AB3@uci.edu>
Source record: 1612

Brian wrote:
> Jim may have taken an oath to defend and protect the constitution
> against all enemies, foreign or domestic at some time in the distant
> past. I don't think he realized the gravity of that oath. And unless
> he's revoked it, it probably still stands.

I wonder if you mean the oath issued by the United States Government.
Larry is talking about taking up arms against the government. Wouldn't
committing treason violate the oath?

The fact that I never took one doesn't make feel less obliged to support
my country.

73, Jim AC6XG

1413. Re: Will you let them take away your guns?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 18:37:46 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A6C7DF9.29258124@IEEE.org>
Source record: 1614

Jim Kelley wrote:
> The fact that I never took one doesn't make feel less obliged to support
> my country.

Would you have supported your country in 1775?
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

1414. Re: "They oughta require a license....blah, blah, blah"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 18:41:25 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <H9%a6.1073$e5.2724274@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 1613

Len Over 21 <lenover21@aol.com> wrote:

> >The one doing the kerchunking is indeed always illegal. Transmitter
> >fingerprinting has been used to successfully ID several kerchunkers over
the
> >years.

> OOs and run-of-the-mill hams can ID them illegal kerchunkers with
> "fingerprint techniques?"

The equipment is commercially available at a reasonable price. Many of the kerchunkers also actually operate the repeater, enabling one to capture the fingerprint of the miscreant, then compare it to properly ID'ed signals.

> ...OK... :-)

Yes, indeed. See http://www.motron.com

73, Ed Hare, W1RFI

>
> didit

1415. Re: FCC Proposal for New Novice Class License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 18:44:05 UTC
From: horseshoestew@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <94hv1jdf1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1615

In article <20010121202538.10077.00000646@ng-cr1.aol.com>,
w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:
> >From: "W4JLE" Fred@w4jle.com
>
> >My proposal to eliminate any requirements for a license will obviate
any
> >need for a colt class.
>
> Now we know you aren't serious. :-)

Say Ed, I was wondering, is there any way of getting transcripts from the proceedings that lead to restructuring? My understanding is that there were folks that had concerns about the elimination of the Novice Class license. Is there any way to know how close "the vote" (or general sentiment) was on this particular issue. I don't want to go barking up the wrong tree, you know - but I've got a hunch that there is some support for something that will set up a more healthy learning/operating environment for kids. Why would the FCC have recently created FRS, and now MURS, if that were not the case?

I don't have a big problem with MURS becoming the defacto experimentation Service for youngsters; but I think they WOULD be better off with something like what I am proposing.

> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

--
------- Stewart - N0MHS --------
Wireless Entertainment/Communication Devices, Networks, and
Public Radio Services Information(MURS,FRS,GMRS,ARS,CB):
http://www.pubcel.com

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1416. Re: CA power crisis caused by internet

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 18:55:14 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nospam.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.g7kmv6e.pminews@ca.news.verio.net>
Source record: 1616

On Sun, 21 Jan 2001 07:37:58 -0600, Cecil wrote:

>Phil Kane wrote:
>> That's why we moved to Oregon in 1999 - Oregon is what
>> the good in California was 40 years ago, and alas is no longer.
>
>Is it Oregon where they have a sign that says, "Welcome to Oregon,
>now go back to CA", or some such?

Urban legend and Grand Canard.

What the sign on I-5 just south of Salem (the state capitol)
says is: "Latitude 45 degrees. You are halfway between the
Equator and the North Pole"

Maybe you were thinking of the sign that says:

"Keep Oregon Green. Bring Money."

Maybe you were thinking of the (legendary) sign at the entrance
to San Diego, long a hotbed of crusty old Republican retired
Navy brass:

"Welcome to San Diego. Keep Right."

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

1417. Re: Before responding to the Colt thread.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 18:56:03 UTC
From: RanHefner <ranhefner@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <94hvnt$12o$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1621
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <94htmu$v3t$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
horseshoestew@my-deja.com wrote:
>
> Ahh, but CB radio DOES allow external antennas, and the fact is MANY
> people ARE using it as a hobby. My opinion is that it is a very poor
> place for kids to be learning about radio.
>

NO! REALLY! I didn't know that. I guess that is why my CB wouldn't
put the "foot" on anyone! GEEES!

A great place for kids to learn about radios IS the amatuer radios
service AS IT IS CURRENTLY STRUCTURED! The Technician class can be
obtained by most any 12 year old and many younger. A give-away ticket
to "kids" is not teaching them anything!

Whether people are using CB as a hobby service or not is irrelevent.
It was never intended to be such. FRS service is not a "hobby"
service. It is a consumer service much like cellular. All these
screwball attempts to expand the FRS service or deminish the amateur
service are perpitrated (sp?) by people with delusions of grandure.

Get over it! The FRS service is fine the way it is...The Amateur
service is fine the way it is...The CB service should be nuked!

--
Randy A. Hefner
http://talk.to/frs
http://go.to/qx3

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1418. Re: FCC Proposal for New Novice Class License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 18:56:10 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <94hvo4$12r$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1622

In article <94hv1jdf1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
horseshoestew@my-deja.com wrote:

> I don't want to go barking up the wrong tree, you know - but
> I've got a hunch that there is some support for something that
> will set up a more healthy learning/operating environment for
> kids.

Do you consider the current Technician license an unhealthy
learning/operating environment for kids?

73, Hans, K0HB
--
"We are fellow travelers on a journey between two
eternities, and it's a trip far too brief for me
to be concerned about your speed at the Code of
Morse."

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1419. Re: CA power crisis caused by internet

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 18:56:36 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nospam.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.g7kmxdf.pminews@ca.news.verio.net>
Source record: 1617

On 21 Jan 2001 22:30:46 GMT, Len Over 21 wrote:

>On the other hand, maybe you could "reactivate" that CW
>net into the LAPD...you know, the one the LAPD didn't
>know about until you "revealed" it to everyone? :-)

LAPD wasn't the California node - CHP Sacramento was. I saw
the station in 1963 but it was out of service by then.

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

1420. Re: "They oughta require a license....blah, blah, blah"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 18:57:24 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nospam.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.g7kmysg.pminews@ca.news.verio.net>
Source record: 1618

On Sun, 21 Jan 2001 06:26:39 GMT, Aaron Jones wrote:

>"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nospam.spam> wrote:
>> Whether one has the necessary training and qualifications
>> to interpret the results in a manner to be accepted as expert
>> testimony is another matter.
>
>As you have previously pointed out, the Feds don't really care about
>our small potato violations, so what good would expert testimony do
>anyway...

Depends if the problem is "kerchunking" the local 146.800
machine or the Sheriff at 155.400..... <ggg>

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

1421. Re: Sound Familiar?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 18:58:37 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nospam.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.g7kn0th.pminews@ca.news.verio.net>
Source record: 1619

On 21 Jan 2001 14:28:18 GMT, W1RFI wrote:

>Some of the tutorial and article statements I have seen imply that UWB cannot
>be detected by radio receivers. True enough if the source is far away, but not
>so if the source is close. Depending on its modulation characteristics, UWB
>can produce discrete modulation sidebands or can sound noiselike.

As I used to preach to those in the Wireless Communications Alliance who though that the spectrum can accommodate an unlimited number of "unlicensed" devices, take a good look at the "unlicensed device" spectrum with a spectrum analyzer and you will see a profile view of a brick on a plate.

"Wanna' tell me that no one knows that it's there?" <ggg>

The reason that the FCC specified "simple formats" for amateur and early commercial spread spectrum was that they could be df-ed with the equipment which we had in hand. When we got newer stuff, the specs were relaxed somewhat.

The Northern Californians and New Englanders (to some extent) were/are hobbled by the mighty Pave Paws (frequency hopping radar) system on the 70 cm band. USAF-SAC, my erstwhile employer, claimed that receiver AGC and squelch response times were much longer than the dwell time on any discrete frequency so it shouldn't be detectable.

"How do you explain why my Motorola Micor squelch trips every time?"

And so on.....

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

1422. Re: CA power crisis caused by internet

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 18:59:21 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A6C8309.4BA1F388@IEEE.org>
Source record: 1620

Phil Kane wrote:
>
> On Sun, 21 Jan 2001 07:37:58 -0600, Cecil wrote:
> >Is it Oregon where they have a sign that says, "Welcome to Oregon,
> >now go back to CA", or some such?
>
> Urban legend and Grand Canard.

Nope, I saw it with my own eyes a number of years ago. I just don't
remember exactly what it said or exactly where it was. It might have
been a private leased billboard.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

1423. Re: FCC Proposal for New Novice Class License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 19:15:18 UTC
From: horseshoestew@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <94i0rt$26b$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1624
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.radio.family

In article <94g47p$6pv$1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>,
zeno333@mindspring.com wrote:
> Saying it is out of date is one thing..it is also the one thing that
you
> would have to expand upon and "prove" to the FCC...

Yes. Since this paragraph is the basis for the proposal, it needs to
be strong. I will be looking at ways to improve that paragraph

> ----------
> In article <94f440$mh4$1@nnrp1.deja.com>, horseshoestew@my-deja.com
wrote:
>
> > Today, technologies like the Family Radio Service, high-speed
telephone
> > & cable modems, the Internet, and inexpensive cellular telephones,
have
> > overshadowed the privileges of the Amateur Radio Service, and made
the
> > requirements for young beginners to obtain a Technician Class
license
> > out of date.
>

--
------- Stewart - N0MHS --------
Wireless Entertainment/Communication Devices, Networks, and
Public Radio Services Information(MURS,FRS,GMRS,ARS,CB):
http://www.pubcel.com

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1424. Re: FCC Proposal for New Novice Class License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 19:18:40 UTC
From: W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com>
Message-ID: <94i13q$c4c$1@iac5.navix.net>
Source record: 1623

Is there no way to make you happy? First I support the CW position and you tell me how wrong I am, and that I am being elitist.

After you have turned me around, and brought my sensitivity to the forefront you doubt me.

My self esteem is ruined, I may never send another dit or dah. With my new sensitivity I am setting here at the key board weeping.

Have you no pity?

--
Fred W4JLE NHI#1001
Executive Grand Pooba - No Hassle International
Doing away with all requirements for a Ham ticket
"We want, therefore we deserve"
Send your non-tax deductible donations today!

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20010122071633.21640.00000698@ng-fy1.aol.com...
> >From: "W4JLE" Fred@w4jle.com
>
> >I have seen the light, and as soon as the FCC sees things my way ...
>
> I will believe that you are serious about the changes you propose when I
see
> you file a request for rulemaking with the FCC. If it gets as far as an
NPRM,
> expect most hams who file comments to oppose it.
>
> It looks to me like another version of "if you won't play the game my way,
I am
> going to take my ball and go home."
>
> The only problem with that is you don't own the ball. :-)
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
>

1425. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 20:02:39 UTC
From: Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com>
Message-ID: <3A6C91DF.EEDB8FBB@dvol.com>
Source record: 1625

Cecil wrote:

>
> What's wrong with having good operators? They're more valuable than
> I am during emergencies.

>
Bingo.
>--

> http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

1426. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 20:27:57 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <fs5p6t08sa0ginbjf8ut88h1qfqa577mej@4ax.com>
Source record: 1626

Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com> wrote:

>Aaron Jones wrote:
>> Never hit old timers, even old time Novices, with a stick. :-)
>
>>
>They cheerfully hit us with sticks and we responded as predicted. Doan do that today
>though, the weenies will just whine and suck their thumbs instead of rising to the
>challenge.

Weenie? Guilty as charged. When they hit me with the stick of
incentive licensing I used Bash to memorize my way to an Advanced. But
I still can't get up the energy to memorize my way to an Extra. Ed's
right, it is a hard test... :-)

1427. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 20:28:00 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <vp5p6ts8d6d8qpfirt5e9qaogo10kibc23@4ax.com>
Source record: 1627

K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org> wrote:

>In article <c6po6tkmqco4o348boom4e9b55gn5hku4d@4ax.com>,
> Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com> wrote:
>
>> Do you also think that it does no harm to the hobby for a ham to get a
>> license to simply operate, and never improve himself technically?
>
>I'm sure there are some of those folks around. Perhaps they are
>contributing in some of the other "Basis and Purpose" points in 97.1.

I know that there are some of those folks around. Namely me. I have
really done little but to operate in the last 30 years or so. I left
the electronics industry in 1968 and have not kept up. The electronics
I learned as a ham in the 50's, and in school in the 60's, and which
employed me at Motorola for several years, still serves me well for
hooking up a ham station in 2001. If my rig broke in the 50's or 60's
I could fix it no matter what. Now if it's not a simple problem, it's
back to the factory. But then how is that much different from most
hams these days...

1428. Re: FCC Proposal for New Novice Class License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 20:28:01 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <kp5p6tcr6u04pvlktu4int05uc0cov9oic@4ax.com>
Source record: 1628

"W4JLE" <Fred@w4jle.com> wrote:
>Is there no way to make you happy? First I support the CW position and you
>tell me how wrong I am, and that I am being elitist.
>After you have turned me around, and brought my sensitivity to the forefront
>you doubt me.
>My self esteem is ruined, I may never send another dit or dah. With my new
>sensitivity I am setting here at the key board weeping.
>Have you no pity?

Fred, it appears that you are just moving your tongue from one cheek
to the other, not changing your ways... :-)

1429. Re: Will you let them take away your guns?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 20:34:20 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A6C994C.A213BFE2@uci.edu>
Source record: 1630

Cecil wrote:

> Jim Kelley wrote:
> > The fact that I never took one doesn't make feel less obliged to support
> > my country.

> Would you have supported your country in 1775?

I don't believe in being ruled by a mob or a King, Cecil. How 'bout
you?

jk

1430. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 20:36:22 UTC
From: "Paul R. Stoetzer, N8HM" <N8HM@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <fP0b6.84$b7.121951@nntp1.onemain.com>
Source record: 1629
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,alt.radio.family,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc

There are several problems with this proposal:

1. As a 15 year old, I can tell you that the most interesting thing of ham radio is DX, not short range VHF communications.
2. This proposal would isolate the newbies, if there are not any other recent "Colt" licensees around, they would quickly grow bored and would not upgrade. Chatting with people who have been around a while and who are talking about the Walk-a-Thon or picnic the local club is involved in or the great conditions on the HF bands today.
3. The Tech license is already extremely easy to get. I got my Tech just over a year ago and it took about a week to study enough to pass the test, and that was with 55 questions on two tests, not 35.

While I agree more young people are needed in the hobby, the problem is not the license structure, which I believe to be perfect, it is the PR deficencies.

73,
Paul
N8HM
"Stewart R Teaze" <HORSESHOE7@prodigy.net> wrote in message news:948o9h$4mg4$1@newssvr05-en0.news.prodigy.com...
> The rapidly-expanding Family Radio Service has exposed millions of young
> people to the world
> of radio communications. But now, where is a young kid to go who has is
> interested in experimenting
> with radios and get more range than the typical 1/2 mile of FRS? MURS
might
> help a bit(if Motorola doesn't
> get their way), but you know that a growing mind is eventually going to
want
> more than just this. GMRS
> doesn't have the resources, and is not a service that was created to
foster
> experimentation. Like it or not,
> the typical young person ends up cutting his radio experimention teeth in
> the Citizen's Band service, because
> there isn't a reasonable entry-level ham license for kids(it is even worse
> now after restructuring, what with the
> elimination of the Novice Class).
>
> Everyday now the USA is falling further and further behind Europe and
Japan
> in the wireless communications

> race. As hams, it is time we make an effort to insure that our young
people
> are provided with the proper
> environment, incentives, and role models to properly learn radio
> communications techniques and etiquette.
> It is time for hams to stop complaining, step up to the plate, and take an
> active role in seeing that our bright,
> young technical minds are being taught properly.
>
> As a result of this, I have reworked the Communicator entry-level license
> proposal I submitted to the FCC last year,
> and I will now be proposing a new entry-level Amateur Radio class known as
> the "Colt" class. I submit a draft
> of the proposal for your review below. Please keep in mind that the
future
> of American involvement in wireless
> communications development depends on us to properly encourage and teach
> tomorrow's experimenters, operators,
> technicians, and engineers...
>
> **********
> Proposal to FCC to institute an introductory-level "Colt" license
> class in the Amateur Radio Service - REV A
>
>
> In the late 1980's and early 1990's when the current Amateur Radio Service
> Technician Class license was conceived and implemented, it was
> an appropriate alternate introductory license class. However, due to the
> recent elimination of the Novice Class license, and as a result of
improving
> technology; the Technician Class license no longer serves well as the only
> introductory license, as it is doing poorly in drawing young members into
> the Service. As a result of license restructuring, it is now actually
> harder for young people to obtain an Amateur license than it was before
> restructuring.
>
> In this critical era of global competition, especially in the wireless
> communications arena, it is essential that we provide a means for properly
> educating our young people in RF communications operation and theory.
>
> Today, technologies like the Family Radio Service, high-speed telephone &
> cable modems, the Internet, and inexpensive cellular
> telephones, have overshadowed the privileges of the Amateur Radio Service,
> and made the requirements for young beginners to obtain a
> Technician Class license out of date. Additionally, the Technician Class
> license has now evolved into a beginning and ending point for
> most modern day Amateurs, who are mostly interested in VHF/UHF
> communications, rather than HF communications. Incentive licensing has
> virtually been eliminated.
>

> The need for a Service dedicated to the goal of teaching young radio users
> proper radio operation techniques and etiquette can clearly be seen in the
> disarray present on the 11 meter Citizen's Band Service frequencies. The
> fact is, the Citizen's Band has become the defacto introductory service
for
> young people just beginning to learn to experiment with radio; yet the
> Citizen's Band is a very poor environment for young people to be learning
> in.
>
> Therefore, it is recommended that a new "Colt Class" license be added to
the
> Amateur Radio Service expressly to encourage young
> individuals to enter the Amateur Radio Service to improve their
> understanding of RF communications theory, provide a healthy learning
> environment, and encourage radio experimentation.
>
> On the 70cm UHF band, Colt licensees would be restricted to voice
> communications on 5 simplex-only 20khz-spaced channels
> on 446.00, 446.02, 446.04, 446.06, and 446.08 Mhz; and digital
> communications up to 19,200bps on 1 simplex-only 60khz bandwidth channel
on
> 446.14Mhz.
>
> On the 1.25m VHF band, Colt licensees would be restricted to voice
> communications on 5 simplex-only 20khz-spaced channels
> on 223.42, 223.44, 223.46, 223.48, and 223.50 Mhz; and digital
> communications up to 19,200bps on 1 simplex-only 60khz bandwidth channel
on
> 223.56Mhz.
>
> To encourage experimentation/understanding of antenna and VHF/UHF RF
> propagation theory, Colt licensees would also be allowed to setup and/or
> operate through a VHF/UHF crossband, simplex user input/output, repeater
> station on two 20khz-bandwidth channels on 223.52Mhz and 446.10Mhz. This
> would allow them to setup an inexpensive repeater system by
interconnecting
> the voice/mic connections via a resistive circuit on two simplex radios;
and
> would not require expensive, and difficult to understand, cavity and
> duplexer filtering at the repeater station site. User radio costs would
be
> low, as they would only need a single simplex radio. As a result of the
> characteristics of this type of repeater, the repeater builders and users
> would learn to coordinate frequencies, and user groupings based on
> environmental conditions, so as to acheive optimal results.
>
> Colt license users would also be subject to the following restrictions:
>
> (1) Individuals applying for a Colt Class license must be under 19 years
of

> age at the time of license application or renewal. The license is valid
for
> 5 years.
>
> (2) Fixed control station antennas will be no more than 6.1 meters (20
> feet) above the ground or above the building or tree on which it is
> mounted.
>
> (3) Transmissions limited to 5 watts ERP, or less.
>
>
> The new license class would have the following goals:
>
> 1) Encourage more young people to enter the Amateur Radio Service, by
> providing an entry-level ARS license class that includes privileges
> allowing reliable short-range voice and data communications.
>
> 2) Not significantly impact existing users of the affected Amateur Radio
> Service frequency bands.
>
> 3) Encourage basic knowledge of radio, electronics, operating principles
and
> etiquette among a wider segment of the general
> population.
>
> 4) Take advantage of the success of the Family Radio Service, and provide
a
> path for those young users interested in further radio experimentation.
>
> The Colt license exam would consist of 25 fairly simple questions.
Emphasis
> would be put on understanding the existing operational, safety, etiquette
> and emergency questions from theTechnician Class question pool that relate
> specifically to Colt Class license privileges. All questions containing
> calculations would contain small integer(whole-number) input values and
have
> relatively small integer results. Colt licensees would be required to
have
> a general understanding of Ohm's Law and Power relations. They should be
> required to have a general understanding of how antenna length relates to
> wavelength; and have a knowledge of transmitter power, antenna gain,
> transmission line loss, and the ability to perform a simple ERP
calculation
> would be required. General knowledge of simple resistive circuits, and
> their power dissipation, would be required. Knowledge of capacitors and
> inductors would not be required.
>
>
> Stewart Teaze - N0MHS
>

>

1431. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 20:54:15 UTC
From: Cathryn Mataga <cathryn@junglevision.com>
Message-ID: <3A6C9DF7.FE5CFEAE@junglevision.com>
Source record: 1631
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,alt.radio.family,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc

"Paul R. Stoetzer, N8HM" wrote:
>
> 3. The Tech license is already extremely easy to get. I got my Tech just
> over a year ago and it took about a week to study enough to pass the test,
> and that was with 55 questions on two tests, not 35.
>
> While I agree more young people are needed in the hobby, the problem is not
> the license structure, which I believe to be perfect, it is the PR
> deficencies.

What about this as a proposal. Leave everything as it is as far as licenses
are concerned. But, then eliminate the rule that you can't charge money
for testing people. And, then work to get the FCC to cut a deal
to allow, for example, Radio Shack and ham radio stores to give ham radio
license tests right in the store -- and set up a computer system to give call signs
right on the spot. Then, the stores could make a little money giving the test.
And, might pick up some extra sales from new hams.

1432. Re: Will you let them take away your guns?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 21:09:39 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A6CA193.C3EC924@IEEE.org>
Source record: 1634

Jim Kelley wrote:
> I don't believe in being ruled by a mob or a King, Cecil. How 'bout
> you?

The IRS mob has ruled my life for years.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

1433. Re: proposal for license testing for profit

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 21:14:34 UTC
From: Denver Braughler <den01@deadletter-bwcc.com>
Message-ID: <3A6CA2BA.7C126101@deadletter-bwcc.com>
Source record: 1632
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna

Cathryn Mataga wrote:
> for example, Radio Shack and ham radio stores to give ham radio
> license tests right in the store -- and set up a computer system to give call signs
> right on the spot. Then, the stores could make a little money giving the test.
> And, might pick up some extra sales from new hams.

If real money could be made from the extra sales, the stores would give the tests free.

Perhaps you can ask Radio Shack whether they think your proposal is viable.

1434. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 21:17:39 UTC
From: The Packrat <spam@n7uic.net>
Message-ID: <Tr1b6.297355$U46.9496569@news1.sttls1.wa.home.com>
Source record: 1633
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,alt.radio.family,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc

The money they charge is for all the expenses of testing - there isn't a
mandatory charge

"Cathryn Mataga" <cathryn@junglevision.com> wrote in message
news:3A6C9DF7.FE5CFEAE@junglevision.com...

"Paul R. Stoetzer, N8HM" wrote:
>
> 3. The Tech license is already extremely easy to get. I got my Tech just
> over a year ago and it took about a week to study enough to pass the test,
> and that was with 55 questions on two tests, not 35.
>
> While I agree more young people are needed in the hobby, the problem is
not
> the license structure, which I believe to be perfect, it is the PR
> deficencies.

What about this as a proposal. Leave everything as it is as far as licenses
are concerned. But, then eliminate the rule that you can't charge money
for testing people. And, then work to get the FCC to cut a deal
to allow, for example, Radio Shack and ham radio stores to give ham radio
license tests right in the store -- and set up a computer system to give
call signs
right on the spot. Then, the stores could make a little money giving the
test.
And, might pick up some extra sales from new hams.

1435. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 21:36:33 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <94i951acf1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1638
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.radio.family

Cathryn Mataga wrote:

> And, then work to get the FCC to cut a deal to allow, for
> example, Radio Shack and ham radio stores to give ham radio
> license tests right in the store

What problem would this solve?

73, Hans, K0HB
--
"We are fellow travelers on a journey between two
eternities, and it's a trip far too brief for me
to be concerned about your speed at the Code of
Morse."

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1436. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 21:39:51 UTC
From: xjim@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <94i9b7$af1$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1637

> What percentage of CW operation do you think is carried on usign the
least
> expensive, simplest equipment vs using the new-fangled, microprocessor
> controlled transceiver?
>
> >while being more reliable in terms of signal to noise ratio, how
could
> >it be that it has been banned for ships at sea and from other
> >government circuits that claim to be for Emergency back-up?
>
> I lack your expertise in determining what emergency equipment should
be on
> ships, but in my humble opinion, they probably make the choice in
terms of
> reliability. If I were on a sinking ship, I would trust that they
would have a
> satellite rescue system instead of a 500-kHz Morse transmitter.
>

Percentages are for insurance companies. In an emergency you would
HOPE to have cellular service.

When I was in the Navy, we had a catastrophic power failure while the
generator was down for repair. We had to pull every quirky trick out
of our hats to bring the boilers back on line. All during that time
batteries went low and and we litterally did this while beating on
failing battle lanterns. We had to call a nearby ship to bring us an
extra 20 gal of Gas for the portable equipment because we had run out.

You better believe we wouldn't have sneered at a HW-7 if it had come to
that.

If you were on a sinking ship, maybe you would want a crew that knew
more than excuses and finger pointing. Anyone who has been on
emergencies knows that half of the newfangled gadgets are worthless in
an emergency. Like laptops and multi-mode controllers that take way
too long to set up and require a pile of support cables and interfaces
to get going, only to have something's batteries go dead.

I also used to support the local Mountain rescue unit with VHF and HF
links, as they often found themselves on the wrong side of the mountain
from HQ. After spending 30 minutes trying to get better than 20db of
noise into the repeater on the other side of the mountain, we would
shift to 75m mobile. After another 20 minutes trying to pass traffic
on 75m phone when the signals were even with the QRN, I never again
forgot the old straight key.

Also, many people seem to think that ham radio is financially prohibitive. You can be a real ham and make lots of contacts with a homebrew CW QRP rig, and get the $20,000 antenna/tower/rig/amp big DX station as you go, and have a ball getting there. We did it then, and people do it now. Besides, if the BIG DX/CONTEST station and the tower were delivered and installed, and you just got the license back yesterday, you've missed out on everything that went before. Truth be known, I'd rather be making that contact anyway, instead of punching through endless menu screens.

My Brother-in-Law's Dad was a ham, but had passed away many years ago. He came to me interested in getting a license of his own. He actually got all hyped up and did the Novice route. He would come to me so stoked about swapping QSL cards and his contacts all over the place with his HW-8. I'll never regret my own triumph of getting something on the air with my own hands and actually making contacts with it.

On the Report and Order thing, I think there was a snafu. I got no response back from the FCC on my comment paper to 98-143 other than an automated receipt, but maybe the tide of popular opinion was against me. Sometimes it takes a while for an idea to gain momentum, but it'll never bear fruit if you don't plant the seed.

Jim, ac6tk
TS-830, TS-130, 30L-1, various VHF/UHF radios, CW/FM/SSB/digital stuff.
Oh ya, 40m 6L6 peanut whistle.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1437. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 21:48:19 UTC
From: W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com>
Message-ID: <94i9so$h3p$1@iac5.navix.net>
Source record: 1635
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,alt.radio.family,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc

You could even have the test on the computer, the computer than could grade your test(s) and as you pointed out issue your call sign on the spot. Then the computer could pop up what the store had in your price range. You would then press your selections and walk to the front of the store, pickup your license and equipment and head home ready to operate.

We could do the same thing from Mall kiosks to attract young people. This could be coupled with playstation rentals, beepers, and cell phones. A one stop communications and entertainment kiosk. ARRL could create a Sony playstation and gameboy cartridge to teach amateur radio, along with an amateur radio adventure that would require simulated contacts with DX countries to obtain clues to finish the game. Wow! I wish I had thought of that. The only problem is getting it by the old elitist hams that think you should learn a bunch of code and radio nonsense to gain what is rightfully yours because you want it..

--
Fred W4JLE NHI#1001
Executive Grand Pooba - No Hassle International
Doing away with all requirements for a Ham ticket
"We want, therefore we deserve"
Send your non-tax deductible donations today!

"Cathryn Mataga" <cathryn@junglevision.com> wrote in message
news:3A6C9DF7.FE5CFEAE@junglevision.com...
>
>
> "Paul R. Stoetzer, N8HM" wrote:
> >
> > 3. The Tech license is already extremely easy to get. I got my Tech just
> > over a year ago and it took about a week to study enough to pass the
test,
> > and that was with 55 questions on two tests, not 35.
> >
> > While I agree more young people are needed in the hobby, the problem is
not
> > the license structure, which I believe to be perfect, it is the PR
> > deficencies.
>
> What about this as a proposal. Leave everything as it is as far as
licenses
> are concerned. But, then eliminate the rule that you can't charge money
> for testing people. And, then work to get the FCC to cut a deal
> to allow, for example, Radio Shack and ham radio stores to give ham radio

> license tests right in the store -- and set up a computer system to give call signs
> right on the spot. Then, the stores could make a little money giving the test.
> And, might pick up some extra sales from new hams.

1438. Re: Follow the Money

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 21:49:00 UTC
From: zeno333@mindspring.com
Message-ID: <94i9s1$l2j$1@slb1.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 1636
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,alt.radio.family,rec.radio.cb

I do not think there needs to be a new Amateur service, but I also think you
are perhaps being a litle hard on the guys commercial and money connection
etc. After all, it was Tandy Corporation that made the FRS proposal to the
FCC..and Tandy is commercial for sure..(ie Rradio Shack)

In article <94aed5$8mn$1@nnrp1.deja.com>, K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org> wrote:

> When you don't understand why somebody is doing something which seems
> senseless to you, sometimes it pays to try to "follow the money".
>
> In this case it led me to a company called "PubCel". According to
> their web site, that company is involved in:
>
> "Wireless Entertainment and Communications Solutions:
>
> - MURS and ARS Voice and Data Communications Systems
>
> - FRS and GMRS Voice Communication Systems"
>
> I think it is safe to say that the "ARS" acronym might mean "Amateur
> Radio Service".
>
> Also according to their web site, the company President is none other
> than Stewart Teaze, N0MHS.
>
> Suddenly this proposal for the "Barbie Doll" Amateur Radio license
> isn't quite so senseless.
>
> 73, Hans, K0HB

1439. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 21:53:17 UTC
From: Roy Lewallen <w7el@eznec.com>
Message-ID: <3A6CABCD.B1B8779A@eznec.com>
Source record: 1639
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,alt.radio.family,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc

I don't like this idea very much. The part that worries me is as you
say, they "might pick up some extra sales from new hams". Without
accusing any store or anyone of dishonesty, I think it's a bad idea for
the test giver to have such an immediate and direct financial incentive
to have the examinee pass.

Roy Lewallen, W7EL

Cathryn Mataga wrote:
>
> What about this as a proposal. Leave everything as it is as far as licenses
> are concerned. But, then eliminate the rule that you can't charge money
> for testing people. And, then work to get the FCC to cut a deal
> to allow, for example, Radio Shack and ham radio stores to give ham radio
> license tests right in the store -- and set up a computer system to give call signs
> right on the spot. Then, the stores could make a little money giving the test.
> And, might pick up some extra sales from new hams.

1440. Re: Sound Familiar?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 22:04:16 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010122170416.22631.00001018@nso-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 1640

In article <20010121203705.10077.00000648@ng-cr1.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>>>Depending on its modulation characteristics, UWB
>>>can produce discrete modulation sidebands or can sound noiselike.
>
>>That assumes that only narrowband, conventional receivers are used
>>to monitor the wideband signal. The RF energy is literally spread so
>>wide across the baseband spectrum that the energy in a tiny fraction
>>of the spectrum is very low.

Before going any further, I will point out (for the benefit of some readers, not yourself) that Truly Random noise power is ALWAYS additive. Also, a quick and clean way to measure path loss is Loss(db) = 37 + 20 Log F + 20 Log D where F is in MHz and D is in statute miles. [1 Km = 0.6214 miles]

>Yes, it is very low, Len, but very low can be used quite effectively for
>communications. Run a few calculations. Start with 30 dBm UWB spread over 1
>GHz bandwidth, 10 dBi antenna gain on transmit, 20 dBi antenna gain on
>receive, a 6 dB receiver noise figure, a 1 kHz receiver bandwidth and a frequency of
>1200 MHz and a separation of 0.1 kM. The result is:
>
>Frequency = 1200 MHz
>Total transmit power = 1 watt
>Transmit spread = 1000 MHz
>Receiver bandwidth = 1000 Hz
>Transmit power in 1 Hz = -60 dBm/Hz
>Transmit power in 1000 Hz = -30 dBm
>Transmit antenna gain = 10 dBi
>Receive antenna gain = 20 dBi
>Distance to receiver = .1 km
>Free-space pathloss = -74.03362 db
>System loss (path loss +/- antenna gains) = -44.03362 dB
>Total loss (path loss +/- antenna gains - spreading loss) = -104.0336 dB
>Specified receive system Noise Figure = 6 dB (includes external noise)
>Calculated receive system sensitivity in 1000 Hz bandwidth = -138 dBm
>Received noise in receiver bandwidth = -74.03362 dBm
>Received noise in receiver bandwidth = S 9
>Receive system noise floor increase in dB = 63.96638 dB

Okay, some remarks on that. First of all, path loss is frequency sensitive. If the UWB bandwidth is 1000 MHz, then you can't name one frequency as if this is the narrowband kind of thing.

If 1.2 GHz is the low end, then 2.2 GHz would be the high end. The path loss over 1 KM (I don't want a goalpost-to-goalpost communications range of 328 feet...I can shout that far...:-) will vary from 94.5 db at 1.2 GHz to 99.7 db at 2.2 GHz.

The choice of 10 dbi Tx and 20 dbi Rx antennas is curious and there is no additional cable loss connections. I would pick a total antenna plus feedline gain at 15 dbi (assuming a cableless dipole reference standard). Total path loss, antenna gain, cable loss would now be -79.5 to -84.7 db over 1 Km. If the transmitter power output is 1 Watt or +30 dbm, the receiver input port would get -49.5 to -54.7 dbm of total UWB signal.

The calculated noise power of a 50 Ohm resistance at 296.9 K over a bandwidth of 1 GHz is 4.05 microvolts or -94.8 dbm with 0 dbm equal to 223.6 millivolts in a 50 Ohm system. Given a sloppy UWB receiver having a NF = 12 db (accounts for all variables such as A/D processing), the equivalent noise input power over a 1 GHz bandwidth is then -82.8 dbm. Overall signal to noise ratio over a 1 KM path is then 33.3 db at 1.2 GHz droping to 28.1 db at 2.2 GHz. That should be enough S:N tolerance for processing the UWB signal.

My particular peeve with the numbers is that the UWB signal in UNDEFINED. First of all, one cannot assume that the UWB signal (whatever it is) is spread evenly across the entire spectrum. It won't be. If the UWB signal starts as a 0.1 microsecond pulse, the spectral content will show defined energy appearing at 10 MHz increments. If there is some kind of modulation on this 100 nanosecond pulse, then the energy is still spread in 10 MHz increments but has some additional energy clustered at those increments.

An example of this clustering is the US NTSC color TV. The color subcarrier was chosen as an odd multiple of half the horizontal line frequency. Why? Turns out that the spectral content of a black-and-white video signal was clustering around increments equal to the horizontal line frequency. The color information would fit in-between the monochrome spectral content, would not over-ride it, and thus allow a transmitted color TV signal to be received over an existing monochrome TV receiver.

Okay, let's assume the undefined UWB signal does have a totally even distribution of spectral energy over a 1000 MHz bandwidth. As defined, the transmitter output of 1 W (total over the bandwidth) is equal to +30 dbm (to readers, 0 dbm = 1 milliWatt in a 50 Ohm system). Assuming the totally even "spread" of spectral energy over 1 GHz, the energy distribution could be stated as 1 nanoWatt per Hz (1 Watt divided by 1 x 10^9). Over a 1 KHz bandwidth of another receiver the received even-spread UWB signal

would have a 1 KHz bandwidth signal total energy of 1 microWatt. But there are no values for path loss/gain yet.

Rather than using a 30 meter distance (about a 100 feet) to a neighbor's receiver capable of tuning in narrow bands (unlikely), let's postulate a 100 meter distance with the same Tx-Rx loss/gains modified for the shorter distance. Total path loss plus antenna gain is now -59.5 to -64.7 db. With a total transmit power of 1 W or +30 dbm, this second, narrowband receiver gets an input of -29.5 dbm at 1.2 GHz to -34.7 dbm at 2.2 GHz. However, the narrow filter in this second receiver will pass only one-millionth of the transmitted evenly-spread energy so the second receiver "looks at" only an equivalent energy of -89.5 dbm to -94.7 dbm.

Given the second receiver NF of 6 db and a 50 Ohm system at 75 F (296.9 K), its equivalent noise floor would be at -131.9 dbm. Is there sufficient signal to noise to clearly show the evenly-spread UWB signal at this second receiver? Yes...42.4 to 37.2 db to be more exact...provided that NF is as good as advertised. :-)

The presentation of this problem was hampered by a mixing of paradigms, of thinking too much that a UWB signal is "just like" a DSSS of a cell phone, appearing as even-spread random "noise" across a narrow spectrum. It has NOT BEEN DEFINED YET.

If the UWB signal were some mythical 0.1 micro-second pulse with width modulation, then the total energy will cluster at 10 MHz increments. That is enough to have a conventional 2m receiver be working from a down-converter and NEVER HEAR ANYTHING from the 0.1 microsecond UWB signal. Or, it could be sitting right on a cluster of energy and get more than expected.

What is even more complex is that the conventional comparison uses a repetitive signal analogue as to what to expect across a spectrum. That is a convenience and much, much easier than trying to find peaks by a time-amplitude analysis. In practice, even a DSSS signal does not have spectral content that persists as if it were repetitive...or as "noise-like" in an even distribution per frequency. Using a repetitive waveform transform is an absolute worst-case spectral energy analysis.

Cellular telephone digital patterns are generally chosen to spread energy evenly across a moderate

bandwidth. The standard is defined. The UWB is not yet defined. With 33 nanosecond pulses, a UWB could have clusters every 30 MHz apart, having "open spaces" wider than the present HF spectrum.

Now, if anyone is doubtful of all this, just get a good, calibrated spectrum analyzer with a high dynamic range and start measuring some wideband sources with both repetitive and non-repetitive modulation. Note: Use proper spectrum analyzer bandwidths and sweep speeds to catch all the little energy products. The results can be interesting...and don't always follow the narrowband analysis methods.

didit

1441. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 22:06:35 UTC
From: Cathryn Mataga <cathryn@junglevision.com>
Message-ID: <3A6CAEEB.83DF27F8@junglevision.com>
Source record: 1641
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,alt.radio.family,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc

Roy Lewallen wrote:
>
> I don't like this idea very much. The part that worries me is as you
> say, they "might pick up some extra sales from new hams". Without
> accusing any store or anyone of dishonesty, I think it's a bad idea for
> the test giver to have such an immediate and direct financial incentive
> to have the examinee pass.
>

Money makes the world go-round. Methinks. And if you want to
get more young people in the hobby, I think you need the kind
of marketing muscle that Radio Shack can provide. And, I think the fraud
issue here is over-estimated. There's been fraud
in the testing system as it is. If you had big companies involved,
who had lawyers, they could snap the whip with the employees.
And, they'd be better positioned to enforce standards, than random
individuals. I think.

Just enact some fines for cheating. Hire a few people to go
around, and masquerade as applicants to keep the system clean. And,
open an office, that would handle reports of fraud, and then
investigate as a criminal matter. It'd probably be cleaner than
the current setup.

1442. Re: Sound Familiar?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 22:37:38 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <cD2b6.1085$e5.2739709@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 1642

Len Over 21 <lenover21@aol.com> wrote:

> >Receive system noise floor increase in dB = 63.96638 dB

> Okay, some remarks on that. First of all, path loss is frequency
> sensitive. If the UWB bandwidth is 1000 MHz, then you can't
> name one frequency as if this is the narrowband kind of thing.
> If 1.2 GHz is the low end, then 2.2 GHz would be the high end.
> The path loss over 1 KM (I don't want a goalpost-to-goalpost
> communications range of 328 feet...I can shout that far...:-)
> will vary from 94.5 db at 1.2 GHz to 99.7 db at 2.2 GHz.

Indeed correct. I used the path loss at 1.2 GHz, the frequency I was trying to receive in this calculated scenario. I didn't feel that the path loss on the frequencies I was not trying to receive was important.

> My particular peeve with the numbers is that the UWB signal
> in UNDEFINED. First of all, one cannot assume that the UWB
> signal (whatever it is) is spread evenly across the entire
> spectrum. It won't be. If the UWB signal starts as a 0.1
> microsecond pulse, the spectral content will show defined
> energy appearing at 10 MHz increments. If there is some
> kind of modulation on this 100 nanosecond pulse, then the
> energy is still spread in 10 MHz increments but has some
> additional energy clustered at those increments.

True enough, but the undefined UWB signal as being a uniform distribution of broadband noise makes the easiest calculations. Uniform distribution is not worst case.

> Given the second receiver NF of 6 db and a 50 Ohm
> system at 75 F (296.9 K), its equivalent noise floor
> would be at -131.9 dbm. Is there sufficient signal to
> noise to clearly show the evenly-spread UWB signal
> at this second receiver? Yes...42.4 to 37.2 db to be
> more exact...provided that NF is as good as
> advertised. :-)

Those figures are correct.

> If the UWB signal were some mythical 0.1 micro-
> second pulse with width modulation, then the total
> energy will cluster at 10 MHz increments. That is
> enough to have a conventional 2m receiver be
> working from a down-converter and NEVER HEAR
> ANYTHING from the 0.1 microsecond UWB signal.
> Or, it could be sitting right on a cluster of energy

> and get more than expected.

You are correct, an unmodulated UWB signal will either show nothing in the nearby narrow-band receiver, or it will show much more than the figures I calculated, but only on a single frequency. An UWB signal that is modulated with a slow data rate will result in slightly less signal across a slightly wider frequency range. An UWB signal that is modulated with high-speed data will appear to be fairly uniform across the frequency range.

> What is even more complex is that the conventional
> comparison uses a repetitive signal analogue as to
> what to expect across a spectrum. That is a
> convenience and much, much easier than trying to
> find peaks by a time-amplitude analysis. In practice,
> even a DSSS signal does not have spectral content
> that persists as if it were repetitive...or as "noise-
> like" in an even distribution per frequency. Using a
> repetitive waveform transform is an absolute worst-
> case spectral energy analysis.

One of the reasons I chose uniform distribution of noise for this approximate discussion,.

> Cellular telephone digital patterns are generally
> chosen to spread energy evenly across a moderate
> bandwidth. The standard is defined. The UWB is
> not yet defined. With 33 nanosecond pulses, a
> UWB could have clusters every 30 MHz apart,
> having "open spaces" wider than the present HF
> spectrum.

None of the UWB proposals I have seen have stipulated an unmodulated pulse, nor have they stipulated limiting the modulation to slow speeds. Even so, analyzing the levels of those clusters would give an interference potential on those frequencies >> the one I caclulated with a uniform noise distribution approximation.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1443. Re: FCC Proposal for New Novice Class License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 22:44:41 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <QJ2b6.1090$e5.2740037@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 1643

<horseshoestew@my-deja.com> wrote:

> Say Ed, I was wondering, is there any way of getting transcripts from
> the proceedings that lead to restructuring?

You will have to ask the FCC, although I don't know if they are required to keep transcripts of internal meetings. The NPRM they issued summarized their proposal and the Report and Order summarized their decision.

> My understanding is that there were folks that had concerns about the
elimination of the Novice
> Class license.

I don't know what records the Commission keeps on the meetings of its staff or its Commissioners.

> but I've got a hunch that there is some support for something that will
set up a more healthy
> learning/operating environment for kids.

If that support, assuming it exists at all, were strong enough that they would reconsider their restructuring decisions, I think that they would have restructured the Novice at the same time instead of eliminating it. I think it will be hard to convince the Commission to implement a replacement for a class of license that very few people were choosing to hold.

> Why would the FCC have recently created FRS, and now MURS, if that were
not the case?

I believe that the FCC created those services to be communications tools. On what basis do you determine that their purpose is tobe a learning environment for kids? Is this documented in their rules or in the Report and Order that created them?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1444. Re: FCC Proposal for New Novice Class License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 22:45:42 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <MK2b6.1091$e5.2740155@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 1644

W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com> wrote:

> Have you no pity?

No, but I do have a sense of humor. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1445. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 22:49:00 UTC
From: City_Slicker <notenuftime@foolscorner.net>
Message-ID: <94idcs$inb@dispatch.concentric.net>
Source record: 1645
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,alt.radio.family,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc

Maybe a 15 year old can explain to the rest how to stop posting to the
rec.radio.CB group.

"Paul R. Stoetzer, N8HM" <N8HM@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:fP0b6.84$b7.121951@nntp1.onemain.com...
> There are several problems with this proposal:
>
> 1. As a 15 year old, I can tell you that the most interesting thing of ham
> radio is DX, not short range VHF communications.
> 2. This proposal would isolate the newbies, if there are not any other
> recent "Colt" licensees around, they would quickly grow bored and would
not
> upgrade. Chatting with people who have been around a while and who are
> talking about the Walk-a-Thon or picnic the local club is involved in or
the
> great conditions on the HF bands today.
> 3. The Tech license is already extremely easy to get. I got my Tech just
> over a year ago and it took about a week to study enough to pass the test,
> and that was with 55 questions on two tests, not 35.
>
> While I agree more young people are needed in the hobby, the problem is
not
> the license structure, which I believe to be perfect, it is the PR
> deficencies.
>
> 73,
> Paul
> N8HM
> "Stewart R Teaze" <HORSESHOE7@prodigy.net> wrote in message
> news:948o9h$4mg4$1@newssvr05-en0.news.prodigy.com...
> > The rapidly-expanding Family Radio Service has exposed millions of young
> > people to the world
> > of radio communications. But now, where is a young kid to go who has is
> > interested in experimenting
> > with radios and get more range than the typical 1/2 mile of FRS? MURS
> might
> > help a bit(if Motorola doesn't
> > get their way), but you know that a growing mind is eventually going to
> want
> > more than just this. GMRS
> > doesn't have the resources, and is not a service that was created to
> foster
> > experimentation. Like it or not,

> > the typical young person ends up cutting his radio experimention teeth
in
> > the Citizen's Band service, because
> > there isn't a reasonable entry-level ham license for kids(it is even
worse
> > now after restructuring, what with the
> > elimination of the Novice Class).
> >
> > Everyday now the USA is falling further and further behind Europe and
> Japan
> > in the wireless communications
> > race. As hams, it is time we make an effort to insure that our young
> people
> > are provided with the proper
> > environment, incentives, and role models to properly learn radio
> > communications techniques and etiquette.
> > It is time for hams to stop complaining, step up to the plate, and take
an
> > active role in seeing that our bright,
> > young technical minds are being taught properly.
> >
> > As a result of this, I have reworked the Communicator entry-level
license
> > proposal I submitted to the FCC last year,
> > and I will now be proposing a new entry-level Amateur Radio class known
as
> > the "Colt" class. I submit a draft
> > of the proposal for your review below. Please keep in mind that the
> future
> > of American involvement in wireless
> > communications development depends on us to properly encourage and teach
> > tomorrow's experimenters, operators,
> > technicians, and engineers...
> >
> > **
> > Proposal to FCC to institute an introductory-level "Colt" license
> > class in the Amateur Radio Service - REV A
> >
> >
> > In the late 1980's and early 1990's when the current Amateur Radio
Service
> > Technician Class license was conceived and implemented, it was
> > an appropriate alternate introductory license class. However, due to
the
> > recent elimination of the Novice Class license, and as a result of
> improving
> > technology; the Technician Class license no longer serves well as the
only
> > introductory license, as it is doing poorly in drawing young members
into

> > the Service. As a result of license restructuring, it is now actually
> > harder for young people to obtain an Amateur license than it was before
> > restructuring.
> >
> > In this critical era of global competition, especially in the wireless
> > communications arena, it is essential that we provide a means for
properly
> > educating our young people in RF communications operation and theory.
> >
> > Today, technologies like the Family Radio Service, high-speed telephone
&
> > cable modems, the Internet, and inexpensive cellular
> > telephones, have overshadowed the privileges of the Amateur Radio
Service,
> > and made the requirements for young beginners to obtain a
> > Technician Class license out of date. Additionally, the Technician
Class
> > license has now evolved into a beginning and ending point for
> > most modern day Amateurs, who are mostly interested in VHF/UHF
> > communications, rather than HF communications. Incentive licensing has
> > virtually been eliminated.
> >
> > The need for a Service dedicated to the goal of teaching young radio
users
> > proper radio operation techniques and etiquette can clearly be seen in
the
> > disarray present on the 11 meter Citizen's Band Service frequencies.
The
> > fact is, the Citizen's Band has become the defacto introductory service
> for
> > young people just beginning to learn to experiment with radio; yet the
> > Citizen's Band is a very poor environment for young people to be
learning
> > in.
> >
> > Therefore, it is recommended that a new "Colt Class" license be added to
> the
> > Amateur Radio Service expressly to encourage young
> > individuals to enter the Amateur Radio Service to improve their
> > understanding of RF communications theory, provide a healthy learning
> > environment, and encourage radio experimentation.
> >
> > On the 70cm UHF band, Colt licensees would be restricted to voice
> > communications on 5 simplex-only 20khz-spaced channels
> > on 446.00, 446.02, 446.04, 446.06, and 446.08 Mhz; and digital
> > communications up to 19,200bps on 1 simplex-only 60khz bandwidth channel
> on
> > 446.14Mhz.
> >
> > On the 1.25m VHF band, Colt licensees would be restricted to voice

> > communications on 5 simplex-only 20khz-spaced channels
> > on 223.42, 223.44, 223.46, 223.48, and 223.50 Mhz; and digital
> > communications up to 19,200bps on 1 simplex-only 60khz bandwidth channel
> on
> > 223.56Mhz.
> >
> > To encourage experimentation/understanding of antenna and VHF/UHF RF
> > propagation theory, Colt licensees would also be allowed to setup and/or
> > operate through a VHF/UHF crossband, simplex user input/output, repeater
> > station on two 20khz-bandwidth channels on 223.52Mhz and 446.10Mhz.
This
> > would allow them to setup an inexpensive repeater system by
> interconnecting
> > the voice/mic connections via a resistive circuit on two simplex radios;
> and
> > would not require expensive, and difficult to understand, cavity and
> > duplexer filtering at the repeater station site. User radio costs would
> be
> > low, as they would only need a single simplex radio. As a result of the
> > characteristics of this type of repeater, the repeater builders and
users
> > would learn to coordinate frequencies, and user groupings based on
> > environmental conditions, so as to acheive optimal results.
> >
> > Colt license users would also be subject to the following restrictions:
> >
> > (1) Individuals applying for a Colt Class license must be under 19 years
> of
> > age at the time of license application or renewal. The license is valid
> for
> > 5 years.
> >
> > (2) Fixed control station antennas will be no more than 6.1 meters (20
> > feet) above the ground or above the building or tree on which it is
> > mounted.
> >
> > (3) Transmissions limited to 5 watts ERP, or less.
> >
> >
> > The new license class would have the following goals:
> >
> > 1) Encourage more young people to enter the Amateur Radio Service, by
> > providing an entry-level ARS license class that includes privileges
> > allowing reliable short-range voice and data communications.
> >
> > 2) Not significantly impact existing users of the affected Amateur Radio
> > Service frequency bands.
> >
> > 3) Encourage basic knowledge of radio, electronics, operating principles
> and

> > etiquette among a wider segment of the general
> > population.
> >
> > 4) Take advantage of the success of the Family Radio Service, and
provide
> a
> > path for those young users interested in further radio experimentation.
> >
> > The Colt license exam would consist of 25 fairly simple questions.
> Emphasis
> > would be put on understanding the existing operational, safety,
etiquette
> > and emergency questions from theTechnician Class question pool that
relate
> > specifically to Colt Class license privileges. All questions containing
> > calculations would contain small integer(whole-number) input values and
> have
> > relatively small integer results. Colt licensees would be required to
> have
> > a general understanding of Ohm's Law and Power relations. They should
be
> > required to have a general understanding of how antenna length relates
to
> > wavelength; and have a knowledge of transmitter power, antenna gain,
> > transmission line loss, and the ability to perform a simple ERP
> calculation
> > would be required. General knowledge of simple resistive circuits, and
> > their power dissipation, would be required. Knowledge of capacitors and
> > inductors would not be required.
> >
> >
> > Stewart Teaze - N0MHS
> >
> >
>
>

1446. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 22:50:26 UTC
From: City_Slicker <notenuftime@foolscorner.net>
Message-ID: <94idfi$jf6@dispatch.concentric.net>
Source record: 1646
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,alt.radio.family,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc

Fred, I know you know better than to keep cross posting this thread. Your mail boxes could get awfully full.

"W4JLE" <Fred@w4jle.com> wrote in message
news:94i9so$h3p$1@iac5.navix.net...
> You could even have the test on the computer, the computer than could
grade
> your test(s) and as you pointed out issue your call sign on the spot. Then
> the computer could pop up what the store had in your price range. You
would
> then press your selections and walk to the front of the store, pickup your
> license and equipment and head home ready to operate.
>
> We could do the same thing from Mall kiosks to attract young people. This
> could be coupled with playstation rentals, beepers, and cell phones. A one
> stop communications and entertainment kiosk. ARRL could create a Sony
> playstation and gameboy cartridge to teach amateur radio, along with an
> amateur radio adventure that would require simulated contacts with DX
> countries to obtain clues to finish the game. Wow! I wish I had thought of
> that. The only problem is getting it by the old elitist hams that think
you
> should learn a bunch of code and radio nonsense to gain what is rightfully
> yours because you want it..
>
> --
> Fred W4JLE NHI#1001
> Executive Grand Pooba - No Hassle International
> Doing away with all requirements for a Ham ticket
> "We want, therefore we deserve"
> Send your non-tax deductible donations today!
>
> "Cathryn Mataga" <cathryn@junglevision.com> wrote in message
> news:3A6C9DF7.FE5CFEAE@junglevision.com...
> >
> >
> > "Paul R. Stoetzer, N8HM" wrote:
> > >
> > > 3. The Tech license is already extremely easy to get. I got my Tech
just
> > > over a year ago and it took about a week to study enough to pass the
> test,
> > > and that was with 55 questions on two tests, not 35.
> > >

> > > While I agree more young people are needed in the hobby, the problem
is
> not
> > > the license structure, which I believe to be perfect, it is the PR
> > > deficencies.
> >
> > What about this as a proposal. Leave everything as it is as far as
> licenses
> > are concerned. But, then eliminate the rule that you can't charge money
> > for testing people. And, then work to get the FCC to cut a deal
> > to allow, for example, Radio Shack and ham radio stores to give ham
radio
> > license tests right in the store -- and set up a computer system to
give
> call signs
> > right on the spot. Then, the stores could make a little money giving
the
> test.
> > And, might pick up some extra sales from new hams.
>
>

1447. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 22:52:30 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <9R2b6.1092$e5.2740349@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 1647

Len Over 21 <lenover21@aol.com> wrote:

> >Just about all large high schools had school-supported ham clubs and club
> >stations.

> Maybe in your area, but not in mine, a city of about 80
> thousand back then.

The club radio station at Manchester High School (CT) had fallen into disuse in 1966, the year I first attended.

> >The 80 & 40m Novice bands crawled with other kids.

> Really? My experience was a lot of WW2 vets were doing
> the crawling.

The 80 meter band was loaded with CW signals starting just as the kids got home from school and lied about their homework. Of course, most receivers of the day had about 5 kHz bandwidth or so, resulting in multiple signals being heard in the passband simultaneously. Even so, the Novice bands were a lot more used than they are today. From memory, most of the hams I worked were under 30, with a pretty high percentage of kids under 18.

> >There were no home computers. There were ham
> >stores in every populated area.

> I can drive 2 miles to an HRO outlet in Burbank, CA. It's in a
> mini-mall across Buena Vista from another mini-mall. :-)

There were more "local" radio and electronics stores then than now. Mail order electronics has become the norm. Back then, to get a part I had to drive across town and hope it is stock. Today, I make a phone call and give them my credit-card number. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1448. Re: Will you let them take away your guns?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 22:53:57 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A6CBA05.68255EA6@uci.edu>
Source record: 1702

Cecil wrote:
>
> Jim Kelley wrote:
> > I don't believe in being ruled by a mob or a King, Cecil. How 'bout
> > you?

> The IRS mob has ruled my life for years.

No smiley, so I guess you're serious. Evidently you're using a
different definition of the word mob than I am.

73, jk

1449. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 22:55:45 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <cU2b6.1093$e5.2740629@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 1648

Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com> wrote:

> I went to a high school in a township which had around 450,00 citizens
> back then, there were 450 +/- of us in the graduating class of '55 which
included
> 6-8 hams.

Manchester High had about 1000 students. Two of us were hams.

> Do that. At least three of the former Novices in my high school class went
on to
> become EEs and two of us went into other engineering disciplines. One of
the
> electron jugglers went on to become a GE VP. No doubt non-hams also became
EEs
> but not out of that class.

Of my circle of Novice friends, none are EEs today.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1450. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 22:57:05 UTC
From: City_Slicker <notenuftime@foolscorner.net>
Message-ID: <94ids1$jor@dispatch.concentric.net>
Source record: 1649
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,alt.radio.family,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc

This thread doesn't belong on the rec.radio.CB NG. Please remove it from
your replies. If you don't know how to do that ask someone.

"Roy Lewallen" <w7el@eznec.com> wrote in message
news:3A6CABCD.B1B8779A@eznec.com...
> I don't like this idea very much. The part that worries me is as you
> say, they "might pick up some extra sales from new hams". Without
> accusing any store or anyone of dishonesty, I think it's a bad idea for
> the test giver to have such an immediate and direct financial incentive
> to have the examinee pass.
>
> Roy Lewallen, W7EL
>
> Cathryn Mataga wrote:
> >
> > What about this as a proposal. Leave everything as it is as far as
licenses
> > are concerned. But, then eliminate the rule that you can't charge money
> > for testing people. And, then work to get the FCC to cut a deal
> > to allow, for example, Radio Shack and ham radio stores to give ham
radio
> > license tests right in the store -- and set up a computer system to
give call signs
> > right on the spot. Then, the stores could make a little money giving
the test.
> > And, might pick up some extra sales from new hams.

1451. Re: proposal for license testing for profit

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 22:59:23 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nospam.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.g7ky5q0.pminews@ca.news.verio.net>
Source record: 1650
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Mon, 22 Jan 2001 16:14:34 -0500, Denver Braughler wrote:

>Cathryn Mataga wrote:
>> for example, Radio Shack and ham radio stores to give ham radio
>> license tests right in the store -- and set up a computer system to give call signs
>> right on the spot. Then, the stores could make a little money giving the test.
>> And, might pick up some extra sales from new hams.
>
>If real money could be made from the extra sales, the stores
would give the tests free.
>
>Perhaps you can ask Radio Shack whether they think your proposal is viable.

The enabling legislation clearly says that examinations are to
be given on a "reimbursement for out-of-pocket expenses" basis
which precludes making a profit. [47 USCA s. 303(f)(1)(I)]

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

1452. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 23:00:53 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <0Z2b6.1094$e5.2740969@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 1701

Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com> wrote:

> Do you also think that it does no harm to the hobby for a ham to get a
> license to simply operate, and never improve himself technically?

For an individual ham? No harm at all. For all hams to choose to take that path? I don't think Amateur Radio would survive long. I think that the likelihood all of those who choose to be hams will simply operate and never improve themselves technically is about zero. I think the likelihood that some individual hams will do so is just about 1.0.

As I look at the present ratio, I believe it to be at a level where the percentage of hams that do improve themselves technically is high enough that we meet our regulatory goals as a service. Incremental changes in testing and requirements to try to trap those last few (that are, IMHO, causing no real harm) would be at a point of diminishing returns right from the get-go.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1453. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 23:02:06 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <8_2b6.1095$e5.2741042@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 1703

Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com> wrote:

> Weenie? Guilty as charged. When they hit me with the stick of
> incentive licensing I used Bash to memorize my way to an Advanced. But
> I still can't get up the energy to memorize my way to an Extra. Ed's
> right, it is a hard test... :-)

Maybe I can help you learn the concepts, Aaron. Doing so is a lot easier
than memorizing. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1454. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 23:06:47 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <y23b6.1096$e5.2741352@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 1704

Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com> wrote:

> The FCC in those days took an agressive, proactive stance with respect to promoting
> upgrading as witnessed by the time limit they put on Novices back then along with
> the later partitioning of four HF bands by license class.

They were not agressive in 1963; they gave me my General, which got me all amateur priveleges, and I never heard another word from them.

> It was sticks & carrots galore and that's simply the way it was *then*, historical fact.

One carrot; take a simple test with a 4-page study guide and have fun until you get your General. The only stick is that you have one year to do it. If you don't want to play with sticks and carrots, go right for General and be done with it altogether. Not exactly "galore" IMHO.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1455. Re: FCC Proposal for New Novice Class License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 23:08:06 UTC
From: W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com>
Message-ID: <94ieh1kbf1@iac5.navix.net>
Source record: 1705

In that case I would like to make you an honorary member of NHI and assign
you the next sequential number NHI#2741.

While our membership is growing by leaps and bounds, I would ask that all
prospective members no longer make their contributions in Pokemon Pongs, or
baseball cards. While we at NHI recognize the intrinsic value of your
contributions, I have been unable to trade them for necessary required
supplies at my local tavern.

--
Fred W4JLE NHI#1001
Executive Grand Pooba - No Hassle International
Doing away with all requirements for a Ham ticket
"We want, therefore we deserve"
Send your non-tax deductible donations today!

"Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:MK2b6.1091$e5.2740155@news.ntplx.net...
> W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com> wrote:
>
> > Have you no pity?
>
> No, but I do have a sense of humor. :-)
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
>

1456. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 23:08:28 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <643b6.1097$e5.2741398@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 1706

Cathryn Mataga <cathryn@junglevision.com> wrote:

> But, then eliminate the rule that you can't charge money
> for testing people.

The present rules permit the VECs to charge a fee for testing people.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1457. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 23:22:20 UTC
From: W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com>
Message-ID: <94ifbi$la9$1@iac5.navix.net>
Source record: 1707
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,alt.radio.family,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc

I would suggest that you rethink that tact.

Did I miss out on the announcement where you had been appointed Usenet enforcer?

net protocol does not allow me to alter the headers on a thread I did not start. As I am not the author of this thread, you are addressing the wrong party.

I also note that your message was sent to all the newsgroups as well.
--
Fred W4JLE NHI#1001
Executive Grand Pooba - No Hassle International
Doing away with all requirements for a Ham ticket
"We want, therefore we deserve"
Send your non-tax deductible donations today!

"City_Slicker" <notenuftime@foolscorner.net> wrote in message news:94idfi$jf6@dispatch.concentric.net...
> Fred, I know you know better than to keep cross posting this thread. Your
> mail boxes could get awfully full.
>
> "W4JLE" <Fred@w4jle.com> wrote in message
> news:94i9so$h3p$1@iac5.navix.net...
> > You could even have the test on the computer, the computer than could
> grade
> > your test(s) and as you pointed out issue your call sign on the spot.
Then
> > the computer could pop up what the store had in your price range. You
> would
> > then press your selections and walk to the front of the store, pickup
your
> > license and equipment and head home ready to operate.
> >
> > We could do the same thing from Mall kiosks to attract young people.
This
> > could be coupled with playstation rentals, beepers, and cell phones. A
one
> > stop communications and entertainment kiosk. ARRL could create a Sony
> > playstation and gameboy cartridge to teach amateur radio, along with an
> > amateur radio adventure that would require simulated contacts with DX
> > countries to obtain clues to finish the game. Wow! I wish I had thought
of
> > that. The only problem is getting it by the old elitist hams that think

> you
> > should learn a bunch of code and radio nonsense to gain what is
rightfully
> > yours because you want it..
> >
> > --
> > Fred W4JLE NHI#1001
> > Executive Grand Pooba - No Hassle International
> > Doing away with all requirements for a Ham ticket
> > "We want, therefore we deserve"
> > Send your non-tax deductible donations today!
> >
> > "Cathryn Mataga" <cathryn@junglevision.com> wrote in message
> > news:3A6C9DF7.FE5CFEAE@junglevision.com...
> > >
> > >
> > > "Paul R. Stoetzer, N8HM" wrote:
> > > >
> > > > 3. The Tech license is already extremely easy to get. I got my Tech
> just
> > > > over a year ago and it took about a week to study enough to pass the
> > test,
> > > > and that was with 55 questions on two tests, not 35.
> > > >
> > > > While I agree more young people are needed in the hobby, the problem
> is
> > not
> > > > the license structure, which I believe to be perfect, it is the PR
> > > > deficencies.
> > > >
> > > What about this as a proposal. Leave everything as it is as far as
> > licenses
> > > are concerned. But, then eliminate the rule that you can't charge
money
> > > for testing people. And, then work to get the FCC to cut a deal
> > > to allow, for example, Radio Shack and ham radio stores to give ham
> radio
> > > license tests right in the store -- and set up a computer system to
> give
> > call signs
> > > right on the spot. Then, the stores could make a little money giving
> the
> > test.
> > > And, might pick up some extra sales from new hams.
> > >
> > >
> >
> >

1458. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-22 23:30:02 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <94ifpfgmc1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1708

In article <94fnu4sqi1@208.207.71.164>,
Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>
>
> Brian wrote:
> \
> > "...the hammers come out." Oh good grief. You tell us exactly the
kind
> > of ham you are every day on rrap.
> >
>
> Getcher helmet on

Nope, its in storage along with my flak vest and LBE. Hopefully I won't
suffer the kind of brain damage you did as a beginner.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1459. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 00:00:31 UTC
From: Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com>
Message-ID: <3A6CC99F.DBFC2749@dvol.com>
Source record: 1709

"Ed Hare, W1RFI" wrote:

> > The FCC in those days took an agressive, proactive stance with respect to
> promoting
> > upgrading as witnessed by the time limit they put on Novices back then
> along with
> > the later partitioning of four HF bands by license class.
>
> They were not agressive in 1963; they gave me my General, which got me all
> amateur priveleges, and I never heard another word from them.

>
Until 1968 . . . Then they heard from YOU din they? Heh. .
>

> > It was sticks & carrots galore and that's simply the way it was *then*,
> historical fact.
>
> One carrot; take a simple test with a 4-page study guide and have fun until
> you get your General. The only stick is that you have one year to do it.

>
"Galore" in the sense that the vast majority of the kids who got into ham radio
took the Novice path, I don't know of any myself who went straight for a
General including those who well into electronics. Kids "galore" opted to face
the stick.
>

> If you don't want to play with sticks and carrots, go right for General and
> be done with it altogether. Not exactly "galore" IMHO

>
All? I wouldn't advise getting on 7.010 with a General.
>

>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

>
w3rv

1460. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 00:07:05 UTC
From: Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com>
Message-ID: <3A6CCB29.CF906C2E@dvol.com>
Source record: 1710

"Ed Hare, W1RFI" wrote:

> Manchester High had about 1000 students. Two of us were hams.

>

> Of my circle of Novice friends, none are EEs today.

>
I can't imagine why the ham demograpics would be so different. It didn't seem to be a fluke but I never paid any attention to any of the "stats". There were also several hams in the preceeding class. Two of my high school ham classmates were also classmates in enginering school, one of those is a lifetime buddy and we've been in the same contest club for over 40 years. Maybe it had something to do with the heavy concentration of the electronics industry around here in that timeframe. RCA, Philco, GE, the big Navy electronics labs, even B&W. 1963 was ten years after my time as a Novice, that could be a factor. Beats me.
>

> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

>
w3rv

1461. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 00:09:24 UTC
From: Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com>
Message-ID: <3A6CCBB4.2AE1DF28@dvol.com>
Source record: 1711

Aaron Jones wrote:

>
> hooking up a ham station in 2001. If my rig broke in the 50's or 60's
> I could fix it no matter what. Now if it's not a simple problem, it's
> back to the factory. But then how is that much different from most
> hams these days...

>
. . . you and most of the rest of us who came out of those days.
>
w3rv

1462. This Just In . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 00:22:11 UTC
From: Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com>
Message-ID: <3A6CCEB3.B3879178@dvol.com>
Source record: 1712

From today's ARRL Bulletin:
>
"The Board's Morse Code resolution declared that deletion of the Article S25 international requirement at WRC-03 ''should not automatically or immediately mean a similar removal of the Morse code from Part 97 of the FCC rules.'' Morse code, the Board affirmed, deserves continued support as an important operating mode as well as in terms of spectrum and ''should be retained as a testing element in the US.'' The resolution also called on ARRL Headquarters staff to ''develop a program designed to promote the use of Morse.''
>
w3rv

1463. Re: Will you let them take away your guns?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 00:24:55 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A6CCF57.D33EE7E4@uci.edu>
Source record: 1719

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> Here's what I really said:

> "In such a situation, an armed response by law-abiding citizens would
> definitely be in order to prevent the armed environmentalists, convicted
> felons, abortion rights activists, and Ku Klux Klansmen from *actually*
> shooting our elected Congressmen and Senators."

You gotta be nuts, Larry. (Better?)

Police are supposed to take care of that sort of thing, not vigilante
committees.
You're going to trust that they'll know the difference between the nuts
with guns on one side, and the nuts with guns on the other? I guess
your guys will be wearing the Red Man ball caps and the other guys will
be wearing the Pro-Choice t-shirts, right? ;-)

1464. Re: Enough already

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 00:27:27 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010122192727.00445.00000863@nso-bj.aol.com>
Source record: 1713

In article <94gihfhfl1@iac5.navix.net>, "W4JLE" <Fred@w4jle.com> writes:

>What are you doing posting this crap in alt.binaries.sex.bestiality ?

Why are you looking in that newsgroup? You like that kind of thing?

didit

1465. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 00:27:28 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010122192728.00445.00000865@nso-bj.aol.com>
Source record: 1714

In article <94hjco$oa1$1@208.206.142.73>, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
writes:

>What he *really* needs is a copy of ARRL's "How to Learn the
>Radiotelegraph Code".

Offer gratefully accepted. With Dave's "Now You're Talking" my
life will be compleat. :-)

didit

1466. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 00:27:28 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010122192728.00445.00000864@nso-bj.aol.com>
Source record: 1715

In article <94hlunnhg1@nnrp1.deja.com>, K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org> writes:

>In article <20010120014523.22779.00000700@nso-fa.aol.com>,
> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
>>
>> Anyone who wants to go back to 1958 is nuts!
>
>Hey, I'll go back! In 1958 I was a college freshman, and Peggy Sue
>Loudermilk (with a body to make a Baptist preacher sweat) was a regular
>visitor in the back seat of my 51 Pontiac hardtop.

That's unfortunate. According to a popular website for alumni,
story has it that the lady died in 1960 from complications of
an STD. Must be a different Peggy Sue...

didit

1467. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 00:27:29 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010122192729.00445.00000866@nso-bj.aol.com>
Source record: 1718

In article <3A6BC910.D882CC0E@ovis.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net> writes:

>> >W1RFI wrote:
>> >
>> >> >The Harvey-Wells Bandmaster, 50 watts (807?), CW & AM, fairly compact,

>Len, you are the crabgrass in the lawn of rrac.

"rrac?"

>The Bandmaster was as much of an "all band" rig as one could get at the
>time of its production. No, it wasn't efficient above 30 MHz but it
>worked. It may not have had the best electrical design but it was a
>mechanical marvel with its right angle drive.

I'm sure it was. I bought a couple National right-angle drives
back in 1949, no doubt inspired by the thoughts of amateurs
desiring this particular model. For something else of course,
not to make a mechanical marvel such as the Bandmaster.

>It is also very compact.
>The matching VFO was designed with a slanted panel and a nice flat and
>low rectangular area where the transmitter could perch atop the VFO.
>I have two, one of them with the VFO. I'd be happy to sell you one so
>that you can spend hours admiring it.

Doubtful that I could afford the price considering others' concern
with my hygiene. I do thank you for the offer.

> With luck, you'll be able to get a license and use it on the air.

Really? I am heartened, although I thought the achievement
of obtaining a license was lots of hard work and a lifetime
of worship and devotion.

>Yes, the company did produce at least one receiver.

This seems to be at odds with the ham writer on one website
so the two of you can discuss that matter.

>You can tell the '57 Chev collectors that their rides are deficient but
>I doubt you'll get any of 'em to trade them in on a new Taurus or an
>Intrepid.

I do not understand this reference. Is it to mobile radio
operation?

>Would you like me to send you a copy of "Now You're Talking"?

Thank you. That would be ever so kind of you. You will
have to pay postage, of course. If you send more than one
I will be glad to hand extras out to youngsters in front of
the HRO at a mini-mall on the corner of Buena Vista and
Victory in Burbank, CA.

didit

1468. Re: CA power crisis caused by internet

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 00:27:32 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010122192732.00445.00000867@nso-bj.aol.com>
Source record: 1716

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.g7kmxdf.pminews@ca.news.verio.net>, "Phil Kane"
<Phil.Kane@nospam.spam> writes:

>On 21 Jan 2001 22:30:46 GMT, Len Over 21 wrote:
>
>>On the other hand, maybe you could "reactivate" that CW
>>net into the LAPD...you know, the one the LAPD didn't
>>know about until you "revealed" it to everyone? :-)
>
> LAPD wasn't the California node - CHP Sacramento was. I saw
> the station in 1963 but it was out of service by then.

Thank you, Phil. Too bad you weren't here a couple years
ago when I bothered some LAPD people about this "CW
station." :-) They were very courteous and did explain
some interesting history of the LAPD at the time.

California Highway Patrol Sacramento CW station was "out
of service" in 1963? OK. Thanks again.

didit

1469. Re: "They oughta require a license....blah, blah, blah"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 00:27:33 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010122192733.00445.00000868@nso-bj.aol.com>
Source record: 1717

In article <H9%a6.1073$e5.2724274@news.ntplx.net>, "Ed Hare, W1RFI"
<w1rfi@arrl.net> writes:

>Len Over 21 <lenover21@aol.com> wrote:
>
>> >The one doing the kerchunking is indeed always illegal. Transmitter
>> >fingerprinting has been used to successfully ID several kerchunkers over
>the
>> >years.
>
>> OOs and run-of-the-mill hams can ID them illegal kerchunkers with
>> "fingerprint techniques?"
>
>The equipment is commercially available at a reasonable price. Many of the
>kerchunkers also actually operate the repeater, enabling one to capture the
>fingerprint of the miscreant, then compare it to properly ID'ed signals.
>
>> ...OK... :-)
>
>Yes, indeed. See http://www.motron.com

Thank you for the interesting website, Ed.

The "TxPorter" works by measuring the transmit frequency drift
when activated. Sounds simple enough...but that assumes
that each transmitter's frequency does exhibit short-term
drift (probably does, no dispute). As to "identification" it depends
on comparing to a "known" database (software limit of 256
"fingerprints"). Not quite the same detail as with finger type
fingerprints but better than nothing. :-)

Motron sells theirs for the economical price of $799 for computer
card and software. [needs a computer existing] 800 bucks
doesn't sound "economical" to the average amateur or does it?
I suppose it does. If W1AW can afford commercial Harris HF
transmitters for an amateur radio station, it does, it does. :-)

didit

1470. Re: "They oughta require a license....blah, blah, blah"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 00:38:22 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010122193822.25659.00001088@nso-fk.aol.com>
Source record: 1720

In article <h81c6t07d3k505s9742uovbuoq5qpip20f@4ax.com>, Jake Brodsky
<frussle@erols.com> writes:

>>There is no time machine to go back to undo the past. There
>>is the possibility that the existing and future FCC can solve
>>some problems in US civil radio. Support the FCC in
>>regulation of radio...or become lawless vigilantes who are
>>outnumbered by others. There is no honor or respect in
>>vigilanteism.
>
>I agree completely. And I assure you, that is not what I'm suggesting.

Understood. I was making a general statement. My apologies.

didit

1471. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 00:48:29 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010122194829.02315.00003353@nso-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 1723

In article <94dfc2$jj4$1@iac5.navix.net>, "W4JLE" <Fred@w4jle.com> writes:

>
>For God's sake Ed, you are working so hard to be politically correct.

I don't know about that, Fred -- for Ed, being politically correct seems to
come quite naturally! I don't really think he needs to work at it at all!

>I guess if a kid is learning baseball, you should not point out he is running
>the bases in the wrong direction for fear he will give up baseball?
>
>Give me a single reason we should be bending over and kissing some snot
>nosed kids ass to get him active in ham radio! If they are interested, I
>will bust my butt to help them.

There is no reason whatsoever. My experience has proven to me that
people who are genuinely interested in amateur radio will get involved
on their own initiative. What is needed, more than anything else, is
major, mass media publicity. Unfortunately, the ARRL seems totally
helpless in getting any for us.

>I have Elmered more than a few in my time, but at no point did I waste time
>on anyone who had no interest.

Nor should you have to. Whenever I've been involved in ham radio
instruction, I've always told the class right from the beginning that I am
there to show them the way, but there is a lot of hard work that needs
to be done and I'm not going to do it for them. That usually causes
about a 90-percent attrition rate right from the beginning, and I'm left
to effectively "elmer" the remaining few truly interested newcomers
who are more than willing to learn the code, open the books and
read them, and learn which end of the soldering iron gets hot.

>I had one guy wanted to be a ham and was having trouble with the code. It
>took me a while to realize his problem was not the code, he did not know how
>to read or write. I worked with him for over a year and he earned his
>ticket. I remember him struggling to read to become a ham, then I listen to
>all the cock and bull about "how tough it is on the children to get a
>ticket".

Well, unless you're a trained educator, I wouldn't have bothered with
that guy. Ham radio isn't a proper hobby for illiterate people. My
advice to them would be to take care of learning basic life skills before
they concern themselves with hobbies.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1472. Re: The Real Bill Clinton Legacy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 00:48:30 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010122194830.02315.00003355@nso-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 1721

In article <94cn4m$u48$1@nnrp1.deja.com>, Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@my-deja.com> writes:

>> > There has been much talk about the Clinton legacy. As William J.
>> > Clinton leaves office, lets take a look at a few things around the
>> > country to discover the real Clinton legacy.
>>
>> ///// C L I P /////
>>
>> Please take your American politics to alt.bloody.sleazy.washington
>newsgroup.
>> This one is an international forum about amateur radio and not about
>> second-rate governments in north america.
>>
>> In other words, bugger off mate.
>>
>> Graeme

Graeme:

I appreciate your concern, but the U.S. no longer has a "second-rate
government in north america (sic)." As of noon yesterday, we are
back to having a first-rate government!

>Hey Aussie....I got a better idea, go stand out on the street corner
>and tell the guy fixing to shoot you to go turn in his weapon.
>
>Dan/W4NTI

I do not endorse this advice, Graeme; after all, the criminals *are*
out there and they *are* armed; unfortunately, law-abiding citizens
of Australia, such as your own good self, are not. Therefore, I'd
advise you to take up permanent residence in a police station.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1473. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 00:48:30 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010122194830.02315.00003354@nso-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 1722

In article <20010120190918.03154.00000332@ng-cu1.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>
>If I were getting into a new hobby that involved a community, as does ham
>radio, and was given the impression that I "better" be a fairly fast learner,
>or I would receive a public lashing for what I felt was an innocent choice of
>words,

Ed:

Just exactly how "slow" a "learner" should we hams tolerate? When told, once, that use of terms like "handle" and "personal" are not generally accepted on the amateur radio airwaves, how many infractions must be permitted before the newcomer can be "set straight" in no uncertain terms (preferably off-the-air)? To use a different example, how many "yield" signs must be posted at one intersection to actually induce the behavior of making the motorist yield to oncoming traffic? Obviously, a reasonably fast learner will only need one; but you apparently seem to advocate an unlimited number of "yield" signs at each intersection, right?

I would very quickly decide that is not a caring, sharing community. I
>almost certainly would find a different circle, because with friends like
>that,
>I would not need enemies.

To which I would reply, "Be my guest -- don't let the door hit you in the ass on the way out!" But getting back to this "caring, sharing community" crap, Ed, just what *was* Mother Teresa's call sign?

>Fortunately, when I first became a ham and probably made "gaffs" that I
>wasn't
>even aware of, I didn't receive the type of "welcome" you are describing.

Neither did I, Ed, because I made relatively few "gaffs" (sic). You see, picking up a microphone and talking into it is no big deal. It's not rocket science, and it's not social science. It's just talking. And us hams have usually talked on radios pretty much the same way we talk all the rest of the time -- without wierd, unconventional slang, acronyms, and lingo. Of course, if you live in a run-down trailer park in 4-land, your mileage may vary.

>IMHO, telling people what they "better" do is not in the spirit of ham radio
>that I have respected for decades.

But telling them what they "better not" do certainly is!

73 de Larry, K3LT

1474. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 00:51:57 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <aB4b6.1104$e5.2747391@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 1724

Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com> wrote:

> > They were not agressive in 1963; they gave me my General, which got me all
> > amateur priveleges, and I never heard another word from them.

> Until 1968 . . . Then they heard from YOU din they? Heh. .

Actually, no; my General expired. I think it was 1976 when I got relicensed. I set off to get my Extra at that point, but parked in a no-parking zone in Boston and got my car towed. I had to sprint to the FCC exam site and just missed the 20 wpm code test. I took all the tests through Advanced that day, then went on and took the First Phone. All carrot; no stick.

> "Galore" in the sense that the vast majority of the kids who got into ham radio
> took the Novice path, I don't know of any myself who went straight for a
> General including those who well into electronics. Kids "galore" opted to face
> the stick.

Perhaps as a kid, but as a young man, I chose the "hard" way.

> > If you don't want to play with sticks and carrots, go right for General and
> > be done with it altogether. Not exactly "galore" IMHO

> All? I wouldn't advise getting on 7.010 with a General.

Thanks for the clarification; I thought we were still in the good old days of 1963. :-) That is the time frame I was thinking in.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1475. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 00:54:00 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <5D4b6.1105$e5.2747600@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 1725

Aaron Jones wrote:

> hooking up a ham station in 2001. If my rig broke in the 50's or 60's
> I could fix it no matter what. Now if it's not a simple problem, it's
> back to the factory. But then how is that much different from most
> hams these days...

How much of that is due to differences in hams and how much is due to differences in the rigs? We learned troubleshooting because we felt we had a shot at fixing the rig. Although it is possible to do more troubleshooting on today's rigs than most hams will admit to, I can well understand if troubleshooting does not appear to be worth learning in today's radio environment.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1476. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 00:55:37 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <CE4b6.1106$e5.2747643@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 1726

Len Over 21 <lenover21@aol.com> wrote:

> In article <94hjco$oa1$1@208.206.142.73>, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
> writes:

> >What he *really* needs is a copy of ARRL's "How to Learn the
> >Radiotelegraph Code".

> Offer gratefully accepted. With Dave's "Now You're Talking" my
> life will be compleat. :-)

And I will toss in all of the 2000 year issues of QST! I'll even sign the
March "QRP" issue for you. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1477. Re: This Just In . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 01:27:24 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A6CDDFC.1DAC7163@uci.edu>
Source record: 1728

Hi Brian,

I notice you forgot to include the part of the announcement that many
here would be the most interested in. ;-)

73, Jim AC6XG

Brian Kelly wrote:
>
> From today's ARRL Bulletin:
> >
> "The Board's Morse Code resolution declared that deletion of the Article
> S25 international requirement at WRC-03 ''should not automatically or
> immediately mean a similar removal of the Morse code from Part 97 of the
> FCC rules.'' Morse code, the Board affirmed, deserves continued support
> as an important operating mode as well as in terms of spectrum and
> ''should be retained as a testing element in the US.'' The resolution
> also called on ARRL Headquarters staff to ''develop a program designed
> to promote the use of Morse.''
> >
> w3rv

1478. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 01:31:23 UTC
From: W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com>
Message-ID: <94imti$r47$1@iac5.navix.net>
Source record: 1727

It looks like I get to change back on my CW position and you will have to go along in agreement Ed,

The Board also revised its position on whether Morse code proficiency should continue to be an international requirement to license operation below 30 MHz. The Board approved a resolution that ''recognizes and accepts'' that the Morse requirement likely will be dropped from Article S25 of the international Radio Regulations at the 2003 World Radiocommunication Conference. But the Board held the line on retaining a domestic Morse requirement, saying that each country should be allowed to determine for itself whether it wants to have a Morse code requirement.

The Board's Morse Code resolution declared that deletion of the Article S25 international requirement at WRC-03 ''should not automatically or immediately mean a similar removal of the Morse code from Part 97 of the FCC rules.'' Morse code, the Board affirmed, deserves continued support as an important operating mode as well as in terms of spectrum and ''should be retained as a testing element in the US.'' The resolution also called on ARRL Headquarters staff to ''develop a program designed to promote the use of Morse.''

The resolution supersedes all previous Board policy statements regarding Morse code and Article S25.

--
Fred W4JLE NHI#1001
Executive Grand Pooba - No Hassle International
Doing away with all requirements for a Ham ticket
"We want, therefore we deserve"
Send your non-tax deductible donations today!

"Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net> wrote in message news:5D4b6.1105$e5.2747600@news.ntplx.net...
> Aaron Jones wrote:
>
>
> How much of that is due to differences in hams and how much is due to
> differences in the rigs

1479. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 01:35:43 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A6CDFEF.72906220@uci.edu>
Source record: 1729

Len Over 21 wrote:

> In article <94hlunnhg1@nnrp1.deja.com>, K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org> writes:
> >Hey, I'll go back! In 1958 I was a college freshman, and Peggy Sue
> >Loudermilk (with a body to make a Baptist preacher sweat) was a regular
> >visitor in the back seat of my 51 Pontiac hardtop.

> That's unfortunate. According to a popular website for alumni,
> story has it that the lady died in 1960 from complications of
> an STD. Must be a different Peggy Sue...

Tacky.

1480. Re: FCC Proposal for New Novice Class License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 01:53:23 UTC
From: Eddie Haskell <harleybum@easyriders.com>
Message-ID: <nu5b6.90403$y9.17320727@typhoon.we.rr.com>
Source record: 1730
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.radio.family

Why turn over PRIME 440 frequencies for novice only use??? give them channels in the hardly used 218-220mhz band...NOT prime 440 RPTR channels. Your in Southern Calif...wake up and smell the coffee..or is this just an effort to "Troll".....Eddie

1481. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 02:04:01 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <OE5b6.1109$e5.2751181@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 1731

W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com> wrote in message news:94imti$r47$1@iac5.navix.net...

> It looks like I get to change back on my CW position and you will have to
go
> along in agreement Ed,

What? You gave up on your new outlook so soon?

I was pleased to see the Board's policy wrt the international treaty on Morse code testing. In my input to my Director, I pointed out that, IMHO, international treaties should be reserved for things like global warming, president stabbing and intercontinental ballistic missles. I don't believe that the nations of the world need concern themselves internationally with Morse code testing in the Amateur Radio Service.

I also agree that it is quite appropriate that each nation be free to decide for itself what specific
Morse-code requirements are needed for an amateur license.

The ARRL Board took the step to reaffirm that it is not changing its current policy wrt the Morse-code tests for US amateur licenses. I didn't believe that it was necessary to say this; simply changing the existing policy wrt international requirements stood on its own. I support not changing the position wrt US testing at this time, but possibly not for the reasons that you do. It is quite likely that consideration of that at WRC will take place in 2003. It would be at least a year before that treaty is ratified, and until then, the FCC has given every indication that it will not be revisiting the Morse code testing issue.

At that time, we will have seen changes in the Amateur Radio Service, may have seen other changes in the nature of the testing and will have gone through at least one election cycle in each Division in the ARRL Board of Directors. Although I feel it safe to say that some of the present incumbents will serve on the ARRL Board in 2004 or later, I also feel it safe to say that it is likely that there will be a new mix of leadership and that Board could very well come to a different policy conclusion than this one. I do not believe it would be appropriate for this Board to make policy that may need to be determined by the ARRL Board in the future; in fact, would be more competently determined by the Board at that time than it is now. The Board addressed what is before Amateur Radio now, the need to prepare for the upcoming WRCs over the coming few years.

How the Board of 2004 will decide will be determined by the makeup of that Board, the influence of ARRL membership and the specifics of what is proposed by the FCC. If more of those who seek to end code testing in the US join the ARRL and vote the bums out, then we could see an entirely different

view. If those who feel that code testing needs to be preserved make their views known, then it is equally possible that the League could choose to pursue keeping code testing as part of the US requirements even if it is no longer an international treaty requirement.

Will I support the present policy of the ARRL Board? Yes, I will. There is no action that can be taken at this time by ARRL wrt code testing in the US, so not changing the policy at this time, but deferring it until possible action is less than 3 or more years away is, IMHO, the right thing to do. Yes, I support not making a decision now that can be better made later, when more factors can be considered.

I will add that these are my personal views. The ARRL policy on the matter is stated clearly in the resolution and Web article.

> Executive Grand Pooba - No Hassle International
> Doing away with all requirements for a Ham ticket
> "We want, therefore we deserve"
> Send your non-tax deductible donations today!

Well, if you have changed your mind, you may have to change your sig. I don't think it really promotes CW to call it "Lotsa' Hassle International," though. Do you? :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1482. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 02:07:39 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <al5b6.1110$e5.2751402@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 1732

Larry Roll K3LT <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote:

> There is no reason whatsoever. My experience has proven to me that
> people who are genuinely interested in amateur radio will get involved
> on their own initiative. What is needed, more than anything else, is
> major, mass media publicity. Unfortunately, the ARRL seems totally
> helpless in getting any for us.

Well, Larry; the plan you proposed would have eliminated ARRL's RFI program, so even you deemed it not acceptable. Did you come up with an alternate? At >$100k per 30-second spot on prime time, I am not sure mass-media ads are the answer.

What percentage of people that might be interested in ham radio do you feel do not know about its existence?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1483. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 02:09:39 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <3K5b6.1111$e5.2751455@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 1733

Larry Roll K3LT <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote:

> Nor should you have to. Whenever I've been involved in ham radio
> instruction, I've always told the class right from the beginning that I am
> there to show them the way, but there is a lot of hard work that needs
> to be done and I'm not going to do it for them. That usually causes
> about a 90-percent attrition rate right from the beginning, ...

In the classes I have helped teach here in Newington, we skip the lecture
and have a much higher graduation rate than 10%. Now, if ARRL is going to
spend all that money on mass-media ads for you, Larry, we expect you to
score better than a 10% on your "final exam."

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1484. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 02:11:02 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <lL5b6.1112$e5.2751517@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 1734

Larry Roll K3LT <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote:

> >I had one guy wanted to be a ham and was having trouble with the code. It
> >took me a while to realize his problem was not the code, he did not know
how
> >to read or write. I worked with him for over a year and he earned his
> >ticket. I remember him struggling to read to become a ham, then I listen
to
> >all the cock and bull about "how tough it is on the children to get a
> >ticket".

> Well, unless you're a trained educator, I wouldn't have bothered with
> that guy. Ham radio isn't a proper hobby for illiterate people. My
> advice to them would be to take care of learning basic life skills before
> they concern themselves with hobbies.

It appears to me, Larry, that the guy's concern with ham radio helped him to attain a major basic life skill, with some help from Fred. That must say more to me about the value of ham radio than it does to you.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1485. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 02:14:20 UTC
From: Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com>
Message-ID: <3A6CE8FC.566F2691@dvol.com>
Source record: 1735

"Ed Hare, W1RFI" wrote:

>
> Actually, no; my General expired. I think it was 1976 when I got relicensed.

>
Different situation. I've manged to keep renewing although I was into the second
year of the grace period last time.
>

> I set off to get my Extra at that point, but parked in a no-parking zone in
> Boston and got my car towed.

>
That stinks. The FCC office here was buried on an upper floor of the old custom
house in the middle of the old city, ya had to be outta yer mind to drive.
>

> I had to sprint to the FCC exam site and just
> missed the 20 wpm code test.

>
I blew the General code test the first time, had to wait a month to take it over
and wound up getting my General just a few days before my Novice died. You had
to start getting really concerned about not having taken the General test 10
weeks before the end of the Novice license 52 week term if you wanted to stay
on the air without a break. Assume you flunk the first pass, wait 30 days to
take it over, pass the second attempt, then wait six weeks for the FCC to
process it and mail it. Talk about different days . .
>

> I took all the tests through Advanced that
> day, then went on and took the First Phone. All carrot; no stick.

>
Yeah, well I went thru the stick & carrot thing twice. First with the Novice,
got the General and had it all. For 14 years I thought I had it made for life
and all of a sudden I wound up having to take the Extra or get whacked with the
stick.
>
I had to beaver on the code because I'd long since been copying only in my head
so I had to get back up to speed with the pencil & pencil drill. I pretty much
breezed thru the Extra. The examiner casually tossed another exam across his
desk at me, sed "Try this one too, Kelly". Wound up with a Second Telegraph.
>

> > General including those who well into electronics. Kids "galore" opted to
> face
> > the stick.
>
> Perhaps as a kid, but as a young man, I chose the "hard" way.

>
Big difference between a youg man who was relicensing and a standard-issue
13-14-year-old total newbie.
>

>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

>
w3rv

1486. Re: This Just In . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 02:18:02 UTC
From: Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com>
Message-ID: <3A6CE9DA.EA0C13B@dvol.com>
Source record: 1736

Jim Kelley wrote:

> Hi Brian,
>
> I notice you forgot to include the part of the announcement that many
> here would be the most interested in. ;-)
>
> 73, Jim AC6XG
>

Whutzat??!

1487. Re: This Just In . . . all of it

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 02:22:53 UTC
From: Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com>
Message-ID: <3A6CEAFD.E61D1DEF@dvol.com>
Source record: 1737

From today's ARRL Bulletin:
>
"The Board also revised its position on whether Morse code proficiency should continue to be an international requirement to license operation below 30 MHz. The Board approved a resolution that ''recognizes and accepts'' that the Morse requirement likely will be dropped from Article S25 of the international Radio Regulations at the 2003 World Radiocommunication Conference. But the Board held the line on retaining a domestic Morse requirement, saying that each country should be allowed to determine for itself whether it wants to have a Morse code requirement.
>
The Board's Morse Code resolution declared that deletion of the Article S25 international requirement at WRC-03 ''should not automatically or immediately mean a similar removal of the Morse code from Part 97 of the FCC rules.'' Morse code, the Board affirmed, deserves continued support as an important operating mode as well as in terms of spectrum and ''should be retained as a testing element in the US.'' The resolution also called on ARRL Headquarters staff to ''develop a program designed to promote the use of Morse.''
>
The resolution supersedes all previous Board policy statements regarding Morse code and Article S25."
>
w3rv

1488. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 02:24:36 UTC
From: Old_Timer <oldtimer@nonsuch.net>
Message-ID: <3A6CEB64.ED3435EF@nonsuch.net>
Source record: 1738
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,alt.radio.family,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc

Cathryn Mataga wrote:
>
> Roy Lewallen wrote:
> >
> > I don't like this idea very much. The part that worries me is as you
> > say, they "might pick up some extra sales from new hams". Without
> > accusing any store or anyone of dishonesty, I think it's a bad idea for
> > the test giver to have such an immediate and direct financial incentive
> > to have the examinee pass.
> >
>
> Money makes the world go-round. Methinks. And if you want to
> get more young people in the hobby, I think you need the kind
> of marketing muscle that Radio Shack can provide. And, I think the fraud
> issue here is over-estimated. There's been fraud
> in the testing system as it is. If you had big companies involved,
> who had lawyers, they could snap the whip with the employees.
> And, they'd be better positioned to enforce standards, than random
> individuals. I think.
>
> Just enact some fines for cheating. Hire a few people to go
> around, and masquerade as applicants to keep the system clean. And,
> open an office, that would handle reports of fraud, and then
> investigate as a criminal matter. It'd probably be cleaner than
> the current setup.

Marketing muscle? Is this from the same group of drooling no-loads I've encountered in almost every RadShack I've entered over the past several decades? These folks panic when a customer refuses to provide his name and address.

The people who are Radio Shack's customers seem to be from several distinct groups: a) those who need a part in a hurry and can't wait for delivery from a "1-800" house (I generally fall into this group), b) those who don't care about price, c) those who don't care about quality and d) those who are waiting for a spouse to finish shopping at the mall.

I don't think we need individuals who are incapable of identifying an electronic component administering amateur license testing.

Dave Heil K8MN

1489. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 02:27:40 UTC
From: Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com>
Message-ID: <3A6CEC1C.2D003BF6@dvol.com>
Source record: 1739

"Ed Hare, W1RFI" wrote:

> I can well
> understand if troubleshooting does not appear to be worth learning in
> today's radio environment.

>
It's not and I find that frustrating.
>

> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

1490. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 02:30:15 UTC
From: Old_Timer <oldtimer@nonsuch.net>
Message-ID: <3A6CECB7.A03754E5@nonsuch.net>
Source record: 1740

Ed Hare, W1RFI wrote:
>
> Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com> wrote:
>
> > I went to a high school in a township which had around 450,00 citizens
> > back then, there were 450 +/- of us in the graduating class of '55 which
> included
> > 6-8 hams.
>
> Manchester High had about 1000 students. Two of us were hams.
>
> > Do that. At least three of the former Novices in my high school class went
> on to
> > become EEs and two of us went into other engineering disciplines. One of
> the
> > electron jugglers went on to become a GE VP. No doubt non-hams also became
> EEs
> > but not out of that class.
>
> Of my circle of Novice friends, none are EEs today.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

The little southern West Virginia town of Oak Hill where I lived in the early and mid-1960s had a population of about 7,000. Collins High School boasted an amateur radio club (which I helped to begin as a sophomore) and the town had six teenaged Novices in the '63-'64 time frame. None of us are EEs but all are still active hams. K8CFT who ran the local TV sales and service shop and who administered our exams did a pretty good job of motivating us.

Dave Heil K8MN

1491. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 02:31:53 UTC
From: Old_Timer <oldtimer@nonsuch.net>
Message-ID: <3A6CED19.46B8C69F@nonsuch.net>
Source record: 1741

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <94hlunnhg1@nnrp1.deja.com>, K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org> writes:
>
> >In article <20010120014523.22779.00000700@nso-fa.aol.com>,
> > lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
> >>
> >> Anyone who wants to go back to 1958 is nuts!
> >
> >Hey, I'll go back! In 1958 I was a college freshman, and Peggy Sue
> >Loudermilk (with a body to make a Baptist preacher sweat) was a regular
> >visitor in the back seat of my 51 Pontiac hardtop.
>
> That's unfortunate. According to a popular website for alumni,
> story has it that the lady died in 1960 from complications of
> an STD. Must be a different Peggy Sue...
>
> didit

This one died in '65 in an LTD.

Dave K8MN

1492. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 02:38:53 UTC
From: Old_Timer <oldtimer@nonsuch.net>
Message-ID: <3A6CEEBD.AAA1F81D@nonsuch.net>
Source record: 1742

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3A6BC910.D882CC0E@ovis.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net> writes:
>
> >> >W1RFI wrote:
> >> >
> >> >> >The Harvey-Wells Bandmaster, 50 watts (807?), CW & AM, fairly compact,
>
> >Len, you are the crabgrass in the lawn of rrac.
>
> "rrac?"
rrap (but you figured that out, I'm sure)

> >The Bandmaster was as much of an "all band" rig as one could get at the
> >time of its production. No, it wasn't efficient above 30 MHz but it
> >worked. It may not have had the best electrical design but it was a
> >mechanical marvel with its right angle drive.
>
> I'm sure it was. I bought a couple National right-angle drives
> back in 1949, no doubt inspired by the thoughts of amateurs
> desiring this particular model. For something else of course,
> not to make a mechanical marvel such as the Bandmaster.

> >It is also very compact.
> >The matching VFO was designed with a slanted panel and a nice flat and
> >low rectangular area where the transmitter could perch atop the VFO.
> >I have two, one of them with the VFO. I'd be happy to sell you one so
> >that you can spend hours admiring it.
>
> Doubtful that I could afford the price considering others' concern
> with my hygiene. I do thank you for the offer.

I'm not sure what that means and I'm not altogether sure that I want to
know.

> > With luck, you'll be able to get a license and use it on the air.
>
> Really? I am heartened, although I thought the achievement
> of obtaining a license was lots of hard work and a lifetime
> of worship and devotion.

You've had the lifetime. Now on to the license.

> >Yes, the company did produce at least one receiver.
>
> This seems to be at odds with the ham writer on one website

> so the two of you can discuss that matter.

You discuss it with him. You can be the first to straighten him out.
The receiver was the R-9, produced in 1955. It featured a slide rule
dial, covered 80-10m and weighed in at 10 lb. The cabinet was 12 1/2" x
10 1/2" x 6 3/4" and the receiver sold for $149.50 less speaker.
You can't get all of your information from the internet or television.

> >You can tell the '57 Chev collectors that their rides are deficient but
> >I doubt you'll get any of 'em to trade them in on a new Taurus or an
> >Intrepid.
>
> I do not understand this reference. Is it to mobile radio
> operation?

Maybe someone can explain the analogy to you.

> >Would you like me to send you a copy of "Now You're Talking"?
>
> Thank you. That would be ever so kind of you. You will
> have to pay postage, of course. If you send more than one
> I will be glad to hand extras out to youngsters in front of
> the HRO at a mini-mall on the corner of Buena Vista and
> Victory in Burbank, CA.

I'd certainly love to have a souvenir snapshot of that little excercise.

Dave Heil K8MN
> didit

1493. The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 02:53:05 UTC
From: Old_Timer <oldtimer@nonsuch.net>
Message-ID: <3A6CF211.2319703D@nonsuch.net>
Source record: 1743

Does the League's newly announced substantial dues hike in these times of low inflation strike anybody else as being excessive?

I noted Dave Sumner's talk of the ARRL being involved in the kinds of things which dues and publication sales would not cover. My feeling is that there is little that the League should be doing which could not be covered by dues and publication sales.

My own feeling is that $39 per year is high for value received since the League already charges now for services which were formerly provided at no cost to members. QST is almost void of good articles these days. There is a dearth of technical content. Contest covereage and DX news are minimal. If I wasn't already a life member I'd have think hard to come up with enough reasons to justify renewal.

Since he was a part of the inner circle for a while, perhaps Hans can share his views on the announced increase in ARRL dues.

Dave Heil K8MN

1494. Re: Will you let them take away your guns?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 03:05:58 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A6CF516.396761F5@IEEE.org>
Source record: 1744

```
Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> Cecil wrote:
> >
> > Jim Kelley wrote:
> > > I don't believe in being ruled by a mob or a King, Cecil. How 'bout
> > > you?
>
> > The IRS mob has ruled my life for years.
>
> No smiley, so I guess you're serious. Evidently you're using a
> different definition of the word mob than I am.

Apparently, you have never had the IRS mob after you for something
of which you are innocent. With the IRS, you are guilty until you
prove your innocence beyond the shadow of a doubt and then some.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca
```

1495. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 03:26:47 UTC
From: W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com>
Message-ID: <94itlv$3am$1@iac5.navix.net>
Source record: 1745

Ed, serious for once, Most TV stations are required to air Public service announcements. A message about ham radio, directed towards today's youth would qualify and be no cost except for production.

Tie it in with the Big Brothers / Sisters mentoring program.

I would be glad to do a bit of research as to what is involved with the PSA's if any interest at Hdq.

Let me know.

73 Fred W4JLE

--
Fred W4JLE NHI#1001
Executive Grand Pooba - No Hassle International
Doing away with all requirements for a Ham ticket
"We want, therefore we deserve"
Send your non-tax deductible donations today!

"Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:aI5b6.1110$e5.2751402@news.ntplx.net...
> Larry Roll K3LT <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote:
>
> > There is no reason whatsoever. My experience has proven to me that
> > people who are genuinely interested in amateur radio will get involved
> > on their own initiative. What is needed, more than anything else, is
> > major, mass media publicity. Unfortunately, the ARRL seems totally
> > helpless in getting any for us.
>
> Well, Larry; the plan you proposed would have eliminated ARRL's RFI
program,
> so even you deemed it not acceptable. Did you come up with an alternate?
At
> >$100k per 30-second spot on prime time, I am not sure mass-media ads are
> the answer.
>
> What percentage of people that might be interested in ham radio do you
feel
> do not know about its existence?
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
>

1496. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 03:32:46 UTC
From: City_Slicker <notenuftime@foolscorner.net>
Message-ID: <94iu0u$ioo@dispatch.concentric.net>
Source record: 1746
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,alt.radio.family,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc

For what ever reason this cross posting continues to be a problem usually stemming from the ham groups. You surely have control to which NG you direct your response to. It figures you would follow everyone off the cliff to adhere to protocol. Do you believe that anyone who is only interested in CB gives a rats @$$ about some new Brownie license to use a radio? This NG is CB no license, no policy etc. So why even post it here?

If I have to nominate myself as the enforcer of this group so be it others will support the cause. If the amateur NG would like all of the CB posts crossed to their NG it can begin immediately. You see it is like one guy turns on an amp then another then another and pretty soon the whole band is unusable. Is it time to see who's is bigger? Or can this just end and everyone take their posts where they belong?

Since I don't know the origins and really don't care to waste time researching I am posting back to all the groups so that no one can later say what happened and why. This thread being crossed to the CB group can be stopped if you want to. Or you can get prepared to read many more posts that don't pertain to your groups.

"W4JLE" <Fred@w4jle.com> wrote in message
news:94ifbi$la9$1@iac5.navix.net...
> I would suggest that you rethink that tact.
>
> Did I miss out on the announcement where you had been appointed Usenet
> enforcer?
>
> net protocol does not allow me to alter the headers on a thread I did not
> start. As I am not the author of this thread, you are addressing the wrong
> party.
>
> I also note that your message was sent to all the newsgroups as well.
> --
> Fred W4JLE NHI#1001
> Executive Grand Pooba - No Hassle International
> Doing away with all requirements for a Ham ticket
> "We want, therefore we deserve"
> Send your non-tax deductible donations today!
>
> "City_Slicker" <notenuftime@foolscorner.net> wrote in message
> news:94idfi$jf6@dispatch.concentric.net...
> > Fred, I know you know better than to keep cross posting this thread.
Your
> > mail boxes could get awfully full.

> >
> > "W4JLE" <Fred@w4jle.com> wrote in message
> > news:94i9so$h3p$1@iac5.navix.net...
> > > You could even have the test on the computer, the computer than could
> > grade
> > > your test(s) and as you pointed out issue your call sign on the spot.
> Then
> > > the computer could pop up what the store had in your price range. You
> > would
> > > then press your selections and walk to the front of the store, pickup
> your
> > > license and equipment and head home ready to operate.
> > >
> > > We could do the same thing from Mall kiosks to attract young people.
> This
> > > could be coupled with playstation rentals, beepers, and cell phones. A
> one
> > > stop communications and entertainment kiosk. ARRL could create a Sony
> > > playstation and gameboy cartridge to teach amateur radio, along with
an
> > > amateur radio adventure that would require simulated contacts with DX
> > > countries to obtain clues to finish the game. Wow! I wish I had
thought
> of
> > > that. The only problem is getting it by the old elitist hams that
think
> > you
> > > should learn a bunch of code and radio nonsense to gain what is
> rightfully
> > > yours because you want it..
> > >
> > > --
> > > Fred W4JLE NHI#1001
> > > Executive Grand Pooba - No Hassle International
> > > Doing away with all requirements for a Ham ticket
> > > "We want, therefore we deserve"
> > > Send your non-tax deductible donations today!
> > >
> > > "Cathryn Mataga" <cathryn@junglevision.com> wrote in message
> > > news:3A6C9DF7.FE5CFEAE@junglevision.com...
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > > "Paul R. Stoetzer, N8HM" wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > 3. The Tech license is already extremely easy to get. I got my
Tech
> > just
> > > > > > over a year ago and it took about a week to study enough to pass
the
> > > test,

> > > > > and that was with 55 questions on two tests, not 35.
> > > > >
> > > > > While I agree more young people are needed in the hobby, the
problem
> > is
> > > not
> > > > > the license structure, which I believe to be perfect, it is the PR
> > > > > deficencies.
> > > >
> > > > What about this as a proposal. Leave everything as it is as far as
> > > licenses
> > > > are concerned. But, then eliminate the rule that you can't charge
> money
> > > > for testing people. And, then work to get the FCC to cut a deal
> > > > to allow, for example, Radio Shack and ham radio stores to give ham
> > radio
> > > > license tests right in the store -- and set up a computer system to
> > give
> > > call signs
> > > > right on the spot. Then, the stores could make a little money
giving
> > the
> > > test.
> > > > And, might pick up some extra sales from new hams.
> > >
> > >
> >
> >
>
>

1497. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 04:23:22 UTC
From: Larry Klose <lklose@net-link.net>
Message-ID: <3a6d0749$0$30009$44a10c7e@news.net-link.net>
Source record: 1747

Here the ARRL Board's Jan 20 resolution:

On motion of International Affairs Vice President Stafford, seconded by Mr. Frenaye, it was MOVED that the following resolution be adopted:

WHEREAS, Morse code, named after Samuel Finley Breese Morse, is an invention that has been essential to telecommunications for over 150 years; and

WHEREAS, the international Morse code has been an essential mode to Amateur Radio from its beginning to this day; and

WHEREAS, Radio Amateurs formed a pool of skilled Morse operators vital in the 20th Century for national defense, disaster, maritime-mobile and aeronautical-mobile communications; and

WHEREAS, since the 1950s there has been a great influx of other technologies that have gradually reduced the need for trained Morse operators outside the Amateur services; and

WHEREAS, the aeronautical-mobile and maritime-mobile applications of Morse have been or are being terminated throughout the world; and

WHEREAS, there is an agenda item for the 2003 World Radiocommunication Conference to consider Article S25; and

WHEREAS, it is highly likely that administrations will delete the Morse code requirement in Article S25 at WRC2003; and

WHEREAS, the international Amateur community has followed the United States lead in reducing the code speed requirement for licensing to operate on bands below 30 MHz to 5 words per minute and there is a trend toward elimination of this requirement; and

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the ARRL Board of Directors recognizes and accepts that suppression of the Morse code requirement in Article S25 is likely to occur at WRC 2003; and be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, that deletion of the requirement from Article S25 should not automatically or immediately mean a similar removal of the Morse code from Part 97 of the FCC rules; and be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, that each administration should determine if Morse code is retained as a testing element; and be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, it is the opinion of this Board at this time that Morse code should be retained as a testing element in the U.S.; and be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Morse code is deserving of continued support as an important operating mode including providing for the protection and

maintenance of sufficient spectrum in band planning; and be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, that staff develop a program designed to promote the use of Morse code; and be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, that this resolution supercedes all previous statements of policy related to suppression of the Morse code requirement in Article S25.

1498. Re: "They oughta require a license....blah, blah, blah"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 05:38:18 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <n26q6t038hke1g3flpjalsntrgsgdmek0h@4ax.com>
Source record: 1750

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
>800 bucks doesn't sound "economical"
>to the average amateur or does it?

Likely a ham club would be more likely than the average amateur to buy and use that type of equipment to track down violators on their repeater systems. To a club of any size that would not be hard to finance...

1499. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 05:38:20 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <026q6t0fdhrfd2dfvngo6bt2u14cbka9mt@4ax.com>
Source record: 1748

"Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net> wrote:
>I think that the likelihood all of those who choose to be hams
>will simply operate and never improve themselves technically is about zero.

I agree. But the percentage of non-technical hams as compared to the
total ham population is vastly higher today than it was in the 50's
and 60's, don't you agree? Do you think this downward curve of
technical hams will ever turn upwards again? If not the curve will
eventually approach zero...

1500. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 05:38:22 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <p06q6tsbcko27utpser87em1i8dln0g29h@4ax.com>
Source record: 1752

"Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net> wrote:
>Maybe I can help you learn the concepts, Aaron.
>Doing so is a lot easier than memorizing. :-)

I don't think so Ed. That's why Bash was so popular (with
me and lots of others)... :-)

1501. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 05:38:24 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <d06q6t0fmml4e93bl30705r7re12jb30jg@4ax.com>
Source record: 1749

"Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net> wrote:
>One carrot; take a simple test with a 4-page study guide and have fun until
>you get your General. The only stick is that you have one year to do it.

A lot of us Novices got our mail order Technician to stop the clock.
That gave us more time and we got to keep our calls...

1502. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 05:38:26 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <uu5q6t4n91rqc1faenqtkss894pss5c1mv@4ax.com>
Source record: 1751

"Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net> wrote:
>How much of that is due to differences in hams
>and how much is due to differences in the rigs?

I think that most of it is due to the rigs. They were simpler and much
much easier to work on years ago. The cars were simpler then too. I
could tear a car engine down when I was a teenager. The boys who
married my daughters have trouble changing their oil. :-) I think
the same principle applies to ham rigs...

>Although it is possible to do more troubleshooting on today's rigs
> than most hams will admit to,

Easy for an engineer to say, especially a
professional ham engineer... :-)

1503. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 05:38:42 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <8u5q6t4772p6rts2v7g20tf5k6kqp3nqqk@4ax.com>
Source record: 1753

Old_Timer <oldtimer@nonsuch.net> wrote:

>Does the League's newly announced substantial dues hike in these times
>of low inflation strike anybody else as being excessive?

Percentage wise it does seem high. But to gripe about $5 extra a year
is silly. That's less than 2 cents a day...

>My own feeling is that $39 per year is high for value received

Too bad you can't quit... :-)

1504. Re: FCC Proposal for New Novice Class License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 05:50:10 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010123005010.14870.00001094@nso-fr.aol.com>
Source record: 1757

In article <itoo6t8iuua5ons5gf65vba0efa58omqbs@4ax.com>, Jim Weir
<jim@rst-engr.com> writes:

>w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI)
>shared these priceless pearls of wisdom:
>
>->The only problem with that is you don't own the ball. :-)
>
>Ed, mostly I agree with you. In this case, I suggest that you go back and
>reread the document that begins, "We the people..." to figure out whether or
>not
>we own the ball and have given the temporary right to make the rules of the
>ball
>game so long as the rulemakers are in accord with our collective wishes.

Interesting philosophy there. Except...who are the "we" in
"we the people?"

I can understand that the "we" includes only already-licensed
radio amateurs since so many have declared their "collective
wishes" in regard to such a rigid maintenance of the status quo.
Still others express "collective wishes" as if the entire "amateur
community" were a form of lodge hall or fraternity (or even
sorority) and insist on obtaining a license _first_ before being
able to voice anything in regards to license testing matters.

The FCC is the only US civil radio agency that regulates US
civil radio and the only group that issues amateur radio
licenses to civilians. The FCC has stated more than once,
including in their Handbook, that they exist for and will hear
from all US citizens. On and about any US civil radio
service.

I sense an interesting dichotomy in this newsgroup. It is
almost exclusively a forum for already-licensed radio
amateurs with many of those having a very rigid rule of
conduct not only on obeying the law of regulations but
also of strict obediance to obeying a non-law of traditional
conformity to everything in and about the "amateur
community." The other side of this dichotomous state
is repeated attempts to dissuade, bar, and generally
disfavor any non-amateur from expressing any thought
on the subject of or regulations regarding amateurs.
That other side is quite contrary to the US Consititution
in its Preamble which begins "We, the People..."

There is no "political correctness" nor any "sensitivity to any weak" individuals or anything else to this other side of the dichotomy. It is simply against the principles of the Constitution. It smacks of a fraternal order which wishes to go against the US Constitution, not quite illegal but as close as one can get to it without having codification in law.

It would seem that this "other side" attitude is a good bar against other US citizens desires, of any kind, in getting or even attempting to get into US amateur radio. That attitude is not good for much of a future or even help from the single US civil radio regulation agency.

It is as if there were a separate "declaration of independence" that is "signed" by all on completing a US amateur radio test as if they are distinct from and independent of the US Constitution and any democratic principles.

Just an observation from someone who believes in and once took a serious oath to defend the United States Constitution with his life if needs be.

didit

1505. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 05:50:13 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010123005013.14870.00001095@nso-fr.aol.com>
Source record: 1755

In article <3A6CEC1C.2D003BF6@dvol.com>, Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com> writes:

>"Ed Hare, W1RFI" wrote:
>
>> I can well
>> understand if troubleshooting does not appear to be worth learning in
>> today's radio environment.
>
>It's not and I find that frustrating.

There's a truism there. Given the inherent reliability of today's
semiconductor and passive components, failure rates are
very low compared to vacuum tube days.

Troubleshooting _inside_ a box isn't needed by today's amateur
radio operators. But, they should be able to troubleshoot
things _outside_ the boxes. Hopefully, some will learn to
measure the performance of their ready-builts to stay within
regulations' technical requirements.

didit

1506. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 05:50:13 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010123005013.14870.00001096@nso-fr.aol.com>
Source record: 1756

In article <OE5b6.1109$e5.2751181@news.ntplx.net>, "Ed Hare, W1RFI"
<w1rfi@arrl.net> writes:

>I will add that these are my personal views. The ARRL policy on the matter
>is stated clearly in the resolution and Web article.
>
>> Executive Grand Pooba - No Hassle International
>> Doing away with all requirements for a Ham ticket
>> "We want, therefore we deserve"
>> Send your non-tax deductible donations today!
>
>Well, if you have changed your mind, you may have to change your sig. I
>don't think it really promotes CW to call it "Lotsa' Hassle International,"
>though. Do you? :-)

Sounds like just-another-rerun of Jim Kehler's "No SSB
International" and Eric June's attempts to become "Names"
through self-appointment. They even had their own Logos
(Kehler's was a reworked copy of NCI's Logo). I guess it's
all in "that's the way they did it so everyone else has to
do the same" spirit of being Dill Sergeants in the Service.

"LHI" does have a ring to it....didit,
LHA :-)

1507. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 05:50:14 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010123005014.14870.00001097@nso-fr.aol.com>
Source record: 1754

In article <CE4b6.1106$e5.2747643@news.ntplx.net>, "Ed Hare, W1RFI"
<w1rfi@arrl.net> writes:

>> >What he *really* needs is a copy of ARRL's "How to Learn the
>> >Radiotelegraph Code".
>
>> Offer gratefully accepted. With Dave's "Now You're Talking" my
>> life will be compleat. :-)
>
>And I will toss in all of the 2000 year issues of QST! I'll even sign the
>March "QRP" issue for you. :-)

Gosh, a surfeit of treasures! Thank you much, Ed, but I don't
need DX contest result listings. Give yourself a lobster dinner
at the local seafood place, sign your bill, and I will be happy.
:-)

didit

1508. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 06:00:45 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nospam.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.g7lhmh0.pminews@ca.news.verio.net>
Source record: 1758

On Mon, 22 Jan 2001 22:26:47 -0500, W4JLE wrote:

>Ed, serious for once, Most TV stations are required to air Public service
>announcements.

Absolutely not.

The "requirement" for PSAs (it never was a REAL requirement,
just an FCC program-type category that had to be reported to
earn "brownie points" at renewal time) went out when Program
Logs and Composite Week reporting were abolished in the 1980s.

The stations that still keep doing it do it to foster good
will in the community, not because it is required.

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

1509. Re: Will you let them take away your guns?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 06:07:20 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <94j72o$k2a$0@208.207.71.147>
Source record: 1759

Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> > >Right. So as long as it's a group you happen to agree with, it's
> > >constitutional for them to start an armed rebellion. That's what I
> > >thought.
>
> > Jim, there is such a thing as right and wrong, and I'm intelligent
> > enough to be able to make that distinction.
>
> But you're not the judge, Larry. You're not A judge. You don't get to
> decide when armed rebellions are legal and when they are not. You can
> pretty well figure that none of them are.

I don't have a dog in this scrap but I would point out that a certain rebellion that began in Boston harbor was hardly considered legal, either....

1510. Re: Will you let them take away your guns?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 06:08:01 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <94j741$k2a$1@208.207.71.147>
Source record: 1760

Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> Brian wrote:
> > I don't think he realized the gravity of that oath. And unless
> > he's revoked it, it probably still stands.
>
> What ever are you talking about Brian?

Is he babbling again so soon?

1511. Re: Will you let them take away your guns?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 06:11:25 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <94j7ad$k2a$2@208.207.71.147>
Source record: 1761

Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > Here's what I really said:
>
> > "In such a situation, an armed response by law-abiding citizens would
> > definitely be in order to prevent the armed environmentalists, convicted
> > felons, abortion rights activists, and Ku Klux Klansmen from *actually*
> > shooting our elected Congressmen and Senators."
>
> You gotta be nuts, Larry. (Better?)
>
> Police are supposed to take care of that sort of thing, not vigilante
> committees.
> You're going to trust that they'll know the difference between the nuts
> with guns on one side, and the nuts with guns on the other? I guess
> your guys will be wearing the Red Man ball caps and the other guys will
> be wearing the Pro-Choice t-shirts, right? ;-)

Larry can always drag out an old illfitting uniform...

1512. Re: The Real Bill Clinton Legacy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 06:12:55 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3A6D20B8.9C66D640@sccoast.net>
Source record: 1762
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

darrell earnshaw wrote:
>
> [snip] post a subject which has absolutely
> nothing to do with the charter of the
> newsgroup. [snip] there's plenty of
> appropriate newsgroups out there [snip]

Well, Darrell, don't worry about it. Its not your job to defend the charter of this newsgroup, or to consider how appropriate the message is. So, relax, don't worry about it, and go on about your business of reading the messages in this newsgroup that do interest you.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net

1513. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 06:32:39 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <94j8i7$ns1$0@208.207.71.147>
Source record: 1763

Aaron Jones wrote:
>
> Old_Timer <oldtimer@nonsuch.net> wrote:
>
> >Does the League's newly announced substantial dues hike in these times
> >of low inflation strike anybody else as being excessive?
>
> Percentage wise it does seem high. But to gripe about $5 extra a year
> is silly. That's less than 2 cents a day...
>
> >My own feeling is that $39 per year is high for value received
>
> Too bad you can't quit... :-)

Well, I sure can. I didn't buy one of those cheap Life memberships way back when because I wasn't that sure I'd always want to be a member, based on some pretty lamebrained acts they either did or condoned. Now my membership expires in April and they keep trying to help me make up my mind whether or not I want another year.

One more mark on the negative side.

There's nothing that comes in QST that I can't find on the net. They have no visible clout with the FCC anymore. Nothing much but feel-good propaganda issues from Newington these days.

What good are they?

Hey-- I see that the BOD made Mark Wilson, the Editor of QST, the "Cheif Operating Officer", over most HQ operations. I thought that was the Executive Secretary's job. ???????????

1514. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 07:12:41 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net>
Message-ID: <3A6D2EE9.69ADA2BF@ovis.net>
Source record: 1764

Aaron Jones wrote:
>
> Old_Timer <oldtimer@nonsuch.net> wrote:
>
> >Does the League's newly announced substantial dues hike in these times
> >of low inflation strike anybody else as being excessive?
>
> Percentage wise it does seem high. But to gripe about $5 extra a year
> is silly. That's less than 2 cents a day...
>
> >My own feeling is that $39 per year is high for value received
>
> Too bad you can't quit... :-)

Percentage-wise, it IS high. If you look at what inflation has been since 1997 when the League last upped the cost of yearly dues, it is outrageous. I think most folks would gripe about five bucks out of their pockets when they get nothing additional for the fiver. If it is such a small amount, why doesn't the League cut the present dues by five bucks per year. After all, it is only five dollars--a mere 2 cents per day ;)

I could quit but I'm paid up for life and I'm not finished living yet. Besides, you know the old saw: I can do more to change the ARRL from within than from the outside.

For one thing, I can air my gripes here.

Dave K8MN

1515. Re: FCC Proposal for New Novice Class License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 07:24:53 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net>
Message-ID: <3A6D31C5.D8F4C50F@ovis.net>
Source record: 1765

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <itoo6t8iuua5ons5gf65vba0efa58omqbs@4ax.com>, Jim Weir
> <jim@rst-engr.com> writes:
>
> >w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI)
> >shared these priceless pearls of wisdom:
> >
> >->The only problem with that is you don't own the ball. :-)
> >
> >Ed, mostly I agree with you. In this case, I suggest that you go back and
> >reread the document that begins, "We the people..." to figure out whether or
> >not
> >we own the ball and have given the temporary right to make the rules of the
> >ball
> >game so long as the rulemakers are in accord with our collective wishes.
>
> Interesting philosophy there. Except...who are the "we" in
> "we the people?"
>
> I can understand that the "we" includes only already-licensed
> radio amateurs since so many have declared their "collective
> wishes" in regard to such a rigid maintenance of the status quo.
> Still others express "collective wishes" as if the entire "amateur
> community" were a form of lodge hall or fraternity (or even
> sorority) and insist on obtaining a license _first_ before being
> able to voice anything in regards to license testing matters.
>
> The FCC is the only US civil radio agency that regulates US
> civil radio and the only group that issues amateur radio
> licenses to civilians. The FCC has stated more than once,
> including in their Handbook, that they exist for and will hear
> from all US citizens. On and about any US civil radio
> service.
>
> I sense an interesting dichotomy in this newsgroup. It is
> almost exclusively a forum for already-licensed radio
> amateurs with many of those having a very rigid rule of
> conduct not only on obeying the law of regulations but
> also of strict obediance to obeying a non-law of traditional
> conformity to everything in and about the "amateur
> community." The other side of this dichotomous state
> is repeated attempts to dissuade, bar, and generally
> disfavor any non-amateur from expressing any thought

> on the subject of or regulations regarding amateurs.
> That other side is quite contrary to the US Consititution
> in its Preamble which begins "We, the People..."

For Pete's sake, Len. You've been babbling here for years and many might like to dissuade you, it hasn't yet worked. No one can bar you from expressing your opinions even if we don't share them or like them. I, for one, reserve the right to call you a fat head if I disagree with your views. That's the other side of free speech. Being able to tell you that I think you bring little to the table is MY right.

> There is no "political correctness" nor any "sensitivity
> to any weak" individuals or anything else to this other
> side of the dichotomy. It is simply against the principles
> of the Constitution. It smacks of a fraternal order which
> wishes to go against the US Constitution, not quite
> illegal but as close as one can get to it without having
> codification in law.

Where is it mandated that I must be any more "politically correct" in putting forth my disagreement with something you might have written? Political correctness is another way of dancing around what one really means. Folks are worried today about damaging the self esteem of another. I'm not worried about your self esteem, Len. I would be most interested in hearing you explain how the amateur radio service is doing anything close to illegality or against the principles espoused in the U.S. Constitution in disageeing with the views of Leonard Anderson.

> It would seem that this "other side" attitude is a good
> bar against other US citizens desires, of any kind, in
> getting or even attempting to get into US amateur radio.
> That attitude is not good for much of a future or even
> help from the single US civil radio regulation agency.
>
> It is as if there were a separate "declaration of
> independence" that is "signed" by all on completing a
> US amateur radio test as if they are distinct from and
> independent of the US Constitution and any
> democratic principles.

Wrap yourself in the flag and get up on that soapbox, Len. Strike a pose while I snap a photo. I'm sure that Ed can arrange to have it appear in an upcoming issue of QST.

> Just an observation from someone who believes in and
> once took a serious oath to defend the United States
> Constitution with his life if needs be.
>
> didit

Oh my...

Dave K8MN

1516. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 08:06:33 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3A6D3B42.DDC1F155@sccoast.net>
Source record: 1766

Cecil wrote:
>
> A pet peeve of mine is when someone
> is 20 over 9 on SSB and asks, "QSL?"
> I usually say, "No, I don't have any
> QSL cards". :-)

There always has to be a comedian in every group. :-)

There is a guy around here who says "QSL" all the time. Its not that
he can't hear, he's just too drunk to understand what anyone is saying.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net

1517. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 08:09:00 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3A6D3BD5.795876B7@sccoast.net>
Source record: 1767

W4JLE wrote:
>
> Dwight, as I posted earlier, I don't care
> what words you use as long as they are
> ones that a person would say in front of
> their mother (assuming she is not a Jerry
> Apringet reject)

I'm not sure that I would say anything in front of my mother. She has
to be the most opinionated person in the world (critical of everything).
She cannot even stand herself. :-)

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net

1518. Re: CA power crisis caused by internet

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 08:29:34 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <94jfdebmb0@208.207.71.147>
Source record: 1768

Phil Kane wrote:
>
> On 21 Jan 2001 22:30:46 GMT, Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> >On the other hand, maybe you could "reactivate" that CW
> >net into the LAPD...you know, the one the LAPD didn't
> >know about until you "revealed" it to everyone? :-)
>
> LAPD wasn't the California node - CHP Sacramento was. I saw
> the station in 1963 but it was out of service by then.
>

According the APCO (Associated Police Communications Officers) manual for 1945 (which I have before me) the Los Angles PD at that time had a radiotelegraph station that operated on the frequencies of 5135, 5140, 7808 and 7935 kc, operating under the callsign KGPL.
I find no mention of radiotelegraph capability at CHP Sacremento in the 1945 manual. BUT- evidently considerable change took place by 1951, as shown in the '51 issue of the APCO manual, which I also have. It shows PD Los Angeles active on channels 'A' through 'I', with the callsign KMA89.
Channel A was 2804 kc, B = 2808, C=2812, D = 5195, E = 5135, F = 5140, G = 7935, H = 7805, and I = 7480 kcs.
The 1951 APCO Handbook edition also shows CHP Sacremento with the exact same capability, under the callsign KMA25. Both stations were licensed for interzone (outstate) traffic handling, and were the only California stations so licensed.
I know that at some later time the interstate traffic contact point was assigned to CHP SACTO, no doubt by agreement beteen the agencies. But, contrary to the belief held so dearly by Mr. L.H. Anderson, Los Angeles PD did indeed use a radiotelegraph station to handle important traffic pertaining to the police business well into the second half of the twentyth century. And you were right - SACTO was the CW node for California, solely later in the era.
As was the case in some heavier populated states, California had a in-state teletype system that distributed the outstate traffic recieved by CHP SACTO. Any traffic routed out of state also had to be teletyped back to SACTO who then placed it onto the CW net for out of state routing. I'm sure the volume of in-state traffic handled justified the statewide tty system.

In contrast my state used CW at each of the nine district stations, each of which could communicate direct to other states, even to SACTO, usually via the relay station at Flagstaff, AZ. The CW net was replaced by TTY in Missouri in 1964, and the CW gear ate the station where I

worked was uninstalled in late 1965/early 66. Flagstaff remained in operation until around 1972, according to a ham who was a former operator there. See:

http://www.metronet.com/~nmcewen/police_radio.html

As an old street cop that may be of interest to you if you haven't already read it.
And the MHP HQ station relayed CW interstate traffic for other states until about that time. I was later a part of the technical crew that removed all the CW gear from the state HQ station in 1975. By '69 we in Mo. had a computer terminal at the operating console.(It was an early RCA, but it worked quite well).

Another contrast. Visiting in Fresno in 1980, I noticed a CHP District Office nearby and decided to pay the radio staff a visit, and look over the operation.
What I found made me glad I lived and worked in the Midwest.
Discussing operations and conditions with the non-uniformed personel (I was uniformed), I learned that my salary was at least 50% higher than theirs, they were not career personnel, (one was a retired bomber pilot, another a sheriff deputy's wife, etc). I asked what level of FCC license they were required to hold (we all held either first or second phone) and they asked "What's that?" When I asked them how they made an NCIC check, they pointed to an ancient TTY terminal over in the corner of the room - they had to send a TTY message to SACTO, where it was entered into the computer system, and the answer returned in the reverse, time consuming fashion. At home I had the keyboard and screen in front of me and got very quick responses.

I came away disappointed.

Dick

1519. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 08:43:06 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <94jg6q$c9b$0@208.207.71.147>
Source record: 1769

Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> > In article <94hlunnhg1@nnrp1.deja.com>, K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org> writes:
> > >Hey, I'll go back! In 1958 I was a college freshman, and Peggy Sue
> > >Loudermilk (with a body to make a Baptist preacher sweat) was a regular
> > >visitor in the back seat of my 51 Pontiac hardtop.
>
> > That's unfortunate. According to a popular website for alumni,
> > story has it that the lady died in 1960 from complications of
> > an STD. Must be a different Peggy Sue...
>
> Tacky.

Typical.

1520. Re: Black helicopters (WAS:Re: No-code kills)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 08:45:35 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010123034535.00714.00003619@nso-md.aol.com>
Source record: 1770

In article <94hol9$q30$2@nnrp1.deja.com>, K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org> writes:

>
>OOOOOPPPPPS -- BREAKING NEWS FLASH!!!!
>
>Due to recent budget cuts at ARRL headquarters there are no longer
>any black helicopters or jack booted thugs on the ARRL payroll. Also,
>the mind control device was recently reposessed by the Newington bank.

Hansl:

Don't look now, but the ARRL just upped membership dues. The
black helicopters are back in the budget. Just wish they'd get a
few Black V-22 Ospreys!

73 de Larry, K3LT

1521. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 09:53:19 UTC
From: Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com>
Message-ID: <3A6D548F.F7835EFA@dvol.com>
Source record: 1771

Len Over 21 wrote:

>
> >> understand if troubleshooting does not appear to be worth learning in
> >> today's radio environment.
> >
> >It's not and I find that frustrating.
>
> There's a truism there. Given the inherent reliability of today's
> semiconductor and passive components, failure rates are
> very low compared to vacuum tube days.

>
I agree with that but the other side of it is the explosion of the parts count, you know how that goes. I have a somewhat elderly Icom 2m FM mobile xcvr, the two incandescent dial lamps burned out. With the help of a thread I launched in .equipment which drew a half dozen posts I tracked down the lamps and was told I should expect to be a soddering arn micro-neurosurgeon for an hour if I try to replace the lamps myself. Two lousy little panel lamps. Screw it, I'm using a flashlight. Ask me if I'm ever gonna dive into my ten-gazzilion junction HF xcvrs.
>

> Troubleshooting _inside_ a box isn't needed by today's amateur
> radio operators. But, they should be able to troubleshoot
> things _outside_ the boxes. Hopefully, some will learn to
> measure the performance of their ready-builts to stay within
> regulations' technical requirements.

>
The only of those which really matter are very rarely encountered spurious outputs and garbaged signals, easy to check with the spectrum anlayzers we have today which didn't exist back then. But it's still back to the shop to get it fixed.
>

>
> didit

>
w3rv

1522. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 09:54:14 UTC
From: Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com>
Message-ID: <3A6D54C6.3F811705@dvol.com>
Source record: 1772

Old_Timer wrote:

> Does the League's newly announced substantial dues hike in these times
> of low inflation strike anybody else as being excessive?
>
> I noted Dave Sumner's talk of the ARRL being involved in the kinds of
> things which dues and publication sales would not cover. My feeling is
> that there is little that the League should be doing which could not be
> covered by dues and publication sales.

>
"Feelings" don't count. Only the dollars and cents budgeting & accounting
spreadsheets count and those have not been posted here, we don't have a
clue.
>

> My own feeling is that $39 per year is high for value received since the
> League already charges now for services which were formerly provided at
> no cost to members. QST is almost void of good articles these days.
> There is a dearth of technical content.

>
QEX.
>
>Contest covereage
>
NCJ
>
>and DX news
>
DX news in any monthly magazine is useless, it's at least six weeks stale.
I get the ARRL DX bulletin every week. Beats the hell outta the Yellow
Sheets and it comes along free with the membership.
>
I'm sure the satellite guys, the NTS crowd and whoever are also grousing
about "inadequate" coverage of their personal hot buttons. It's unreasonable
to expect to pack "adequate" coverage of every niche specialty in as diverse
a hobby as ham radio into one magazine for forty bucks a month dues. QST
does a decent job of going down the middle, end of.
>

> are minimal. If I wasn't already a life member I'd have think hard to
> come up with enough reasons to justify renewal.

>
Fifteen years ago when I was into ultralight aviation I was paying $40/yr

for a 35-40 page newsprint rag published by an FAA Part 105 advocacy group which never accomplished anything for all practical purposes. Back when a maxed-out Honda Civic was $7,500. Eleven cents a day is cheap for what the ARRL does for us.
>
Yeah, I should have bought a life membership when they were $150.
>

> Dave Heil K8MN

>
w3rv

1523. Re: Will you let them take away your guns?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 11:13:20 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <94jp0chiq1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1773

In article <94j741$k2a$1@208.207.71.147>,
Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>
>
> Jim Kelley wrote:
> >
> > Brian wrote:
> > > I don't think he realized the gravity of that oath. And unless
> > > he's revoked it, it probably still stands.
> >
> > What ever are you talking about Brian?
>
> Is he babbling again so soon?
>
Apparently we have another one who babbled through his oath.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1524. Re: Will you let them take away your guns?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 11:17:57 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <94jp92$hs5$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1774

In article <94j7ad$k2a$2@208.207.71.147>,
Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>
>
> Jim Kelley wrote:
I guess
> > your guys will be wearing the Red Man ball caps and the other guys
will
> > be wearing the Pro-Choice t-shirts, right? ;-)
>
> Larry can always drag out an old illfitting uniform...
>

A Red Man baseball cap hardly constitutes a uniform. However, we would
all love to see you in your old ill-fitting uniform at Dayton, Dick.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1525. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 11:38:17 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010123063817.12166.00000951@ng-cd1.aol.com>
Source record: 1775

>From: Dick Carroll

>Hey-- I see that the BOD made Mark Wilson, the Editor of QST, the "Cheif
>Operating Officer", over most HQ operations. I thought that was the
>Executive Secretary's job.

Dave Sumner will continue to be Mark's boss.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1526. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 11:39:28 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010123063928.12166.00000952@ng-cd1.aol.com>
Source record: 1776

>From: Dave Heil k8mn@ovis.net

>For one thing, I can air my gripes here.

If you now live in WV, you should also air your gripes with Dennis Bodson, the Roanoke Division Director.

See http://www.arrl.org/divisions

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1527. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 11:42:57 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010123064257.12166.00000953@ng-cd1.aol.com>
Source record: 1777

>From: "W4JLE" Fred@w4jle.com

>Ed, serious for once, Most TV stations are required to air Public service
>announcements.

See http://www.arrl.org/pio for a general description of ARRL's media-public relations program. Info about the PSAs that ARRL provided to TV and radio stations is included.

> I would be glad to do a bit of research as to what is involved with the
> PSA's if any interest at Hdq.

If you have any suggestions about how the PSAs could be improved, send them to Jennifer Hagy at the address on the PIO web page.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1528. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 11:53:40 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010123065340.12166.00000954@ng-cd1.aol.com>
Source record: 1778

>From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

>Just exactly how "slow" a "learner" should we hams tolerate?

I don't know. What time limit does Part 97 place on learning?

> When told, once, that use of terms like "handle" and "personal" are not
>generally accepted on the amateur radio airwaves, how many
>infractions must be permitted before the newcomer can be "set
>straight" in no uncertain terms (preferably off-the-air)?

What does Part 97 have to say about such "infractions?" What does the US constitution have to say about such infractions? I think that 99% of those who use the "wrong" lingo on the ham bands will come around on their own; I feel no need to "set them straight."

> To use a different example, how many "yield" signs must be posted at one
>intersection to actually induce the behavior of making the motorist
>yield to oncoming traffic?

Yield signs are a matter of law. What is the law about the use of the word "personal" instead of "name?"

> Obviously, a reasonably fast learner will
only need one; but you apparently
> seem to advocate an unlimited number of "yield" signs at each intersection,
right?

I advocate that the number of yield signs can be determined by law. You advocate that the choice of words people use should be determined by your personal tastes in what you want to hear. Which one of us is on higher moral ground, Larry. Do you think I should be be able to "set straight" those who excerise their right wrt other parts of our Constitution? Why do you think that the right to bear arms is sacred yet the right of free speech is sacred, as long as you don't hear a word you don't like in a particular context?

>To which I would reply, "Be my guest -- don't let the door hit you in
>the ass on the way out!" But getting back to this "caring, sharing
>community" crap, Ed, just what *was* Mother Teresa's call sign?

Hmmm, is that sorta' like "politically correct?" I guess I have a bit more faith in hamdom that you, do, Larry. I hope you are not surprised that you have only a handful of loyal followers...

>Neither did I, Ed, because I made relatively few "gaffs" (sic).

:-) LOL. I think I will end it on that note. It says more than I ever could. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1529. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 11:58:05 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010123065805.12166.00000955@ng-cd1.aol.com>
Source record: 1779

>From: Brian Kelly kelly@dvol.com

>I can't imagine why the ham demograpics would be so different.

I can't either, Brian; Manchester was a typical middle class town. But unless other students were hams and didn't tell anyone, I know of none other than Roy, WA1DOI.

>Maybe it had something to do with the heavy concentration of the
> electronics industry around here in that timeframe.

That might explain it; the Hartford area was primarily insurance. The main industry was aerospace, with the emphasis on aero. My dad worked at Pratt and Whitney, a major manufacturer of jet engines.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1530. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 12:03:06 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010123070306.12166.00000956@ng-cd1.aol.com>
Source record: 1780

>Percentages are for insurance companies. In an emergency you would
>HOPE to have cellular service.

Not in the boat that is sinking in the middle of the Atlantic.

> Anyone who has been on emergencies knows that half of the newfangled
> gadgets are worthless in an emergency.

I have not read much in the press about the failure of emergency devices in
emergencies. Do we need a media coverup to make this all plausible?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

>Like laptops and multi-mode controllers that take way
>too long to set up and require a pile of support cables and interfaces
>to get going, only to have something's batteries go dead.

What emergency system requires the use of a laptop and support cables?

>Also, many people seem to think that ham radio is financially
>prohibitive. You can be a real ham and make lots of contacts with a
>homebrew CW QRP rig

Really? :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1531. Re: "They oughta require a license....blah, blah, blah"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 12:06:40 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010123070640.12166.00000957@ng-cd1.aol.com>
Source record: 1781

>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)

>800 bucks doesn't sound "economical" to the average amateur or does it?

How much does the average ham station cost? That might provide a reasonable
scale by which to answer your question.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1532. Re: FCC Proposal for New Novice Class License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 12:09:49 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010123070949.12166.00000958@ng-cd1.aol.com>
Source record: 1782

>From: horseshoestew@my-deja.com

>> EVERYONE has stated and reiterated that the Technician Class is about
>> the easiest license to get in Ham Radio history.

>The old Novice was the easiest.

As unexpected as it is, you are correct and "everyone" is wrong. That mid 60s Novice was as simple a test as I could imagine. (If anyone missed the post on the ARRL study guide for the Novice, email me at w1rfi@arrl.net; I will send you a copy). The study guide had 39 questions. There were no questions on antennas, feed lines propagation of any electronics past Ohm's law. I laugh my self nearly to death when I see people post they the Tech test is dumbed down from the good old days. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1533. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 12:14:03 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010123071403.12166.00000959@ng-cd1.aol.com>
Source record: 1783

>From: Brian Kelly kelly@dvol.com

>The only of those which really matter are very rarely encountered spurious
>outputs and garbaged signals, easy to check with the spectrum anlayzers we
>have today which didn't exist back then.

Very few hams have a spectrum analyzer.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1534. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 12:15:14 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010123071514.12166.00000960@ng-cd1.aol.com>
Source record: 1784

>From: Aaron Jones nomail@nomail.com

>>Although it is possible to do more troubleshooting on today's rigs
>> than most hams will admit to,

>Easy for an engineer to say, especially a professional ham engineer... :-)

Read the Handbook chapter on troubleshooting, post 1994.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1535. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 12:16:46 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010123071646.12166.00000961@ng-cd1.aol.com>
Source record: 1785

>From: Aaron Jones nomail@nomail.com

>>Maybe I can help you learn the concepts, Aaron.
>>Doing so is a lot easier than memorizing. :-)

>I don't think so Ed. That's why Bash was so popular (with
>me and lots of others)... :-)

To each his own, Aaron. Do you think the fellow who asked the question about meters vs frequency found it easier to memorize all those frequency vs meters or to use 300/F?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1536. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 12:20:33 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010123072033.12166.00000962@ng-cd1.aol.com>
Source record: 1786

>From: Aaron Jones nomail@nomail.com

> agree. But the percentage of non-technical hams as compared to the
>total ham population is vastly higher today than it was in the 50's
>and 60's, don't you agree?

I am not sure that I do, Aaron. The scope of the tests is a lot more than it
was in the 50s and 60s. What impact does that have?

I think the real question to ask is what percentage of the US population were
"technical hams" in 1960 as compared to the percentage of US population that
are "technical hams" today?

>Do you think this downward curve of technical hams will ever turn
> upwards again?

It will if I can help it. :-) The ARRL Tech Info pages at
http://www.arrl.org/tis are pretty popular.

>If not the curve will eventually approach zero...

Might even go negative? :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1537. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 12:25:36 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010123072536.12166.00000963@ng-cd1.aol.com>
Source record: 1787

>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)

>>And I will toss in all of the 2000 year issues of QST! I'll even sign the
>>March "QRP" issue for you. :-)

>Gosh, a surfeit of treasures! Thank you much, Ed, but I don't
>need DX contest result listings.

Do you want me to cut them out or can you just skip reading them. Typically
about 6 pages or so per issue.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1538. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 13:32:24 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010123083224.12159.00000895@ng-cd1.aol.com>
Source record: 1788

>From: Brian Kelly kelly@dvol.com

>"Feelings" don't count. Only the dollars and cents budgeting & accounting
>spreadsheets count and those have not been posted here, we don't have a
>clue.

I don't have the details on the budget proposal, other than the Lab budget. But I do know that the decision has been reached over the past year to add more staff. The ones that I feel are most valuable are being added to address what I have seen as problems that the ARRL needed to address.

One staffer added late last year is someone to work on developing "in-house" news. I have seen again and again where someone at ARRL HQ has done something valuable and important for amateur radio, and not told anyone other than his boss. That "someone" has all too often been me.

Just as an example from my own work, I think that ARRL has been negligent in not telling its members that the ARRL RFI Task Group met in Allentown, PA and made a recommendation that ARRL staff investigate illegal Part 15 devices that operate in our ham bands and to select some cases to take to the FCC. (One of several action items.) I actually wrote up part of that meeting, but got on to other things.

Those other things included the tests that I did with some representatives from HomePlug on the home-networking products they are developing to use residential electrical wiring in homes to network computers. Ditto on similar work with the Home Phone Networking Alliance and the VDSL standards committees. I have this partially written up, too, but just can't find the time to put it all together.
That in-house reporter is starting to do just that, filling in the gaps in what I am able to and can find the time to do. IMHO, ARRL members have a right to know these things and I feel that ARRL has not communicated with its members as well as it should. That staffer is one way to address it. Right thing to do, or should I do a few less things and take more time to tell folks about them, or keep the lines of communcation closed? I think the League has been negligent in not reporting these things and I hope to see improvements.

The Education and Certification program was added last year, as well. With all of the real and perceived inadequacies of the testing process, it is important that hams have as many ways to learn as possible. ARRL already publishes a lot of good books, but those who are going to learn on their own from books are already doing so. A more formal approach was wanted by some, and some documentation of the demonstrated abilities of hams will be an added plus.

The ARRL Web page has been increased by quite a scope over the past years. Do hams use it? Should the League stop adding to the Tech info pages? I could let

the Tech Info Coordinator go to help pay for the staff I am adding to help with the growing problem of RFI to hams. Who wants to make the choice?

These are just a few examples; I can't supply all the details for things outside the Lab, but wanted to offer a snapshot of some of the reasons that more funding is being sought. I do recall that for this year, the budget is not balanced. There is some investment in the future; the future of doing more things for the overall benefit of ham radio (RFI, education) and some investment in staff that will help develop other sources of revenue that will help the ARRL do more without having to tap into the membership with dues increases.

What I don't think is fair to ARRL members is that much of this increase is to fund things that are not individual membership benefits but are for the overall good of Amateur Radio. They are being done for all hams, but are being paid for by those who are willing to pony up dues dollars every year. I hope that the realization that supporting things like the RFI program and education and Jim Haynie's Big Project and other things IS important will bring in those who are now standing on the outside.

I pay over $100 a year to belong to the IEEE. I pay over $30 a year for some of my non-ham magazine subscriptions. I will gladly pay this dues increase as well, as long as the League comes through on its promises to do those things it is setting out to do. And tells me about them. Even working at HQ, I find out things long after the fact sometimes. :-)

Actually, I just realized, I have put off the devil a bit on the dues increase. I just renewed my membership for 3 years, at the current rate (plus a multi-year discount). The dues increase is going to go in effect in July, so if you renew before then, you can get in at today's rate. Maybe by the time you have to pay the higher rate, you will decide it is worth it. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1539. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 14:10:08 UTC
From: "Leland C. Scott" <no-spam@junk-mail.net>
Message-ID: <t6r46410u1fse4@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 1789

"Larry Klose" <lklose@net-link.net> wrote in message
news:3a6d0749$0$30009$44a10c7e@news.net-link.net...
> WHEREAS, since the 1950s there has been a great influx of other
technologies
> that have gradually reduced the need for trained Morse operators outside
the
> Amateur services; and
>
> WHEREAS, the aeronautical-mobile and maritime-mobile applications of Morse
> have been or are being terminated throughout the world; and
>
> WHEREAS, there is an agenda item for the 2003 World Radiocommunication
> Conference to consider Article S25; and
>
> WHEREAS, it is highly likely that administrations will delete the Morse
code
> requirement in Article S25 at WRC2003; and
>

> FURTHER RESOLVED, that deletion of the requirement from Article S25 should
> not automatically or immediately mean a similar removal of the Morse code
> from Part 97 of the FCC rules; and be it
>
> FURTHER RESOLVED, that each administration should determine if Morse code
is
> retained as a testing element; and be it
>
> FURTHER RESOLVED, it is the opinion of this Board at this time that Morse
> code should be retained as a testing element in the U.S.; and be it

Looks like the ARRL has its collective head still firmly planted in the
past. Time to write my division director again.

--
Leland C. Scott
KC8LDO

1540. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 14:11:20 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <3A6D9108.DC6FB3CB@arrl.org>
Source record: 1790

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> Aaron Jones wrote:
> >
> > Old_Timer <oldtimer@nonsuch.net> wrote:
> >
> > >Does the League's newly announced substantial dues hike in these times
> > >of low inflation strike anybody else as being excessive?
> >
> > Percentage wise it does seem high. But to gripe about $5 extra a year
> > is silly. That's less than 2 cents a day...
> >
> > >My own feeling is that $39 per year is high for value received
> >
> > Too bad you can't quit... :-)
>
> Percentage-wise, it IS high. If you look at what inflation has been
> since 1997 when the League last upped the cost of yearly dues, it is
> outrageous.

Huh? The new rate represents a per-annum increase of about 3%.

> I think most folks would gripe about five bucks out of
> their pockets when they get nothing additional for the fiver.

For the past few years ARRL has been increasing some direct services to members and dramatically increasing expenditures in advocacy areas, as threats to amateur spectrum rise. During that time there has been no dues increase. Now one is needed in order to maintain and increase those activities. In other words, the dues increase is in part to help offset the costs of benefits -- direct and indirect -- that have already been added, and in part to help fund future increased activity. (Such as a new Lab employee to help Ed Hare with EMI/RFI matters.)

The statement that "they get nothing additional" simply overlooks the additions that have already been made and those that are planned.

Jon

1541. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 14:39:17 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <94k52j$r9g$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1791

Old_Timer <oldtimer@nonsuch.net> wrote:

> Since he was a part of the inner circle for a while, perhaps Hans can
> share his views on the announced increase in ARRL dues.

Thanks for the 5H3US QSL that recently arrived.

My views on the increase? Cheap at twice the price.

I am constantly amazed at the amount of work that my membership dues accomplish for amateur radio. Many of the programs of ARRL benefit all amateurs, not just members, so I accept the fact that my dues help fund things beyond the benefits which accrue to me individually. Sort of like if AAA Members (rather than all vehicle owners) funded highway maintenance in my state.

73, de Hans, K0HB
--
"We are fellow travelers on a journey between two
eternities, and it's a trip far too brief for me
to be concerned about your speed at the Code of
Morse."

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1542. Re: 10 bucks buys a ham license.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 14:44:04 UTC
From: sjwoodr@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <94k5bhrfe1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1792
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <9488ancrm1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
LRod <lr0d@my-deja.com> wrote:
> Hmmm. I know a lot of those guys. I ran exams just down the river from
> them in Aurora. In fact, the guy that started the testing group up
there
> years ago and I were both with DeVry VEC originally. I can't remember
> callsigns, since I've moved, but there must have been some turnover
that
> leaves some uninformed VEs, because the guy I know wouldn't do that or
> train his people to do that. Sorry.
> <snip>

I sent an email to the VE and he offered to let me take
the extra class exam in February for free. That's fair
enough for me; it gives me more time to study!

--steve

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1543. Re: Black helicopters (WAS:Re: No-code kills)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 14:52:08 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <94k5qjrvl1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1793

In article <20010123034535.00714.00003619@nso-md.aol.com>,
yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote:
> In article <94hol9$q30$2@nnrp1.deja.com>, K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org> writes:
>
> >
> >OOOOOPPPPPS -- BREAKING NEWS FLASH!!!!
> >
> >Due to recent budget cuts at ARRL headquarters there are no longer
> >any black helicopters or jack booted thugs on the ARRL payroll.
> >Also, the mind control device was recently reposessed by the
> >Newington bank.
>
> Hansl:
>
> Don't look now, but the ARRL just upped membership dues. The
> black helicopters are back in the budget.

Hey, great! And do they have any openings for jack-booted thugs?
You and I could apply. I'm sure Cecil and Brian would give us
glowing recommendations.

73, Hansl
15th Degree JBT
--
Blessed are the meek, for they make great scapegoats.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1544. Re: FCC Proposal for New Novice Class License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 16:03:02 UTC
From: "Steven J Robeson", K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <94k9vf$1c$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1799

In article <20010123005010.14870.00001094@nso-fr.aol.com>,
lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:

> Just an observation from someone who believes in and
> once took a serious oath to defend the United States
> Constitution with his life if needs be.

But it reads more like diatribe from someone who can't get his
way, therefore will find ANY excuse to denigriate and antagonize those
whom he hold's responsible for HIS angst.

You're just a creep with an attitude, Anderson. Every once in a
while you start to act human, but then you slide right back into
the "all Hams are brownshirts" routine.

You change the tune from time to time, but the lyrics are the same.

--
"If You're Not A Ham....You're SPAM!"

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1545. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 16:04:17 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <pZhb6.1119$e5.2789975@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 1795

Leland C. Scott <no-spam@junk-mail.net> wrote:

> > FURTHER RESOLVED, it is the opinion of this Board at this time that Morse
> > code should be retained as a testing element in the U.S.; and be it

> Looks like the ARRL has its collective head still firmly planted in the
> past. Time to write my division director again.

Isn't the statement really saying that the ARRL is not seeking to change the US regulations at this time? It will be at least 4 years away before the FCC would even consider a change, looking at the timing of the WRC and estimating the amount of time it will take to ratify the treaty. I think that it is premature to set a policy now on a matter that cannot be changed now and that can be decided better when something specific can be put on the plate. A lot can change in the membership, in Amateur Radio and in the makeup of the Board in the intervening 4 years. It is, IMHO, up to a future Board to change or affirm its policy wrt US regulations when it appears that it is time to act. The present policy simply does not change the status quo wrt the ARRL policy on US requirements. Considering that no change in policy can effect any change in US regulations, I think the Board made a reasonable choice.

The Board dealt with the international treaty now because now is when the decisions need to be made.

IMHO, of course.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1546. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 16:06:47 UTC
From: Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com>
Message-ID: <3A6DAC17.A022F748@dvol.com>
Source record: 1796

W1RFI wrote:

> >From: Brian Kelly kelly@dvol.com
>
> >"Feelings" don't count. Only the dollars and cents budgeting & accounting
> >spreadsheets count and those have not been posted here, we don't have a
> >clue.
>
> I don't have the details on the budget proposal, other than the Lab budget.
> But I do know that the decision has been reached over the past year to add more
> staff. The ones that I feel are most valuable are being added to address what
> I have seen as problems that the ARRL needed to address.
>
> One staffer added late last year is someone to work on developing "in-house"
> news. I have seen again and again where someone at ARRL HQ has done something
> valuable and important for amateur radio, and not told anyone other than his
> boss. That "someone" has all too often been me.

>
Hmmm . . mixed reaction here to that one. I've been involved with much bigger and scattered industrial operations which have in-house infranet webs which do a pretty good job of keeping everybody up to speed, departments & individuals have web pages, etc. Of course you wind up with at least one IS person and they don't come for free.
>

> Just as an example from my own work, I think that ARRL has been negligent in
> not telling its members that the ARRL RFI Task Group met in Allentown, PA and
> made a recommendation that ARRL staff investigate illegal Part 15 devices that
> operate in our ham bands and to select some cases to take to the FCC. (One of
> several action items.) I actually wrote up part of that meeting, but got on to
> other things.
>
> Those other things included the tests that I did with some representatives from
> HomePlug on the home-networking products they are developing to use residential
> electrical wiring in homes to network computers. Ditto on similar work with
> the Home Phone Networking Alliance and the VDSL standards committees. I have
> this partially written up, too, but just can't find the time to put it all
> together.

>
Simple overload situation which managers get paid to resolve, buck it upstairs for the money decisions. Which is what the BOD just rendered.
>

>
> That in-house reporter is starting to do just that, filling in the gaps in what
> I am able to and can find the time to do. IMHO, ARRL members have a right to
> know these things and I feel that ARRL has not communicated with its members as
> well as it should. That staffer is one way to address it. Right thing to do,
> or should I do a few less things and take more time to tell folks about them,
> or keep the lines of communcation closed?

>
Tough call because you can't hang a dollars & cents value on it like you can in a
commercial operation. All ya can do it try it.

> I think the League has been negligent
> in not reporting these things and I hope to see improvements.

>
That should be SOP for a non-profit, not a good idea to keep the dues-payers in the
dark about the dollars. But then that opens up the prospect for members nit-picking
expenses.
>

>
> The Education and Certification program was added last year, as well. With all
> of the real and perceived inadequacies of the testing process, it is important
> that hams have as many ways to learn as possible. ARRL already publishes a lot
> of good books, but those who are going to learn on their own from books are
> already doing so. A more formal approach was wanted by some, and some
> documentation of the demonstrated abilities of hams will be an added plus.

>
Lost me on that one.
>

> The ARRL Web page has been increased by quite a scope over the past years. Do
> hams use it? Should the League stop adding to the Tech info pages? I could let
> the Tech Info Coordinator go to help pay for the staff I am adding to help with
> the growing problem of RFI to hams. Who wants to make the choice?

>
Yeah, hams use it, I log on several times a month.
>

> These are just a few examples; I can't supply all the details for things
> outside the Lab, but wanted to offer a snapshot of some of the reasons that
> more funding is being sought. I do recall that for this year, the budget is not
> balanced. There is some investment in the future; the future of doing more
> things for the overall benefit of ham radio (RFI, education) and some
> investment in staff that will help develop other sources of revenue that will
> help the ARRL do more without having to tap into the membership with dues
> increases.

>
Works for me.
>

> What I don't think is fair to ARRL members is that much of this increase is to
> fund things that are not individual membership benefits but are for the overall
> good of Amateur Radio.

>
If nobody is tending the overall flock eventually there won't be a flock.
>

> They are being done for all hams, but are being paid
> for by those who are willing to pony up dues dollars every year. I hope that
> the realization that supporting things like the RFI program and education and
> Jim Haynie's Big Project and other things IS important will bring in those who
> are now standing on the outside.

>
Unfortunately 20% of the flock paying the whole freight bill is very typical of
regulated hobby advocacy groups. Private avaition has the same problem and there
isn't anything anybody can do about it. Freeloaders is freeloaders.
>

>
> I pay over $100 a year to belong to the IEEE.

>
And they still nail you to the wall for standards and other publications. The ASME
Boiler Code was $3k last time I looked. For an unbound stack of paper.
>

> I pay over $30 a year for some
> of my non-ham magazine subscriptions. I will gladly pay this dues increase as
> well, as long as the League comes through on its promises to do those things it
> is setting out to do. And tells me about them. Even working at HQ, I find out
> things long after the fact sometimes. :-)

>
Spend more time hanging on the water cooler. Heh.
>

> Actually, I just realized, I have put off the devil a bit on the dues increase.
> I just renewed my membership for 3 years, at the current rate (plus a
> multi-year discount). The dues increase is going to go in effect in July, so
> if you renew before then, you can get in at today's rate. Maybe by the time
> you have to pay the higher rate, you will decide it is worth it. :-)

>
It's worth it no matter what -within limits - I do the three year option myself and
I'm gonna tack on another three shortly.
>

> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

>
w3rv

1547. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 16:07:40 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net>
Message-ID: <3A6DAC4C.2A5A3580@ovis.net>
Source record: 1797

Brian Kelly wrote:
>
> Old_Timer wrote:
>
> > Does the League's newly announced substantial dues hike in these times
> > of low inflation strike anybody else as being excessive?
> >
> > I noted Dave Sumner's talk of the ARRL being involved in the kinds of
> > things which dues and publication sales would not cover. My feeling is
> > that there is little that the League should be doing which could not be
> > covered by dues and publication sales.
>
> >
> "Feelings" don't count. Only the dollars and cents budgeting & accounting
> spreadsheets count and those have not been posted here, we don't have a
> clue.

Feelings=perceptions and in this case perceptions of the ARRL most
certainly count. If the League desperately needs the money to do
something which appeals to the membership, a better selling job needs to
be done.
>
> > My own feeling is that $39 per year is high for value received since the
> > League already charges now for services which were formerly provided at
> > no cost to members. QST is almost void of good articles these days.
> > There is a dearth of technical content.
>
> >
> QEX.

...consists mostly of material formerly available in QST at no
additional charge.

> >Contest covereage
> >
> NCJ

...was formerly produced outside of the League. Now the League has put
much of the contest coverage formerly in QST into this rag.
> >
> >and DX news
> >
> DX news in any monthly magazine is useless, it's at least six weeks stale.

On air reports might be stale. Photos and personalities don't get
stale. News of upcoming operations would be interesting. So would

writeups of operations just completed (along with even more photos).

> I get the ARRL DX bulletin every week. Beats the hell outta the Yellow
> Sheets and it comes along free with the membership.

I'm really not discussing band activity reports. I get the e-mail
bulletin too and find it sometimes useful.

> >
> I'm sure the satellite guys, the NTS crowd and whoever are also grousing
> about "inadequate" coverage of their personal hot buttons. It's unreasonable
> to expect to pack "adequate" coverage of every niche specialty in as diverse
> a hobby as ham radio into one magazine for forty bucks a month dues. QST
> does a decent job of going down the middle, end of.

The magazine has been stripped of real content, not just in my areas of
interest (which are many). I suppose I can always read how to wire a
DPST toggle switch in "Ask The Doctor".
> >
>
> > are minimal. If I wasn't already a life member I'd have think hard to
> > come up with enough reasons to justify renewal.
>
> >
> Fifteen years ago when I was into ultralight aviation I was paying $40/yr
> for a 35-40 page newsprint rag published by an FAA Part 105 advocacy group
> which never accomplished anything for all practical purposes. Back when a
> maxed-out Honda Civic was $7,500. Eleven cents a day is cheap for what the
> ARRL does for us.

I'm happy that you're happy.

> Yeah, I should have bought a life membership when they were $150.

I got mine when it was at (I think) $275 (1977?). Wisely invested, that
money along with the money received from others who invested long term
in the ARRL should have produced a good return.

Dave K8MN

1548. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 16:08:52 UTC
From: Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com>
Message-ID: <3A6DAC94.832913EA@dvol.com>
Source record: 1798

W1RFI wrote:

>
> >Maybe it had something to do with the heavy concentration of the
> > electronics industry around here in that timeframe.
>
> That might explain it; the Hartford area was primarily insurance.

>
Never much thought about it before but that could very well have had a lot to do with it. The father of one of the two kids I was closest to was an EE manger with Philco and had been ham when he was a kid, the other's father was a Navy lab type who had a ham ticket. Dunno abt the rest. The neighborhood ham club membership was at least 3/4 Navy lab employees.
>
>The main

> industry was aerospace, with the emphasis on aero. My dad worked at Pratt and
> Whitney, a major manufacturer of jet engines.

>
I know that place well, been to the East Hartford plant several times and to the Palm Beach County facility twice. The Florida operation is mind-boggling, 50,000 acres or some such, world's largest private wildlife preserve complete with it's own 9,000 foot runway. Aerospace alligtor farm. They do the military engines including the black boxes, "by invitation only" . .

>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

>
w3rv

1549. Re: FCC Proposal for New Novice Class License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 16:09:23 UTC
From: "Steven J Robeson", K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <94kaba$f7$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1802
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.radio.family

In article <94ht4h$uh7$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
horseshoestew@my-deja.com wrote:

>>Stewart, there was not ONE post of support for your Colt class

> Not true.

What SERIOUS post supported this concept, Stewart?

>>EVERYONE has stated and reiterated that the Technician Class is about
>>the easiest license to get in Ham Radio history.

> The old Novice was the easiest.

Your OPINION, one not supported by archived facts.

72

Steve, K4YZ

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1550. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 16:09:38 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net>
Message-ID: <3A6DACC2.D7A5D203@ovis.net>
Source record: 1800

W1RFI wrote:
>
> >From: Dave Heil k8mn@ovis.net
>
> >For one thing, I can air my gripes here.
>
> If you now live in WV, you should also air your gripes with Dennis Bodson, the
> Roanoke Division Director.
>
> See http://www.arrl.org/divisions
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

Ed,

Be assured that I shall. I hope that he will be more receptive to
views of membership than former Director Kanode.

Dave K8MN

1551. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 16:16:59 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <94kaprmhj0@208.207.71.163>
Source record: 1801

Aaron Jones wrote:
> I have
> really done little but to operate in the last 30 years or so. I left
> the electronics industry in 1968 and have not kept up. The electronics
> I learned as a ham in the 50's, and in school in the 60's, and which
> employed me at Motorola for several years, still serves me well for
> hooking up a ham station in 2001. If my rig broke in the 50's or 60's
> I could fix it no matter what. Now if it's not a simple problem, it's
> back to the factory. But then how is that much different from most
> hams these days...

Exactly. Any "ordinary" ham who attempts to dig into his TS2000 which has anything more than a operational glitch that might be corrected by resetting the microprocessor, or some other minor correction, is asking for more trouble than he really wants. And the problem here is not just that hams don't commonly possess technical knowledge and skill, many do. Even electrical engineeers know that there is much more to it than technical knowledge. Skilled technicians are sent to intensive school training on specific pieces of radio equipment for thorough familarization with those specific units. Been there, done that. You need specific knowledge, specific skills and specific test equipment with the attendant experience on how to apply them all.

I would very carefully limit my incursions into my Icom 756 should it fail. I haven't been through a specific course in that transciever. That doesn't mean I wouldn't do some serious investigating to see whether or not I might be able to learn enough to fix it myself. I bought the service manual for that purpose, as I always do. I even disposed of a perfectly good IC761 because I couldn't get a service manual for it, Icom America told me it wasn't available. But there is definitely a point beyond which I would not go, and away to the factory service center it goes.

1552. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 16:20:13 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net>
Message-ID: <3A6DAF3D.DFB259F9@ovis.net>
Source record: 1803

Jon Bloom wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > Aaron Jones wrote:
> > >
> > > Old_Timer <oldtimer@nonsuch.net> wrote:
> > >
> > > >Does the League's newly announced substantial dues hike in these times
> > > >of low inflation strike anybody else as being excessive?
> > >
> > > Percentage wise it does seem high. But to gripe about $5 extra a year
> > > is silly. That's less than 2 cents a day...
> > >
> > > >My own feeling is that $39 per year is high for value received
> > >
> > > Too bad you can't quit... :-)
> >
> > Percentage-wise, it IS high. If you look at what inflation has been
> > since 1997 when the League last upped the cost of yearly dues, it is
> > outrageous.
>
> Huh? The new rate represents a per-annum increase of about 3%.

I hope some of that money finds its way into funding for remedial math
skills for you, Jon. $3.40 would be a hike of 10%. 3% would be $1.02.
Now how much would a five dollar hike be?

> > I think most folks would gripe about five bucks out of
> > their pockets when they get nothing additional for the fiver.
>
> For the past few years ARRL has been increasing some direct services to
> members and dramatically increasing expenditures in advocacy areas, as
> threats to amateur spectrum rise. During that time there has been no
> dues increase. Now one is needed in order to maintain and increase those
> activities. In other words, the dues increase is in part to help offset
> the costs of benefits -- direct and indirect -- that have already been
> added, and in part to help fund future increased activity. (Such as a
> new Lab employee to help Ed Hare with EMI/RFI matters.)
>
> The statement that "they get nothing additional" simply overlooks the
> additions that have already been made and those that are planned.

During the past few years the League has also begun charging for
services formerly included at no extra cost to membership. The price

for other services has risen dramatically.

If I have a business and find myself with fewer customers (members) and less business I don't suddenly begin an expansion program; I find ways to cut costs--maybe even terminate some employees. It is not likely that I suddenly increase the price of my products by 17 or 18 percent. The business which took such a tack would likely find itself with even fewer customers (members).

Dave K8MN

1553. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 16:26:14 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net>
Message-ID: <3A6DB0A6.64FC3B5B@ovis.net>
Source record: 1804

K0HB wrote:
>
> Old_Timer <oldtimer@nonsuch.net> wrote:
>
> > Since he was a part of the inner circle for a while, perhaps Hans can
> > share his views on the announced increase in ARRL dues.
>
> Thanks for the 5H3US QSL that recently arrived.

Glad you received it. I've been back for six months and WA8JOC is STILL
cranking out the cards. He just received direct requests for QSLs from
my J52US and 9L1US days going back to the late eighties/early nineties.
I'm still at work on the antenna farm here and am hoping that everything
will be complete some time in the spring.

> My views on the increase? Cheap at twice the price.
>
> I am constantly amazed at the amount of work that my membership dues
> accomplish for amateur radio. Many of the programs of ARRL benefit all
> amateurs, not just members, so I accept the fact that my dues help fund
> things beyond the benefits which accrue to me individually.

I think the League should do a better job of informing the membership as
to what it is doing and what the costs are.

> Sort of
> like if AAA Members (rather than all vehicle owners) funded highway
> maintenance in my state.

I'd love to see your roads. Here, the state collects the taxes and
pretty much ignores the road maintenance.

1554. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 16:28:30 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <94kbfemhj1@208.207.71.163>
Source record: 1805

Brian wrote:
>

Hopefully I won't
> suffer the kind of brain damage you did as a beginner.

I should've remembered that all that bashing your head against walls
and knashing your teeth over a simple code test did it to you long, long
ago.

1555. Re: Before responding to the Colt thread.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 16:32:16 UTC
From: "Steven J Robeson", K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <94kbmg$1ok$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1806
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <94hr7q$sn9$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
RanHefner <ranhefner@my-deja.com> wrote:

> They are
> not a hobby service in the sense that amateur radio is, but rather a
> consumer oriented radio service where you purchase and make no
> modifications to and transmit as intended with "off-the-shelf"
> equipment.

Randy, did you post this just to read your own stuff, or do you
really believe it?

I do agree in part that CB and FRS are consumer oriented services,
however the NG "alt.radio.family" and the stroies realted by "QRM" and
yourself only validate my assertion that these services are just as
much a "hobby" and Amateur Radio.

Of the shelf or not, you CANNOT convince me that the bandedge-to-
bandedge noise on 11 meters is just people using a radio as a tool for
thier business. Just taint so.

And I DO monitor FRS, especially in the ATL area, and I can tell
you that there are a LOT of people using FRS for the sake of fun with a
radio...NOT just to facilitate some other activity.

73

Steve, K4YZ

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1556. Re: VHF history (long) (was: any ideas on HOw to learn Morse

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 16:42:08 UTC
From: "Steven J Robeson", K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <94kc8v$2bh$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1808

In article <94hkq7mbo1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org> wrote:

> Deja-news has an excellent memory. Please use it to substantiate your
> allegations that there are liars on r.r.a.p.

> Good luck on this one now!

Well well...a challenge. Hmmmmmm.....This will take some
pondering. One is, what good will it do....??

Of course, I am not the only one who challenges Lennies "facts",
and I know that it requires no further re-posts of that already
stated. But if you insist.....

However, this one will cost you dinner for two at a restaurant of
MY choice, and I DON'T eat cheap. And trust me, I don't make that kind
of offer unless I am sure it's YOUR plastic that's going to be
crunching the invoice.

Game time?

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1557. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 16:47:27 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <3A6DB59F.8F8FE110@arrl.org>
Source record: 1807

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> Jon Bloom wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > Percentage-wise, it IS high. If you look at what inflation has been
> > > since 1997 when the League last upped the cost of yearly dues, it is
> > > outrageous.
> >
> > Huh? The new rate represents a per-annum increase of about 3%.
>
> I hope some of that money finds its way into funding for remedial math
> skills for you, Jon. $3.40 would be a hike of 10%. 3% would be $1.02.
> Now how much would a five dollar hike be?

Per-annum, Dave. You know, the same basis on which inflation is usually
stated.

What has been the *total* (not annual) inflation rate since 1997?

Not that adjusting for inflation is the sole factor involved. As one
example, QST postage has risen twice since 1997, for a total of
something like a 20% increase. (Don't quote me on that number since I'm
working from memory, but it's in that ballpark.) That isn't reflected in
the CPI.

> > The statement that "they get nothing additional" simply overlooks the
> > additions that have already been made and those that are planned.
>
> During the past few years the League has also begun charging for
> services formerly included at no extra cost to membership. The price
> for other services has risen dramatically.

Direct fees for some services have been added or increased, but that's
not true of others, particularly those that aren't delivered on an
individual basis. The net result has been an increase in costs that
aren't recovered by fees.

> If I have a business and find myself with fewer customers (members) and
> less business I don't suddenly begin an expansion program; I find ways
> to cut costs--maybe even terminate some employees.

Thereby reducing service to your customers, driving customers away and
possibly entering the classic death spiral of an ever-diminishing
customer base.

> It is not likely
> that I suddenly increase the price of my products by 17 or 18 percent.
> The business which took such a tack would likely find itself with even
> fewer customers (members).

I'm sure some members will find $39 too high. I'm sure others will evaluate what ARRL is doing for them and decide it's worth $39. There's no point in arguing the ratio here since we'll know soon enough.

Jon

1558. Re: FCC Proposal for New Novice Class License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 16:48:48 UTC
From: K0HB@ARRL.ORG
Message-ID: <94kclg$ha1$1@news.netmar.com>
Source record: 1794

In article <20010123070949.12166.00000958@ng-cd1.aol.com>, W1RFI
<w1rfi@aol.com> writes:

> The study guide had 39 questions. There were no questions on
> antennas, feed lines propagation of any electronics past Ohm's
> law.

Man, you 60's guys had it TOUGH! My 1955 edition (yes, I still have it)
has only 33 study questions, but it does have electronics questions about
chokes and various LC filters.

73, de Hans, K0HB
--
"God is a comic playing to an audience afraid to laugh."

----- Posted via NewsOne.Net: Free (anonymous) Usenet News via the Web -----
http://newsone.net/ -- Free reading and anonymous posting to 60,000+ groups
NewsOne.Net prohibits users from posting spam. If this or other posts
made through NewsOne.Net violate posting guidelines, email abuse@newsone.net

1559. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 16:57:43 UTC
From: Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com>
Message-ID: <3A6DB807.9BB7161C@dvol.com>
Source record: 1810

Dave Heil wrote:

> > "Feelings" don't count. Only the dollars and cents budgeting & accounting
> > spreadsheets count and those have not been posted here, we don't have a
> > clue.
>
> Feelings=perceptions and in this case perceptions of the ARRL most
> certainly count. If the League desperately needs the money to do
> something which appeals to the membership, a better selling job needs to
> be done.

>
I agree with that. Too many closets in Newington for my taste.
>

> > >
> > QEX.
>
> ...consists mostly of material formerly available in QST at no
> additional charge.

>
There is also a bunch of fresh material which is usually too esoteric to publish
in QST.
>

>
> > >Contest covereage
> > >
> > NCJ
>
> ...was formerly produced outside of the League. Now the League has put
> much of the contest coverage formerly in QST into this rag.

>
Ya can't cover the 'tests as well in QST, the thing would become huge, ditto all
the far-end technical material from QEX. Can't combine three magazines into one
for the same money as one of them.
>

>
> > DX news in any monthly magazine is useless, it's at least six weeks stale.
>
> On air reports might be stale. Photos and personalities don't get
> stale. News of upcoming operations would be interesting. So would
> writeups of operations just completed (along with even more photos).

>
. . maybe another damned magazine? The Web is probably a better venue for DX news
of the sort you're looking for.
>

>
> > I get the ARRL DX bulletin every week. Beats the hell outta the Yellow
> > Sheets and it comes along free with the membership.
>
> I'm really not discussing band activity reports. I get the e-mail
> bulletin too and find it sometimes useful.

>
QST didn't do a bad job on the Bhutan operation. All they can do in any topic area
is hit the high spots.
>

>
> The magazine has been stripped of real content, not just in my areas of
> interest (which are many). I suppose I can always read how to wire a
> DPST toggle switch in "Ask The Doctor".

>
Now, now! There's a problem: Over the years big gulfs have been created which
didn't exist in earlier days. One one hand we have old fart 20wpm Extras like
thee and me who have done it all on one hand and new-wave noclues some of which
really don't know how to wire a DPST switch on the other hand with QST caught in
the middle. It's just a no-win situation.
>
Hams were bitching about the ARRL , the dues and QST content a half century ago.
The good news is that we're consistent and predictable.

>
> Dave K8MN

>
w3rv

1560. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 16:59:27 UTC
From: "R.L. Tannehill, P.E." <rickw7rt@firstinter.net>
Message-ID: <3A6DB86F.39BC67B2@firstinter.net>
Source record: 1809

"Ed Hare, W1RFI" wrote:
>
> Leland C. Scott <no-spam@junk-mail.net> wrote:
>
> > > FURTHER RESOLVED, it is the opinion of this Board at this time that
> Morse
> > > code should be retained as a testing element in the U.S.; and be it
>
> > Looks like the ARRL has its collective head still firmly planted in the
> > past. Time to write my division director again.
>
> Isn't the statement really saying that the ARRL is not seeking to change the
> US regulations at this time? It will be at least 4 years away before the FCC
> would even consider a change, looking at the timing of the WRC and
> estimating the amount of time it will take to ratify the treaty. I think
> that it is premature to set a policy now on a matter that cannot be changed
> now and that can be decided better when something specific can be put on the
> plate. A lot can change in the membership, in Amateur Radio and in the
> makeup of the Board in the intervening 4 years. It is, IMHO, up to a
> future Board to change or affirm its policy wrt US regulations when it
> appears that it is time to act. The present policy simply does not change
> the status quo wrt the ARRL policy on US requirements. Considering that no
> change in policy can effect any change in US regulations, I think the Board
> made a reasonable choice.
>
> The Board dealt with the international treaty now because now is when the
> decisions need to be made.
>
> IMHO, of course.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

While I am disappointed that the Board so vehemently defended Morse
testing in the US in their resolution, I understand their reluctance to
deal with what is basically a non-issue at this time. First things
first, we will hold the League's feet to the fire to -enthusiastically-
support and foster support in Region 2, for elimination of S25.5 at
WRC2003. Then, in 2004, we will have another go-round on the US testing
issue. By then, the opposition of many of the Board hard-liner PCTA's
may be a dead issue, literally.

Rick Tannehill - W7RT
ARRL VE, VCE, OO
NCI #1394

1561. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 17:02:51 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <94kdfrsvr0@208.207.71.163>
Source record: 1811

Jon Bloom wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > Aaron Jones wrote:
> > >
> > > Old_Timer <oldtimer@nonsuch.net> wrote:
> > >
> > > >Does the League's newly announced substantial dues hike in these times
> > > >of low inflation strike anybody else as being excessive?
> > >
> > > Percentage wise it does seem high. But to gripe about $5 extra a year
> > > is silly. That's less than 2 cents a day...
> > >
> > > >My own feeling is that $39 per year is high for value received
> > >
> > > Too bad you can't quit... :-)
> >
> > Percentage-wise, it IS high. If you look at what inflation has been
> > since 1997 when the League last upped the cost of yearly dues, it is
> > outrageous.
>
> Huh? The new rate represents a per-annum increase of about 3%.

Huh??? $5 as a percentage of $34 comes out to be 14.7% on my Casio.

Dick

1562. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 17:03:18 UTC
From: Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com>
Message-ID: <3A6DB956.7EC608D4@dvol.com>
Source record: 1812

W1RFI wrote:

>
> Very few hams have a spectrum analyzer.

>
If you're in a populated area they can usually be "accessed".

1563. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 17:06:09 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <3A6DBA01.19D9B9EB@arrl.org>
Source record: 1813

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> Jon Bloom wrote:
> >
> > Huh? The new rate represents a per-annum increase of about 3%.
>
> Huh??? $5 as a percentage of $34 comes out to be 14.7% on my Casio.

14.7% PER ANNUM (over 4 years), Dick? Your calculator's broken. Or maybe
it just needs a new battery.

Jon

1564. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 17:13:46 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <94ke4a$15b$0@208.207.71.163>
Source record: 1815

W1RFI wrote:
>
> The ARRL Web page has been increased by quite a scope over the past years. Do
> hams use it? Should the League stop adding to the Tech info pages? I could let
> the Tech Info Coordinator go to help pay for the staff I am adding to help with
> the growing problem of RFI to hams. Who wants to make the choice?

I will say this - the existance of the ARRL web page will play a large
part
in my decision on whether or not I want to remain a member. That is
probably the most useful tangible thing that ARRL has done, outside of
your ongoing efforts in RFI/EMI, in recent years. I do get a lot of use
out of it.
Its expansion should definitely be encouraged.

Dick

1565. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 17:15:42 UTC
From: "Leland C. Scott" <no-spam@junk-mail.net>
Message-ID: <t6rf26jedi6m5f@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 1816

"R.L. Tannehill, P.E." <rickw7rt@firstinter.net> wrote in message
news:3A6DB86F.39BC67B2@firstinter.net...
> While I am disappointed that the Board so vehemently defended Morse
> testing in the US in their resolution, I understand their reluctance to
> deal with what is basically a non-issue at this time. First things
> first, we will hold the League's feet to the fire to -enthusiastically-
> support and foster support in Region 2, for elimination of S25.5 at
> WRC2003. Then, in 2004, we will have another go-round on the US testing
> issue. By then, the opposition of many of the Board hard-liner PCTA's
> may be a dead issue, literally.

I hope so. I just wrote a short E-mail to George Race (Great Lakes Division
Director) asking that the ARRL board reexamine the issue of
retaining/dropping Morse Code testing when it is finally dropped from the
ITU treaty requirements.

--
Leland C. Scott
KC8LDO

1566. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 17:16:19 UTC
From: Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com>
Message-ID: <3A6DBC63.7AFA9A84@dvol.com>
Source record: 1817

"R.L. Tannehill, P.E." wrote:

> support and foster support in Region 2, for elimination of S25.5 at
> WRC2003. Then, in 2004, we will have another go-round on the US testing
> issue. By then, the opposition of many of the Board hard-liner PCTA's
> may be a dead issue, literally.

>
But it could just as well go the other way, too. Hmmm?
>

>
>
> Rick Tannehill - W7RT

>
w3rv

1567. Re: FCC Proposal for New Novice Class License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 17:19:46 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <94kefi$255$0@208.207.71.163>
Source record: 1818

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> Len Over 21 wrote:
> >
> > didit
>
> Oh my...
>

Yeah.....while you were away the infamous No CW Testicles has adopted what he percieves to be the end of a CW qso as his concluding byline. Just makes him look even that much more ridiculous. He has been told that is it actually
dit<space>dit but of course as usual he ignores all advice. And also of course he he has no idea what it means.

Dick W0EX

1568. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 17:42:03 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <94kfpb$4ta$0@208.207.71.163>
Source record: 1821

"Leland C. Scott" wrote:
>
> > FURTHER RESOLVED, it is the opinion of this Board at this time that Morse
> > code should be retained as a testing element in the U.S.; and be it
>
> Looks like the ARRL has its collective head still firmly planted in the
> past. Time to write my division director again.
>

Don't worry about it, Larry, this is just their "interim" position,
which they have adopted as they move from complete support of CW testing
to its complete abandonment. Can't make any sudden, sensational and
upsetting moves, you know. Might upset someone. Walk that tightrope.
Actually, I don't see where it matters more than trivially anyway,
since FCC today pretty well ignores ARRL.
Hang around long enough, you'll find out how it works.

1569. Re: VHF history (long) (was: any ideas on HOw to learn Morse

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 17:50:17 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <Owjb6.1124$e5.2796228@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 1823

<Steven J Robeson>; K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com> wrote

> Of course, I am not the only one who challenges Lennies "facts",
> and I know that it requires no further re-posts of that already
> stated. But if you insist.....

Do you think that Len believes that what he says is untrue?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1570. Re: CA power crisis caused by internet

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 17:50:57 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nospam.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.g7medf0.pminews@ca.news.verio.net>
Source record: 1822

On 23 Jan 2001 08:29:34 GMT, Dick Carroll wrote:

>I asked what level of FCC license
>they were required to hold (we all held either first or second phone)
>and they asked "What's that?"

You were talking to dispatchers who, except for very small
departments, are non-sworn personnel in California.

All technical work (system design, installation, and
maintenance) is done by techs of the State Department of
General Services' Communications Division, who, in spite of
"license deregulation", are required to hold FCC GROLs because
their duties also include servicing and adjustment of marine
and aviation stations licensed to the State.

>When I asked them how they made an NCIC
>check, they pointed to an ancient TTY terminal over in the corner of the
>room - they had to send a TTY message to SACTO, where it was entered
>into the computer system, and the answer returned in the reverse, time
>consuming fashion.

IIRC Fresno was one of the "tail end" offices in the conversion
that was taking place at the time. It's all high-speed computer
now, with MDTs in the patrol cars.

> I came away disappointed.

I, too, was disappointed when I visited the Sacramento office in
1963, but I later found out that although this was where the
CW station was, it wasn't the HQ comm office, but the local
patrol office. The HQ comm office with all the terminals and
statewide remote-access panels was two blocks away in the big
HQ building.

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

1571. Re: 10 bucks buys a ham license.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 17:55:17 UTC
From: LRod <lr0d@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <94kgi0$6ha$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1824
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <94k5bhrfe1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
sjwoodr@my-deja.com wrote:

> I sent an email to the VE and he offered to let me take
> the extra class exam in February for free. That's fair
> enough for me; it gives me more time to study!

I'm glad you did that, and I'm glad he did that. That's a good
resolution. I wish it hadn't happened in the first place, but this will
work out. Thanks for not giving up on it.

LRod

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1572. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 18:12:16 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <94khi0$8vt$0@208.207.71.163>
Source record: 1825

Jon Bloom wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > Jon Bloom wrote:
> > >
> > > Huh? The new rate represents a per-annum increase of about 3%.
> >
> > Huh??? $5 as a percentage of $34 comes out to be 14.7% on my Casio.
>
> 14.7% PER ANNUM (over 4 years), Dick? Your calculator's broken. Or maybe
> it just needs a new battery.
>
> Jon

'Tis not my calculator that is broke, $5 is 14.7& of the %34 *annual*
membership fee.
Looks like an attempt to invoke New Math as yet another Newington Smoke
Screen. Doesn't work any better than it ever did.

1573. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 18:39:11 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <3A6DCFCF.E5D9A534@arrl.org>
Source record: 1826

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> Jon Bloom wrote:
> >
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > >
> > > Jon Bloom wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Huh? The new rate represents a per-annum increase of about 3%.
> > >
> > > Huh??? $5 as a percentage of $34 comes out to be 14.7% on my Casio.
> >
> > 14.7% PER ANNUM (over 4 years), Dick? Your calculator's broken. Or maybe
> > it just needs a new battery.
> >
> > Jon
>
> 'Tis not my calculator that is broke, $5 is 14.7& of the %34 *annual*
> membership fee.
> Looks like an attempt to invoke New Math as yet another Newington Smoke
> Screen. Doesn't work any better than it ever did.

This is one of the reasons I don't hang around rrap much any more -- too
many people like Dick who (willfully? ignorantly?) misinterpret simple,
direct statements and then use their misinterpretation as "evidence" of
unethical behavior on the part of the other party. Guess my stomach for
idiocy like this isn't as strong as Ed's.

Dick

1574. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 18:43:56 UTC
From: K0HB@USWEST.NET
Message-ID: <94kjdc$q8l$1@news.netmar.com>
Source record: 1814

In article <3A6DAF3D.DFB259F9@ovis.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net> writes:

>I hope some of that money finds its way into funding for remedial math
>skills for you, Jon. $3.40 would be a hike of 10%. 3% would be $1.02.
>Now how much would a five dollar hike be?

Looks like about 3.5% per year to me, except we paid no increase in
the intervening years, so we saved $7.31 over a yearly 3.5% increase,
plus we can still save even more if we renew (for 1, 2, or 3 years)
prior to July.

1997 - 34.00 Baseline
1998 - 35.19
1999 - 36.42
2000 - 37.70
2001 - 39.01

73, Hans, K0HB

----- Posted via NewsOne.Net: Free (anonymous) Usenet News via the Web -----
http://newsone.net/ -- Free reading and anonymous posting to 60,000+ groups
NewsOne.Net prohibits users from posting spam. If this or other posts
made through NewsOne.Net violate posting guidelines, email abuse@newsone.net

1575. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 18:46:34 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <Alkb6.1125$e5.2799406@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 1827

R.L. Tannehill, P.E. <rickw7rt@firstinter.net> wrote:

> While I am disappointed that the Board so vehemently defended Morse
> testing in the US in their resolution, I understand their reluctance to
> deal with what is basically a non-issue at this time.

I think the "at this time" language in your post and in the resolution is pretty important. IMHO, the Board is saying that it will leave it to the correct time to deal with the issue. I believe that to be the correct choice, for a number of reasons.

The only reasons to have dealt with it now would be if the US regulations were on the plate now -- they are not -- of if the ARRL Board had made up its mind now about how it wants the ARRL to handle a not-completely-defined issue that will probably come up four, or more, years from now.

> First things first, we will hold the League's feet to the fire
to -enthusiastically-
> support and foster support in Region 2, for elimination of S25.5 at
> WRC2003.

There is a wide range of ARRL response and position to the policy set forth at this Board meeting. It could indeed range from "enthusiastic" to simply no longer being the only dissenting vote at an international IARU meeting. Constructively holding ARRL's feet to the fire, in either direction, will indeed influence the implementation of ARRL policy.

> Then, in 2004, we will have another go-round on the US testing issue. By
then, the opposition
> of many of the Board hard-liner PCTA's may be a dead issue, literally.

I hope not. I would rather see an evolution of ideas and constructive change than see people die to give me my way. My views have changed over the years, as I imagine yours have; I would imagine that at one point in your life you believed that Morse code testing was important to Amateur Radio. I hope that as more hams are able to assess the impact of the changes have taken place to date that we may see more changes in the way people feel. We all have a few years to give our "final answer."

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1576. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 18:48:53 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <3A6DD215.8C099F91@arrl.org>
Source record: 1828

Jon Bloom wrote:
>
....
> Dick

I wasn't trying to sign Dick's name... the rest of my posting got cut off. (I don't compose messages under Netscape for Linux often enough to be comfortable with its perverse key mapping.)

Jon

1577. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 18:49:51 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <Eokb6.1126$e5.2799718@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 1829

Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com> wrote:
> > One staffer added late last year is someone to work on developing "in-house"
> > news. I have seen again and again where someone at ARRL HQ has done something
> > valuable and important for amateur radio, and not told anyone other than his
> > boss. That "someone" has all too often been me.

> Hmmm . . mixed reaction here to that one. I've been involved with much bigger and
> scattered industrial operations which have in-house infranet webs which do a pretty
> good job of keeping everybody up to speed, departments & individuals have web
> pages, etc. Of course you wind up with at least one IS person and they don't come
> for free.

Mea culpa -- by "in house" news, I meant more information about the activities of ARRL being shared with our membership, through the Letter, Web, QST, etc.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1578. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 18:53:43 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <3A6DD337.2A5529B3@arrl.org>
Source record: 1830

"Ed Hare, W1RFI" wrote:
>
> The only reasons to have dealt with it now would be if the US regulations
> were on the plate now -- they are not -- of if the ARRL Board had made up
> its mind now about how it wants the ARRL to handle a not-completely-defined
> issue that will probably come up four, or more, years from now.

In any case, the present Board cannot commit that future Board (which
may, for all we know, be a completely different group of members) to a
particular policy. There is no policy the present Board could adopt
which that future Board could not reverse, just as the present Board has
just reversed the policy (WRT the treaty) of past Boards.

Jon

1579. Re: Will you let them take away your guns?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 18:57:03 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A6DD3FF.604F05C0@IEEE.org>
Source record: 1832

Jim Kelley wrote:
> But personally, I'm glad they vigorously collect the government
> revenue. I for one, am reasonably reluctant to give up so much of my
> money to them. I imagine there are others who are even more reluctant
> to do so. If tax money was gathered in a donation-like process, I'm
> quite sure we'd always run the government in deficit.

I think the people who want high taxes should pay them and the people
who don't want high taxes should pay less. In other words, tax the
liberals at a higher rate than the conservatives. Then count the
number of liberals. :-)
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

1580. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 18:59:37 UTC
From: K0HB@USWEST.NET
Message-ID: <94kkaprch1@news.netmar.com>
Source record: 1819

In article <94kaprmhj0@208.207.71.163>, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
writes:

> Exactly. Any "ordinary" ham who attempts to dig into his TS2000 which
>has anything more than a operational glitch that might be corrected by
>resetting the microprocessor, or some other minor correction, is asking
>for more trouble than he really wants.

Haven't looked at a TS2000 yet, but I bet an amplifier is still an amplifier,
a power supply is still a power supply, and components still smoke or blow
fuses when they fail.

I spent the $35.00 for a "Service Manual" for my Icom 775DSP, and have saved
myself 3 shop calls with simple troubleshooting similar to what I did way
back when on my Hallicrafters SX-101. Voltages are lower, and components are
smaller, but the electronic theories haven't changed much.

Wouldn't go mucking about in the DSP logic, etc., but the old "7-Step"
troubleshooting protocols still work just fine on the rest of it.

My "instrumentation" consists of only a Fluke 76 DVM, a Techtronix 5MHz dual
trace scope, and and old HP-300C signal generator.

And I think I'm a pretty "ordinary" ham. Lotsa guys are much better!

73, Hans, K0HB
Lord High Liberator of the Electric Smoke

----- Posted via NewsOne.Net: Free (anonymous) Usenet News via the Web -----
http://newsone.net/ -- Free reading and anonymous posting to 60,000+ groups
NewsOne.Net prohibits users from posting spam. If this or other posts
made through NewsOne.Net violate posting guidelines, email abuse@newsone.net

1581. Re: Will you let them take away your guns?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 19:00:41 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A6DD4D9.98663971@uci.edu>
Source record: 1831

Cecil wrote:
> Apparently, you have never had the IRS mob after you for something
> of which you are innocent. With the IRS, you are guilty until you
> prove your innocence beyond the shadow of a doubt and then some.

It's true - so far I haven't done anything to send up the red flags.
Knock on wood.

But personally, I'm glad they vigorously collect the government
revenue. I for one, am reasonably reluctant to give up so much of my
money to them. I imagine there are others who are even more reluctant
to do so. If tax money was gathered in a donation-like process, I'm
quite sure we'd always run the government in deficit.

73, Jim AC6XG

1582. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 19:00:57 UTC
From: xjim@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <94kkd2$ah3$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1833

> I have not read much in the press about the failure of emergency devices in
> emergencies. Do we need a media coverup to make this all plausible?

Well... My take on the press, is that they don't even know that the water is cold until they run into an iceburg, and even then they get the color wrong. But that's another story.

The problem with gadgets and emergencies, is that you need a real emergency in order to test their efficiency. I have been involved both professionaly (LMR) and in RACES (off and on depending on political currents) since the Civil Defense days, and currently support US Army MARS. The simple gadgets that are highly adaptable, like an 8' Crecent wrench, are the most useful when compared to highly technical gadgets like uP controlled radios and data terminals. Multi-channel radios and programmable radios often present a problem for people who only bring them out of the back room twice a year. Even Fire/Police/Rescue people may find it difficult to talk to one another even if they have a common frequency because they might not be able to find it in their 100 channel radios.

I'm not talking about things that are broken or worthless from the start (there are those) Rather I'm talking about things that don't get used in real emergencies either because they are not adaptable to the emergency at hand, or because the available personnel isn't familiar or the equipment isn't intuitive enough.

Ham radio operators are supposed to bridge the communications gap in emergencies for those who are trained in other areas, by being resourceful with both operating and technical skills. One of the most common failures I have seen is when the equipment or propagation aren't up to the task, or the operator is unprepared to handle signed written traffic. We are valuable because we can make use of what survives the disaster, not by how well we can raid ham store shelves.

Jim, ac6tk

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1583. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 19:03:35 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A6DD587.A8835A18@IEEE.org>
Source record: 1836

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Don't worry about it, Larry, this is just their "interim" position,
> which they have adopted as they move from complete support of CW testing
> to its complete abandonment.

You're seeing black helicopters again, Dick. The next board may be made
up of completely different people. Do you think a completely different
board will carry on your anti-code-test conspiracy alleged above?

If you believe your opinion to be the majority opinion, it shouldn't
take too much work to load the next board with pro-code-test people.
OTOH, I suspect you realize that your opinion is held by a very small
minority of hams and is doomed to be buried in the sands of time.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

1584. Re: Will you let them take away your guns?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 19:04:10 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A6DD5AA.7C9C6A83@uci.edu>
Source record: 1835

Dick Carroll wrote:
> I don't have a dog in this scrap but I would point out that a certain
> rebellion that began in Boston harbor was hardly considered legal,
> either....

We're discussing a rebellion against the US government, not the one that started the US government. Maybe I'm wrong, but one seems at odds with the other. Or are we just talking rebellion for rebellion's sake here.

73, Jim AC6XG

1585. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 19:09:58 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A6DD706.6FD7EF08@IEEE.org>
Source record: 1837

Jon Bloom wrote:
> This is one of the reasons I don't hang around rrap much any more -- too
> many people like Dick who (willfully? ignorantly?) misinterpret simple,
> direct statements and then use their misinterpretation as "evidence" of
> unethical behavior on the part of the other party. Guess my stomach for
> idiocy like this isn't as strong as Ed's.

Is a one year ARRL membership fee going from $34 to $39 or is it
going up by one dollar each year for the next five years?
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

1586. Re: Will you let them take away your guns?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 19:11:15 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A6DD753.66F79733@uci.edu>
Source record: 1834

Cecil wrote:
> I think the people who want high taxes should pay them and the people
> who don't want high taxes should pay less. In other words, tax the
> liberals at a higher rate than the conservatives. Then count the
> number of liberals. :-)

I've often thought exactly the same thing. An excellent idea - and very fair. The only problem is that the liberals don't think THEY should pay more taxes - it's only the OTHER guy who should pay more taxes.

73, Jim AC6XG

1587. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 19:14:26 UTC
From: K0HB@USWEST.NET
Message-ID: <94kl6i$sg9$1@news.netmar.com>
Source record: 1820

In article <94kdfrsvr0@208.207.71.163>, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
writes:
>
>
>Jon Bloom wrote:
>>
>> Dave Heil wrote:
>> >
>> > Aaron Jones wrote:
>> > >
>> > > Old_Timer <oldtimer@nonsuch.net> wrote:
>> > >
>> > > >Does the League's newly announced substantial dues hike in these
times
>> > > >of low inflation strike anybody else as being excessive?
>> > >
>> > > Percentage wise it does seem high. But to gripe about $5 extra a year
>> > > is silly. That's less than 2 cents a day...
>> > >
>> > > >My own feeling is that $39 per year is high for value received
>> > >
>> > > Too bad you can't quit... :-)
>> >
>> > Percentage-wise, it IS high. If you look at what inflation has been
>> > since 1997 when the League last upped the cost of yearly dues, it is
>> > outrageous.
>>
>> Huh? The new rate represents a per-annum increase of about 3%.
>
>
> Huh??? $5 as a percentage of $34 comes out to be 14.7% on my Casio.
>
> Dick

Hmmmmm..... yes, 14.7% per-annum certainly would be outrageous -- more like
$58.85 (not $39.00). 'Cording to my TI the actual increase was almost
precisely 3.5% per-annum, except they skipped some annums, so we actually
saved $7-and-change in the interim.

73, de Hans, K0HB

----- Posted via NewsOne.Net: Free (anonymous) Usenet News via the Web -----
http://newsone.net/ -- Free reading and anonymous posting to 60,000+ groups
NewsOne.Net prohibits users from posting spam. If this or other posts
made through NewsOne.Net violate posting guidelines, email abuse@newsone.net

1588. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 19:18:20 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A6DD8FC.3005AB2D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 1838

K0HB@USWEST.NET wrote:
> Hmmmmm..... yes, 14.7% per-annum certainly would be outrageous -- more like
> $58.85 (not $39.00). 'Cording to my TI the actual increase was almost
> precisely 3.5% per-annum, except they skipped some annums, so we actually
> saved $7-and-change in the interim.

Percentage increase = 100*(increase/present-cost)

If the increase is $5 and the present-cost is $34, then that's a 14.7%
increase from one year's subscription to the next year's subscription.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

1589. Re: Before responding to the Colt thread.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 19:19:10 UTC
From: RanHefner <ranhefner@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <94klf2bco1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1839
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy

You just don't seem to understand. Maybe you should ask some of your amateur radio friends what the word "hobby" means as it pertains to amateur radio.

In article <94kbmg$1ok$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
Steven J Robeson, K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com> wrote:
> And I DO monitor FRS, especially in the ATL area, and I can tell
> you that there are a LOT of people using FRS for the sake of fun with
a
> radio...NOT just to facilitate some other activity.
>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4YZ
>
> Sent via Deja.com
> http://www.deja.com/
>

--
Randy A. Hefner
http://talk.to/frs
http://go.to/qx3

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1590. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 19:22:10 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <94klklbno1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1840

"Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net> wrote:

> I think the "at this time" language in your post and in the
> resolution is pretty important. IMHO, the Board is saying
> that it will leave it to the correct time to deal with the issue.

"Boldness has genius, power and magic in it."
--von Goethe

I was disappointed that the BoD display this "go with the flow -
wait and see" attitude. Having sat in that room in the past,
I know that boldness is often punished, but this seemed like
the perfect time to display some leadership and vision.

Opportunity lost. Sigh!

73, de Hans, K0HB
--
"We are fellow travelers on a journey between two
eternities, and it's a trip far too brief for me
to be concerned with whether or not you have passed
a Morse code test."
-- K0HB

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1591. Re: Will you let them take away your guns?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 19:23:38 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A6DDA3A.40910F57@uci.edu>
Source record: 1841

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Larry can always drag out an old illfitting uniform...

An old one is undoubtedly best since it's probably going to get some new holes in it anyway. ;-)

73, Jim

1592. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 19:46:26 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <94kn2g$d2c$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1845

In article <3A6DD706.6FD7EF08@IEEE.org>,
Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:

> Is a one year ARRL membership fee going from $34 to $39 or is it
> going up by one dollar each year for the next five years?

It went up a $1.25 a year in 98, 99, 00, and 01, but the increase is
not imposed until July 01.

73, de Hans, K0HB
--
"We are fellow travelers on a journey between two
eternities, and it's a trip far too brief for me
to be concerned about whether or not you passed
a Morse code test."

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1593. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 19:47:24 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <3A6DDFCC.BD9934A2@arrl.org>
Source record: 1842

Cecil wrote:
>
> K0HB@USWEST.NET wrote:
> > Hmmmmm..... yes, 14.7% per-annum certainly would be outrageous -- more like
> > $58.85 (not $39.00). 'Cording to my TI the actual increase was almost
> > precisely 3.5% per-annum, except they skipped some annums, so we actually
> > saved $7-and-change in the interim.
>
> Percentage increase = 100*(increase/present-cost)
>
> If the increase is $5 and the present-cost is $34, then that's a 14.7%
> increase from one year's subscription to the next year's subscription.

Yep. But that wasn't the topic being addressed, which was a comparison
of the dues increase to the rate of inflation. To compute that you need
to include the term over which the increase occurred, which is 4 years.
Your calculation ignores the lack of increase between 1997 and 2001 and
thus fails to address the question.

Figures don't lie, but...

Jon

1594. Re: Will you let them take away your guns?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 19:49:30 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A6DE04A.36B4AC92@IEEE.org>
Source record: 1844

Jim Kelley wrote:
> We're discussing a rebellion against the US government, not the one that
> started the US government. Maybe I'm wrong, but one seems at odds with
> the other. Or are we just talking rebellion for rebellion's sake here.

I believe we are talking about a rebellion to restore U.S. Constitutional
government.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

1595. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 19:52:20 UTC
From: W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com>
Message-ID: <94kndo$3v7$1@iac5.navix.net>
Source record: 1843

I am not as concerned with the content, as getting the air time. I live south of Atlanta and have never seen a PSA on ham radio on any of the channels I watch. I am a night owl by nature, and some of the PSA's used to fill time in the wee hours are covering some really inane subjects.

This week, just for grins, I will make some inquires to the stations in Atlanta and Columbus to see what is necessary to get them run.

> See http://www.arrl.org/pio for a general description of ARRL's media-public
> relations program. Info about the PSAs that ARRL provided to TV and radio
> stations is included.
>
> > I would be glad to do a bit of research as to what is involved with the
> > PSA's if any interest at Hdq.
>
> If you have any suggestions about how the PSAs could be improved, send them to
> Jennifer Hagy at the address on the PIO web page.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>

1596. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 20:01:31 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A6DE31B.6D371FC5@IEEE.org>
Source record: 1846

Jon Bloom wrote:
> Your calculation ignores the lack of increase between 1997 and 2001 and
> thus fails to address the question.

A membership cost increase is a step function like a binary bit going
from 'zero' to 'one'. It didn't happen over a number of years. It's
a step function that happens at renewal time.

Is there any difference in having one double-scotch per day for a week
VS not drinking for six days and then having seven double-scotches?
"But ossifer, I only averaged one double-scotch per day."
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

1597. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 20:07:10 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <94ko96$e6v$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1847

In article <3A6DD8FC.3005AB2D@IEEE.org>,
Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> If the increase is $5 and the present-cost is $34, then that's
> a 14.7% increase from one year's subscription to the next year's
> subscription.....

....or 3.5% increase per-annum since the 1997 increase (which was the
original assertion).

Whatever.

73, Hans, K0HB
--
"We are fellow travelers on a journey between two
eternities, and it's a trip far too brief for me
to pick the fly shit out of your pepper pot."

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1598. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 20:22:12 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <3A6DE7F4.D0F99D5F@arrl.org>
Source record: 1848

Cecil wrote:
>
> A membership cost increase is a step function like a binary bit going
> from 'zero' to 'one'. It didn't happen over a number of years. It's
> a step function that happens at renewal time.

But the inflation it was being compared to is an average over time, so to make any meaningful comparison you have to compute a time-average for the dues increase over the same period as used for the inflation computation.

> Is there any difference in having one double-scotch per day for a week
> VS not drinking for six days and then having seven double-scotches?
> "But ossifer, I only averaged one double-scotch per day."

Money ain't scotch. (Probably just as well.)

Jon

1599. Re: Will you let them take away your guns?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 20:24:07 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A6DE867.5C5739A2@uci.edu>
Source record: 1849

Cecil wrote:
>
> Jim Kelley wrote:
> > We're discussing a rebellion against the US government, not the one that
> > started the US government. Maybe I'm wrong, but one seems at odds with
> > the other. Or are we just talking rebellion for rebellion's sake here.

> I believe we are talking about a rebellion to restore U.S. Constitutional
> government.

Really? Since you seem to know all about this, what happened to the US Constitutional government that made a restoration necessary in the first place? These ground rules were never actually established. Larry just said that it would be okay for 10,000 people with guns to attack the nations Capitol (he then added that that wouldn't be the case if they were people who he didn't happen to agree with).

73, Jim AC6XG

1600. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 20:48:49 UTC
From: Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com>
Message-ID: <3A6DEE31.6368CA9D@dvol.com>
Source record: 1850

>
> Mea culpa -- by "in house" news, I meant more information about the
> activities of ARRL being shared with our membership, through the Letter,
> Web, QST, etc.

>
Overviews of staff activities & plans, etc. Good idea.

>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

>
w3rv

1601. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 21:05:56 UTC
From: "Leland C. Scott" <no-spam@junk-mail.net>
Message-ID: <t6rshu9fojg81@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 2001

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:94kfpb$4ta$0@208.207.71.163...
> I don't see where it matters more than trivially anyway,
> since FCC today pretty well ignores ARRL.
> Hang around long enough, you'll find out how it works.

I don't see any reason to not start kicking the donkey in the behind now.
That way when it gets good and ready to move it will be right on our
"schedule", not its. No time like the present to get people use to the idea
the code test is going down the drain. Wait a few years until the ITU treaty
requirement is gone, then START fighting to get the ARRL, and the FCC to
consider dropping the Code test requirement for another few years? No way.

--
Leland C. Scott
KC8LDO

1602. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 21:43:39 UTC
From: Dana <dana@randomc.com>
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.10.10101231633050.21580-100000@cluster2>
Source record: 2003
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,alt.radio.family,rec.radio.cb

What are those freqs for the family radio service?

1603. Re: Will you let them take away your guns?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 21:47:18 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A6DFBE6.8124DFA6@uci.edu>
Source record: 2004

K0HB@USWEST.NET wrote:
>
> In article <3A6DE04A.36B4AC92@IEEE.org>, Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
> writes:
>
> >I believe we are talking about a rebellion to restore U.S. Constitutional
> >government.

> I believe you're a bunch of impotent old geezers just talking to hear your
> toothless gums flap.

I object! Cecil is not a bunch of old geezers.

ac6xg

1604. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 22:01:52 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <Lcnb6.1127$e5.2809438@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 2005

W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com> wrote in message news:94kndo$3v7$1@iac5.navix.net...

> I am not as concerned with the content, as getting the air time. I live
> south of Atlanta and have never seen a PSA on ham radio on any of the
> channels I watch. I am a night owl by nature, and some of the PSA's used
to
> fill time in the wee hours are covering some really inane subjects.

> This week, just for grins, I will make some inquires to the stations in
> Atlanta and Columbus to see what is necessary to get them run.

That is exactly the approach that works best. Local stations respond more
to local viewers than they do to a request from a national organization.
Jen Hagy should be able to help, if needed.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1605. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 22:06:23 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <Zgnb6.1128$e5.2809939@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 2006

Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

> Don't worry about it, Larry, this is just their "interim" position,
> which they have adopted as they move from complete support of CW testing
> to its complete abandonment. Can't make any sudden, sensational and
> upsetting moves, you know. Might upset someone. Walk that tightrope.

I think that is less likely than my theory that the Board decided not to solve a problem that would not surface for at least 4 years. I think it very unlikely that the ARRL will originate petition for rulemaking that will certainly follow any change in the international treaty, but at this stage, it is not certain what the final treaty will look like or just what rules changes will be put on the table. I agree with the Board if they decided not to cross the bridge until they could see just what kind of bridge it is.

Your tightrope theory just sounds less plausible to me.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1606. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 22:11:27 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <Jlnb6.1129$e5.2810209@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 2007

K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org> wrote:

> I was disappointed that the BoD display this "go with the flow -
> wait and see" attitude. Having sat in that room in the past,
> I know that boldness is often punished, but this seemed like
> the perfect time to display some leadership and vision.

> Opportunity lost. Sigh!

If you meant the opportunity to change ARRL's policy 4 years before that policy change could have any effect on US regulations, I guess technically it is a "lost" opportunity, but this is an issue that the ARRL Board will have to address again when the inevitable FCC NPRM comes down the pike. I think anything the Board did now would be pretty much moot and may have to be re-done in response to the actual content of the NPRM,or even of the treaty itself.

As you have sat in that room, you know how difficult it can be to hammer out an understanding with 15 different viewpoints on the table at the same time. If deciding to change only the policy wrt the international treaty at this was the only way they could get enough agreement to get ANY resolution to pass, I can understand and accept it.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1607. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 22:16:06 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <94kvqtlsq1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2011
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <3A65E44C.FE56CA41@IEEE.org>,
Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> Jim Kelley wrote:
> >
> > Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> > news:3A639E9F.304EE3D8@IEEE.org...
> > > The arguments are different. Jim says there is not one code-
tested jammer
> > > using Morse code equipment.

This is not true. You are misrepresenting what I wrote, Cecil. That's beyond the pale. I am posting this to both NGs so there's no confusion.

> I say there is at least one and probably more.

Nobody denies that. I simply refuse to play your game.
> >
> > I'm enjoying your argument in the third person here, Cecil. Which
Jim are
> > you claiming said these things? Quotes might better illustrate
your point.
> > Or they might not.
> >
> I redirect this thread from r.r.a.antenna where it doesn't belong.

Yet you continued to post to the "no-code kills" thread long after you promised to stop. At least 40 posts on that thread, involving all sorts of things like your experiences in aircraft in South America, were posted to rraa. Many were posted ONLY to rraa. Only about a third of them involved me in any way.

> Jim, N2EY, is redirecting everything back to r.r.a.antenna where it
> doesn't belong. That's the reason for the disconnect.

You keep redirecting it because you know I don't post to policy anymore. I made this exception to avoid any more of that.

> Jim will not
> admit that there ever has been a single code-tested ham using Morse
> equipment for the purpose of jamming.

That is simply not true. I just won't play your games. So you are distorting and making stuff up about me behind my back.

> He refuses to condemn code-
> tested hams who use Morse equipment for the purpose of jamming since

> he says there never has been any.

Wrong, wrong, wrong, Cecil. I have repeatedly condemned ALL jammers on the ham bands, regardless of testing or mode. The ones you mention are a subset, and so are logically included.

> That's because any admission of
> such would violate the immaculate conception virginal religious
> aspect of Morse code to the PCTA.

Nonsense. I just won't play your games anymore.

Much of what you have written about me is simply not true, Cecil. I have pointed out your mistakes above. You will not admit them, of course.

Anyone who believes what Cecil has written can check deja.com and read my posts for themselves.

Enough of your games, Cecil. I'm sorry you are so bored that you have to spend time trying to "get other people's goats".

Game over.

73 de Jim, N2EY
FISTS #4360
BIT #0001

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1608. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 22:16:20 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <jqnb6.1130$e5.2810580@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 2008

Leland C. Scott <no-spam@junk-mail.net> wrote:

> I don't see any reason to not start kicking the donkey in the behind now.
> That way when it gets good and ready to move it will be right on our
> "schedule", not its. No time like the present to get people use to the
idea
> the code test is going down the drain. Wait a few years until the ITU
treaty
> requirement is gone, then START fighting to get the ARRL, and the FCC to
> consider dropping the Code test requirement for another few years? No way.

Hello, Leland,

I don't think the FCC is going to entertain any petition for rulemaking wrt code testing until the treaty is changed and ratified.

It is very much appropriate to start working on the ARRL Board now, by sharing your views and either convincing your ARRL Director why they should hold sway or by voting the guy out and voting a new guy in. What is your Director's views on the US requirements? You may find that your job is already done. :-) Of course, others may be trying to persuade him in the other direction. Tom Frenaye already knows my views, but I took the time to reiterate them before the Board meeting.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1609. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 22:19:03 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <Ssnb6.1131$e5.2810924@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 2009

Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com> wrote:

> > Feelings=perceptions and in this case perceptions of the ARRL most
> > certainly count. If the League desperately needs the money to do
> > something which appeals to the membership, a better selling job needs to
> > be done.

> I agree with that. Too many closets in Newington for my taste.

I agree with that too; a better selling job needs to be done. In my case, it has never been a question of belief, but of finding the time to spend 2-3 days working on an informative article before the next emergency seems to come down the pike.

I will promise to my friends here that once I get a bit more staff in the Lab to handle some of the individual RFI issues, I will put together a lot more info on what I have been up to and I will see that it gets published somewhere.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1610. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 22:22:17 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <Uvnb6.1132$e5.2811019@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 2010

Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com> wrote:

> Now, now! There's a problem: Over the years big gulfs have been created which
> didn't exist in earlier days. One one hand we have old fart 20wpm Extras like
> thee and me who have done it all on one hand and new-wave noclues some of which
> really don't know how to wire a DPST switch on the other hand with QST caught in
> the middle. It's just a no-win situation.

When I was a Nervous, those articles on the basics were really neat and exciting; they were high-tech to me. Now that I am a seasoned old vet, the same articles are "really dumbed down" in QST.

Go back and look at those old articles with today's eyes.

> Hams were bitching about the ARRL , the dues and QST content a half century ago.
> The good news is that we're consistent and predictable.

Those who aren't members can see a nice sample of the Tech articles from QST at:

http://www.arrl.org/tis

Enjoy.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI
>

1611. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 22:32:36 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <zFnb6.1133$e5.2811852@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 2012

Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote:

> > > > > Huh? The new rate represents a per-annum increase of about 3%.

> > 'Tis not my calculator that is broke, $5 is 14.7& of the %34 *annual*
> > membership fee.
> > Looks like an attempt to invoke New Math as yet another Newington Smoke
> > Screen. Doesn't work any better than it ever did.

> This is one of the reasons I don't hang around rrap much any more -- too
> many people like Dick who (willfully? ignorantly?) misinterpret simple,
> direct statements and then use their misinterpretation as "evidence" of
> unethical behavior on the part of the other party. Guess my stomach for
> idiocy like this isn't as strong as Ed's.

I think, Jon and Dick, that the term "per annum" may have been misunderstood. If applied to a 4-year term, a per-annum rate is applied each year. After all, if one puts money in a savings account at a per-annum rate, they certainly would understand the term if the bank only applied the interest to one year. :-)

So, lets take it step by step, over 4 years.

Year 1: $34.00 + (.035 * $34.00) = $35.19
Year 2: $35.19 + (.035 * $35.19) = $36.42
Year 3 : $36.42 + (.035 * $36.42) = $37.69
Year 4: $37.69 + (.035 * $37.69) = $39.00

This worked out to 3.5% increase each year,except that no one had to pay the $35.19, the $36.42 or the $37.69; it stayed at $34.00 for those years.

Does that help?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1612. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 22:34:31 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <mHnb6.1134$e5.2811856@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 2013

K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org> wrote:

> > Is a one year ARRL membership fee going from $34 to $39 or is it
> > going up by one dollar each year for the next five years?

> It went up a $1.25 a year in 98, 99, 00, and 01, but the increase is
> not imposed until July 01.

And the increase is not retroactive. :-)

And, if you really want to beat the system, do what I just did; renew for 3 years on the ARRL web site at the $34.00 rate. That way, the increase won't be proactive for 3 years, either. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1613. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 22:37:09 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <RJnb6.1135$e5.2811980@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 2014

Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:

> Is there any difference in having one double-scotch per day for a week
> VS not drinking for six days and then having seven double-scotches?
> "But ossifer, I only averaged one double-scotch per day."

Tell you what, Cecil, to avoid this problem in the future, you can increase your dues voluntarily every year by the published rate of inflation. That way, you can avoid all the big jumps and you will be ahead of all the rest of us. Go ahead and send it to me in cash; I will go upstairs and pay your dues for you. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1614. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 22:38:22 UTC
From: Larry Klose <lklose@net-link.net>
Message-ID: <3a6e0879$0$30003$44a10c7e@news.net-link.net>
Source record: 2015

"Leland C. Scott" <no-spam@junk-mail.net> wrote in message
news:t6rshu9fojg81@corp.supernews.com...
>
> "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:94kfpb$4ta$0@208.207.71.163...
> > I don't see where it matters more than trivially anyway,
> > since FCC today pretty well ignores ARRL.

It is no suprise that the FCC ignored the ARRL, since they
were initially demanding that the FCC continue a regulation
(13 & 20 wpm code test) that was not in conformity law
(5 USC 706).

FCC gave the ARRL plenty of opportunity to show some
leadership, but the Board said "no change". So FCC
proceeded without them and issued the License
Restructuring Decision. The ARRL ask the FCC to use
5 & 10 wpm code exams. The FCC's Report and Order said
that Morse code exam requirement served "no regulatory
purpose". So what does the ARRL Board do? They
demand the FCC continue 5 wpm code exams.

> > Hang around long enough, you'll find out how it works.

In a very short time I have learned how anthe system does
not work.

> I don't see any reason to not start kicking the donkey in the behind now.
> That way when it gets good and ready to move it will be right on our
> "schedule", not its. No time like the present to get people use to the
idea
> the code test is going down the drain. Wait a few years until the ITU
treaty
> requirement is gone, then START fighting to get the ARRL, and the FCC to
> consider dropping the Code test requirement for another few years? No way.

I personally advocate thpetition the United States/FCC to adopt a WRC 2003
policy to: (1) suppress ITU rule S25.5, (2) take exception to S25.5 in the
WRC 2003 Final Acts if it is nor suppressed, and (3) delete 47 CFR 97.503(a)
after the conclusion of WRC 2003 without any futher proceedings.

Larry Klose KC8EPO

1615. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 22:52:22 UTC
From: Larry Klose <lklose@net-link.net>
Message-ID: <3a6e0b34$0$30003$44a10c7e@news.net-link.net>
Source record: 2016

"Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:Zgnb6.1128$e5.2809939@news.ntplx.net...
> I think that is less likely than my theory that the Board decided not to
> solve a problem that would not surface for at least 4 years. I think it
very
> unlikely that the ARRL will originate petition for rulemaking that will
> certainly follow any change in the international treaty, but at this
stage,
> it is not certain what the final treaty will look like or just what rules
> changes will be put on the table. I agree with the Board if they decided
> not to cross the bridge until they could see just what kind of bridge it
is.

The so called "bridge" you claim the Board can not see is in fact a great
wall that surround Newington, casting a shadow over Board's vision.

The Board spent thirty years constructing that wall, now it scheduled
for removal in 2003.

Larry KC8EPO

1616. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 23:02:08 UTC
From: Larry Klose <lklose@net-link.net>
Message-ID: <3a6e0d7e$0$30006$44a10c7e@news.net-link.net>
Source record: 2017

"Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:Jlnb6.1129$e5.2810209@news.ntplx.net...
> K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org> wrote:
>
> > I was disappointed that the BoD display this "go with the flow -
> > wait and see" attitude. Having sat in that room in the past,
> > I know that boldness is often punished, but this seemed like
> > the perfect time to display some leadership and vision.
>
> > Opportunity lost. Sigh!
>
> If you meant the opportunity to change ARRL's policy 4 years before that
> policy change could have any effect on US regulations, I guess technically
> it is a "lost" opportunity, but this is an issue that the ARRL Board will
> have to address again when the inevitable FCC NPRM comes down the pike. I
> think anything the Board did now would be pretty much moot and may have to
> be re-done in response to the actual content of the NPRM,or even of the
> treaty itself.
>
> As you have sat in that room, you know how difficult it can be to hammer
> out an understanding with 15 different viewpoints on the table at the same
> time. If deciding to change only the policy wrt the international treaty
at
> this was the only way they could get enough agreement to get ANY
resolution
> to pass, I can understand and accept it.

Since the Morse code exam requirement is a public policy matter,
and the amateur radio community is about evenly divided, the ARRL Board
could have elected to take no position, and not interfere. For thirty years
the Board has act contrary to the public interest and contrary to the
interest of the majority of licensees.

I can not understand nor do I accept it.

Larry KC8EPO

1617. Re: Will you let them take away your guns?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 23:12:59 UTC
From: K0HB@USWEST.NET
Message-ID: <94l35rddg1@news.netmar.com>
Source record: 2002

In article <3A6DE04A.36B4AC92@IEEE.org>, Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
writes:

>I believe we are talking about a rebellion to restore U.S. Constitutional
>government.

I believe you're a bunch of impotent old geezers just talking to hear your
toothless gums flap.

73, Hans, K0HB

----- Posted via NewsOne.Net: Free (anonymous) Usenet News via the Web -----
http://newsone.net/ -- Free reading and anonymous posting to 60,000+ groups
NewsOne.Net prohibits users from posting spam. If this or other posts
made through NewsOne.Net violate posting guidelines, email abuse@newsone.net

1618. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 23:20:42 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <lmob6.1138$e5.2814627@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 2018

Larry Klose <lklose@net-link.net> wrote:

> Since the Morse code exam requirement is a public policy matter,
> and the amateur radio community is about evenly divided, the ARRL Board
> could have elected to take no position, and not interfere.

Since the Morse code exam is a public policy matter and the amateur radio
community is about evenly divided, the NCI Board could have elected to take
no position and not interfere...

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1619. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 23:27:18 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <Ysob6.1139$e5.2814845@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 2019

Larry Klose <lklose@net-link.net> wrote:

> FCC gave the ARRL plenty of opportunity to show some
> leadership, but the Board said "no change".

The ARRL's comments to the FCC were plenty of change, Larry. Trying to rewrite history here?

> The ARRL ask the FCC to use 5 & 10 wpm code exams.

It was 5 and 12 wpm, if accuracy is important.

> The FCC's Report and Order said that Morse code exam requirement served
"no regulatory
> purpose". So what does the ARRL Board do? They demand the FCC continue 5
wpm code exams.

When? In its comments to the FCC for restructuring? NCI agreed that a 5 wpm test was needed to satisfy the treaty? Now? Can you tell me where and when the ARRL communicated their "demand" to the FCC? The language of the ARRL policy was clear enough to me that the League is choosing not to change its policy wrt US testing at this time.

You are misrepresenting facts, Larry. It does not reflect well on you or your goals.

> I personally advocate thpetition the United States/FCC to adopt a WRC 2003
> policy to: (1) suppress ITU rule S25.5, (2) take exception to S25.5 in the
> WRC 2003 Final Acts if it is nor suppressed, and (3) delete 47 CFR
97.503(a)
> after the conclusion of WRC 2003 without any futher proceedings.

Now that sounds a bit more realistic. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1620. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 23:28:33 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <4uob6.1140$e5.2814912@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 2020

Larry Klose <lklose@net-link.net> wrote:

> The so called "bridge" you claim the Board can not see is in fact a great
> wall that surround Newington, casting a shadow over Board's vision.

Sounds just like that preacher on late night tv. :-)

> The Board spent thirty years constructing that wall, now it scheduled
> for removal in 2003.

The ARRL Board seems to agree with you.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1621. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 23:46:14 UTC
From: Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com>
Message-ID: <3A6E17C6.FA205D61@dvol.com>
Source record: 2021

Larry Klose wrote:

> I personally advocate thpetition the United States/FCC to adopt a WRC 2003
> policy to: (1) suppress ITU rule S25.5, (2) take exception to S25.5 in the
> WRC 2003 Final Acts if it is nor suppressed, and (3) delete 47 CFR 97.503(a)
> after the conclusion of WRC 2003 without any futher proceedings.

>
Don't get real upset if it doesn't quite work out your way.
>

> Larry Klose KC8EPO

>
w3rv

1622. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-23 23:47:18 UTC
From: Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com>
Message-ID: <3A6E1806.C6729DDE@dvol.com>
Source record: 2022

"Ed Hare, W1RFI" wrote:

> > I agree with that. Too many closets in Newington for my taste.
>
> I agree with that too; a better selling job needs to be done. In my case,
> it has never been a question of belief, but of finding the time to spend 2-3
> days working on an informative article before the next emergency seems to
> come down the pike.

>
I like the idea of letting the members get a peek at more of the details which
make a difference we never usually hear about about but good grief Edward,
don't bury us with 2-3 day diatribes per month!
>

> I will promise to my friends here that once I get a bit more staff in the
> Lab to handle some of the individual RFI issues, I will put together a lot
> more info on what I have been up to and I will see that it gets published
> somewhere.

>
Dump the lab, turn it over to somebody else and get outta there. Your RFI
activities while being of a technical nature are much more political, consensus
building and educational pursuits which have nothing to do with lab tests of the
latest whizzy xcvrs. Considering your background and the ogre content of the
exponential escalation of the number of Part 15 devices (among other threats)
SOMEBODY gotta put full time into it. No point to having the latest whizzy
ricebox which got five stars in the reviews if the bands are garbaged. Tag,
you're it.
>

> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

>
w3rv

1623. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 00:10:27 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010123191027.17535.00001138@nso-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 2026

In article <3A6DB59F.8F8FE110@arrl.org>, Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org> writes:

>I'm sure some members will find $39 too high. I'm sure others will
>evaluate what ARRL is doing for them and decide it's worth $39. There's
>no point in arguing the ratio here since we'll know soon enough.

In taking a long, hard look at what the ARRL offers and does,
I would say a $45 to $50 annual membership is reasonable for
the membership advantages.

That is outside of the "QST subscription." QST should be able
to self-support based on advertising sales for a "captive"
170 K or so readership per month.

All the other services should be worth the increased price of
membership IMHO.

In my case and that of many others, the issue is less about
cost than of what the BoD decides is good for the member-
ship...or for the US amateur radio community as a whole,
in particular the license testing regulations.

didit

1624. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 00:10:28 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010123191028.17535.00001139@nso-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 2024

In article <3A6DBA01.19D9B9EB@arrl.org>, Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org> writes:

>Dick Carroll wrote:
>>
>> Jon Bloom wrote:
>> >
>> > Huh? The new rate represents a per-annum increase of about 3%.
>>
>> Huh??? $5 as a percentage of $34 comes out to be 14.7% on my Casio.
>
>14.7% PER ANNUM (over 4 years), Dick? Your calculator's broken. Or maybe
>it just needs a new battery.

...it's not the calculator that needs the new battery...

didit

1625. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 00:10:29 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010123191029.17535.00001141@nso-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 2023

In article <3a6d0749$0$30009$44a10c7e@news.net-link.net>, "Larry Klose"
<lklose@net-link.net> writes:

>Here the ARRL Board's Jan 20 resolution:

Thanks for posting that, Larry.

didit

1626. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 00:10:29 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010123191029.17535.00001140@nso-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 2025

In article <3A6DD8FC.3005AB2D@IEEE.org>, Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>> $58.85 (not $39.00). 'Cording to my TI the actual increase was almost
>> precisely 3.5% per-annum, except they skipped some annums, so we actually
>> saved $7-and-change in the interim.
>
>Percentage increase = 100*(increase/present-cost)
>
>If the increase is $5 and the present-cost is $34, then that's a 14.7%
>increase from one year's subscription to the next year's subscription.

What part of "per annum" do you not understand, Cecil?

didit

1627. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 00:10:31 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010123191031.17535.00001142@nso-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 2030

In article <pZhb6.1119$e5.2789975@news.ntplx.net>, "Ed Hare, W1RFI"
<w1rfi@arrl.net> writes:

>Leland C. Scott <no-spam@junk-mail.net> wrote:
>
>> > FURTHER RESOLVED, it is the opinion of this Board at this time that
>Morse
>> > code should be retained as a testing element in the U.S.; and be it
>
>> Looks like the ARRL has its collective head still firmly planted in the
>> past. Time to write my division director again.
>
>Isn't the statement really saying that the ARRL is not seeking to change the
>US regulations at this time?

Is it?

>It will be at least 4 years away before the FCC
>would even consider a change, looking at the timing of the WRC and
>estimating the amount of time it will take to ratify the treaty.

The US Congress mandated the FCC to perform biennial reviews
of regulations. "Biennial" is defined as every two years, not four.

I thought ITU-R standards are voted and adopted, not "ratified."
The "treaty" is a statement that the USA is a member of the
ITU and supports it, not the individual standards for any particular
radio service.

>I think
>that it is premature to set a policy now on a matter that cannot be changed
>now and that can be decided better when something specific can be put on the
>plate.

I thought that any sort of "policy" affects the future. The decision
could have just as easily been made to read that it (the BoD)
supports that the FCC should begin changing the code test
requirement as soon as S25.5 is deleted or amended to void the
code test for a below-30-MHz-privilege amateur radio license.

>A lot can change in the membership, in Amateur Radio and in the
>makeup of the Board in the intervening 4 years.

Yes, a meteor can fall or aliens invade the earth...

>It is, IMHO, up to a
>future Board to change or affirm its policy wrt US regulations when it

>appears that it is time to act. The present policy simply does not change
>the status quo wrt the ARRL policy on US requirements. Considering that no
>change in policy can effect any change in US regulations, I think the Board
>made a reasonable choice.

I see the BoD as thinking more of its and the ARRL's future
insofar as membership numbers. Hard-line PCTAs are
more likely found in ARRL membership than outside. That's
as it should be since the ARRL need only be concerned
about its membership.

>The Board dealt with the international treaty now because now is when the
>decisions need to be made.

Disagree. The time to act, to show the leadership and vision
stated by Hans Brakob, should have come at least two years
earlier. Stating that time-now was "the time to act" looks
more like a rubber-stamp approval of whatever the BoD does.

The issue of eliminating the code test requirement in S25.5
surfaced in earnest about four years ago, did not happen
overnight. As far back as 1990 the FCC said (in the R&O
establishing the Technician class license) that a code test
does not fit with their requirements as to licensing. The
time to act was before this weekend.

Stubborness (perhaps lethargy) in seeing the future laid
out before them is not an endearing quality of the ARRL
leadership. Such may comfort the membership but does
nothing to bring in new memberships (and dues monies)
from the over 3/4s of all US licensees that are not now
members of the ARRL.

>IMHO, of course.

Of course...and IMHO too.

didit

1628. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 00:10:32 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010123191032.17535.00001143@nso-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 2027

In article <94klklbno1@nnrp1.deja.com>, K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org> writes:

>"Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net> wrote:
>
>> I think the "at this time" language in your post and in the
>> resolution is pretty important. IMHO, the Board is saying
>> that it will leave it to the correct time to deal with the issue.
>
>"Boldness has genius, power and magic in it."
> --von Goethe
>
>I was disappointed that the BoD display this "go with the flow -
>wait and see" attitude. Having sat in that room in the past,
>I know that boldness is often punished, but this seemed like
>the perfect time to display some leadership and vision.
>
>Opportunity lost. Sigh!

While I did not expect boldness and vision in leadership, I am heartened that the BoD went as far as it did. Given the past emphasis on morse code abilities thought necessary for all radio amateurs, the BoD decision seemed to be a Major Upheaval in Attitude! I have to give the BoD a warm round of applause in appreciation of actually getting around to changing its collective mind!

It will now be interesting to see what happens with revised Agendas for WRC-2003 after the International Bureau's meeting of 30 January 2001 on Agenda item details. :-)

Note: The present agenda for WRC-2003 carries a non-specific statement concerning "S25" (not S25.5 but only of all standards inclusive in regard to amateur radio). If the ARRL has any clout left with the FCC, the new agenda may show something less general than it does now.

didit

1629. Re: FCC Proposal for New Novice Class License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 00:10:33 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010123191033.17535.00001144@nso-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 2029

In article <3A6D31C5.D8F4C50F@ovis.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net> writes:

>For Pete's sake, Len. You've been babbling here for years and many
>might like to dissuade you, it hasn't yet worked.

Quite true and not just for "Pete's sake."

>No one can bar you
>from expressing your opinions even if we don't share them or like them.
>I, for one, reserve the right to call you a fat head if I disagree with
>your views.

You have done more than that, especially when not receiving
any praise over the "clever" use of CW as an order-wire for
a State Department FSK TTY circuit. :-)

>That's the other side of free speech. Being able to tell
>you that I think you bring little to the table is MY right.

Si, el Jefe. What you say is all right. What others say is
all wrong unless it coincides with your light right.

So...all readers can now expect name-calling to be a
"tradition" in this newsgroup now that you are retired from
government service?

>Where is it mandated that I must be any more "politically correct" in
>putting forth my disagreement with something you might have written?

Nobody is mandating Dave Heil. He is El Jefe and will call
anyone a "fat head" if he feels like it. :-)

>Political correctness is another way of dancing around what one really
>means. Folks are worried today about damaging the self esteem of
>another. I'm not worried about your self esteem, Len.

I am not worried about my self esteem, El Jefe.

I think El Jefe is worried about his self-image.

>I would be most
>interested in hearing you explain how the amateur radio service is doing
>anything close to illegality or against the principles espoused in the
>U.S. Constitution in disageeing with the views of Leonard Anderson.

No you would not. You say the above to troll for another bout
of Heilian ascerbicity to get even with another who did not
please you in a newsgroup exchange.

>Wrap yourself in the flag and get up on that soapbox, Len. Strike a
>pose while I snap a photo. I'm sure that Ed can arrange to have it
>appear in an upcoming issue of QST.

How will that resolve anything, El Jefe? Why would QST bother
with any photo of a non-amateur? QST is a membership
magazine of the ARRL, isn't it?

>> Just an observation from someone who believes in and
>> once took a serious oath to defend the United States
>> Constitution with his life if needs be.
>
>Oh my...

Ah, so an expression of patriotism for the USA is suddenly
passe'? Strange coming from a former employee of the US
government. It was the United States government, wasn't it?

To who (or whom) is El Jefe's allegiance owed?

didit

1630. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 00:10:34 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010123191034.17535.00001145@nso-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 2028

In article <20010123071403.12166.00000959@ng-cd1.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>>From: Brian Kelly kelly@dvol.com
>
>>The only of those which really matter are very rarely encountered spurious
>>outputs and garbaged signals, easy to check with the spectrum anlayzers we
>>have today which didn't exist back then.
>
>Very few hams have a spectrum analyzer.

On one hand, a TxPorter from Motron is considered "valuable" at $800 for fingerprinting repeater kerchunkers, but a spectrum analyzer is not considered good?

An MF to VHF amateur spectrum analyzer can be built for less than $400 in essential parts, using an old oscilloscope for a display. Analog Devices has some excellent logarithmic amplifier-successive-detector ICs that can yield an 80 db dynamic range. Mini-Circuits has a line of good VCOs (Voltage Controlled Oscillators) that can serve as the first L.O. swept by a 555 timer generating a sawtooth waveform. Up-convert the first mixer output, filter it with a high-Q resonator, then down-convert to a choice of narrow filters. The Agilent (new name for HP Test and Measurement Div.) website has some excellent free download tutorials which explain the principles. Other than the essential items mentioned, the ARRL Handbook should have all the details on supporting circuitry.

A spectrum analyzer is an excellent instrument for displaying the harmonic content of a transmitter, for "sniffing" out RF leakage, and can show the quality of modulation of SSB, AM, FM, or PM...even OOK CW with slow sweep speeds and sharp IF filtering.

Such an instrument could be designed and built as a club project, made available for club members' use. It doesn't have to be an integral part of any individual radio amateur's equipment. It is a good receiving tool if used as an indicator of received signals a la the old "Panadapter." Icom has made receivers with an auxilliary 1st IF output specifically for an external spectrum analyzer connection.

didit

1631. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 00:19:19 UTC
From: Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com>
Message-ID: <3A6E1F87.D15BA37@dvol.com>
Source record: 2031

Larry Klose wrote:

> . . The FCC's Report and Order said
> that Morse code exam requirement served "no regulatory
> purpose".

>
Why do tests on on ssb, atv, digital comms, FM, etc.apparently serve a
regulatory purpose but cw tests do not serve a regulatory purpose?
>
w3rv

1632. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 00:42:46 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <Kzpb6.1149$e5.2819002@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 2032

Len Over 21 <lenover21@aol.com> wrote:

> >Very few hams have a spectrum analyzer.

> On one hand, a TxPorter from Motron is considered "valuable" at
> $800 for fingerprinting repeater kerchunkers, but a spectrum
> analyzer is not considered good?

Very few hams have fingerprinting equipment, too.

I think the spectrum analyzer would be the more valuable of the two.

> An MF to VHF amateur spectrum analyzer can be built for less
> than $400 in essential parts, using an old oscilloscope for a
> display. Analog Devices has some excellent logarithmic
> amplifier-successive-detector ICs that can yield an 80 db
> dynamic range. Mini-Circuits has a line of good VCOs
> (Voltage Controlled Oscillators) that can serve as the first
> L.O. swept by a 555 timer generating a sawtooth waveform.
> Up-convert the first mixer output, filter it with a high-Q
> resonator, then down-convert to a choice of narrow filters.
> The Agilent (new name for HP Test and Measurement Div.)
> website has some excellent free download tutorials which
> explain the principles. Other than the essential items
> mentioned, the ARRL Handbook should have all the details
> on supporting circuitry.

You are correct; it is relatively easy to build and use a spectrum analyzer,
although the inexpensive ones often do not have a lot of dynamic range.

Two good sources of info are:

http://www.arrl.org/tis/info/pdf/9808035.pdf - Part 1- a spectrum analyzer
construction project
http://www.arrl.org/tis/info/pdf/9809037.pdf - Part 2
http://www.science-workshop.com/Joe_Carr%27s_NV_article.htm - Poor man's
spectrum analyzer

A tutorial on spectrum analyzers is found at:

http://www.science-workshop.com/

> A spectrum analyzer is an excellent instrument for
> displaying the harmonic content of a transmitter, for
> "sniffing" out RF leakage, and can show the quality of
> modulation of SSB, AM, FM, or PM...even OOK CW
> with slow sweep speeds and sharp IF filtering.

> Such an instrument could be designed and built as a
> club project, made available for club members' use.
> It doesn't have to be an integral part of any individual
> radio amateur's equipment. It is a good receiving tool
> if used as an indicator of received signals a la the old
> "Panadapter." Icom has made receivers with an
> auxilliary 1st IF output specifically for an external
> spectrum analyzer connection.

Good advice all, Len.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1633. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 00:42:52 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <94l8eatlp1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2033

In article <Jlnb6.1129$e5.2810209@news.ntplx.net>,
"Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net> wrote:

> If deciding to change only the policy wrt the international
> treaty at this was the only way they could get enough agreement
> to get ANY resolution to pass, I can understand and accept it.

I can understand it, but it just keeps getting harder to accept.

73, de Hans, K0HB
--
"We are fellow travelers on a journey between two
eternities, and it's a trip far too brief for me
to be concerned about your speed at the Code of
Morse."

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1634. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 00:56:59 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <4Npb6.1150$e5.2819890@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 2034

Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com> wrote:

> I like the idea of letting the members get a peek at more of the details which
> make a difference we never usually hear about about but good grief Edward,
> don't bury us with 2-3 day diatribes per month!

Not at all, but it will take me 2-3 days to put together the info just on VDSL, Home Networking and a few of the other immediate threats. ARRL should put together more stuff like:

http://www.arrl.org/tis/info/rfiteljx.html

> Dump the lab, turn it over to somebody else and get outta there. Your RFI
> activities while being of a technical nature are much more political, consensus
> building and educational pursuits which have nothing to do with lab tests of the
> latest whizzy xcvrs.

You are quite correct; RFI and equipment testing are two different beasts. Mike Tracy does our equipment testing. Problem has been, up until this past weekend, that I have been doing individual member contact on RFI problems, working with utilities, manufacturers and the like on individual RFI problems, contact with industry groups (VDSL, HomePlug, Home Phone Networking Alliance, to name the recent ones), assigned tasks to help prepare our comments to the FCC on various regulatory issues, participation on 4 different industry standards committees, plus a few ARRL Board-level committees as staff liaison or as a member. And, of course, the occasional 2-3 day writing assignment for articles and the day-to-day supervision of the guy who does the testing, the guy who puts up the TIS pages and, of course, Zack, our Lab "generalist." You are correct; all of this cannot be done justice by one person; some of those areas are seeing a growing backlog. I am not saying this to brag, but in support of your view that a full-time effort toward just the RFI component is needed.

> Considering your background and the ogre content of the exponential escalation of the number
> of Part 15 devices (among other threats) SOMEBODY gotta put full time into it.

Yes, indeed; I expect to see the Help Wanted ad for the several new HQ positions that will be created as a result of the last Board meeting hit QST for the March issue, and it the ARRL Web page, probably tomorrow. Check http://www.arrl.org/announce/jobs/ over the coming couple of days to see the general scope of the position. I may continue to do some of the industry

committee liaison work because it is going well, but I definately want to see a full-time effort go into addressing the growing problem of RFI to hams. That will also let me work some on some of the R&D and noise studies that I have been hoping to find some time to do, and to occasionally work a 40 hour week. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1635. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 01:00:28 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <lQpb6.1151$e5.2820085@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 2035

Len Over 21 <lenover21@aol.com> wrote:

> In my case and that of many others, the issue is less about
> cost than of what the BoD decides is good for the member-
> ship...or for the US amateur radio community as a whole,
> in particular the license testing regulations.

As you point out, Len, the ARRL Board does not (and IMHO should not) decide the US licensing regulations. The FCC has sole regulatory authority over the Amateur Radio Service. The ARRL Board determines only ARRL policy. And among the things the Board has decided is good for the Amateur Community are the very things you say should be worth $50 a year. Actually, considering that they are funded by a combination of dues, advertising revenues and pub sales, plus a smattering of donations, they probably are worth just about what you cite. :-)

73,
EdHare, W1RFI

1636. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 01:02:29 UTC
From: Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com>
Message-ID: <3A6E29A5.99589F63@dvol.com>
Source record: 2036

Len Over 21 wrote:

> Such an instrument could be designed and built as a
> club project, made available for club members' use.
> It doesn't have to be an integral part of any individual
> radio amateur's equipment.

>
An article on "How to Build the Black Box" which feeds the Firewire port in the back of Le Machine should work even better with a bunch less hardware. .
>

> It is a good receiving tool
> if used as an indicator of received signals a la the old
> "Panadapter." Icom has made receivers with an
> auxilliary 1st IF output specifically for an external
> spectrum analyzer connection.

>
Old as the hills, had a Heathkit version (HO-10?) in the early 60s fed by my 75A4. Been there, done 'em, trust me, they're useless panel clutter for real-world ham listening ops. Decent modulation checkers but that was about the extent of their usefulness.
>

> didit

>
w3rv

1637. Re: Will you let them take away your guns?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 01:03:03 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <94l9k7$9vf$0@208.207.71.175>
Source record: 2037

Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > I don't have a dog in this scrap but I would point out that a certain
> > rebellion that began in Boston harbor was hardly considered legal,
> > either....
>
> We're discussing a rebellion against the US government, not the one that
> started the US government. Maybe I'm wrong, but one seems at odds with
> the other. Or are we just talking rebellion for rebellion's sake here.

Not me. I gathered that Larry was referring to the possibility that somehow the government had become so tyranical, in violation of the Constitition, that someone concluded that armed rebellion was again in order. I can't imagine that, but I suppose it can't be completely ruled out.
Sometimes you wonder how far some of them can incrementalize things without going over the line.

1638. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 01:03:08 UTC
From: Larry Klose <lklose@net-link.net>
Message-ID: <3a6e29da$0$30002$44a10c7e@news.net-link.net>
Source record: 2038

"Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:Imob6.1138$e5.2814627@news.ntplx.net...
> Larry Klose <lklose@net-link.net> wrote:
>
> > Since the Morse code exam requirement is a public policy matter,
> > and the amateur radio community is about evenly divided, the ARRL Board
> > could have elected to take no position, and not interfere.
>
> Since the Morse code exam is a public policy matter and the amateur radio
> community is about evenly divided, the NCI Board could have elected to
take
> no position and not interfere...

Ed, NCI only represents person who support an end to Morse code exam requirement; whereas the ARRL represent a much large number of licensees that are about evenly divided on the matter. When the ARRL Board takes a position on this matter, irregardless of the position, it going against the interest of about half of its members. The ARRL Board would have acted more responsible by presenting both side of the matter, and telling members to file their own comments with the FCC. In stead it chose side against a large number of its members and further dividing the community.

It was ARRL that was a major influence in getting S25.5 adopted by ITU and in convincing the FCC that the amateur radio community wanted continued Morse code examinations.

The ARRL Board should have told the procoder to go argue their own case, and not waste member funds on a matter that was not in conformity with law.

Larry KC8EPO

1639. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 01:08:40 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <7fas6tsamek2keq28bl0f7nbmbr9d2v153@4ax.com>
Source record: 2039

w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:
>Read the Handbook chapter on troubleshooting, post 1994.

I have never had to resort to the embarrassment of sending my ham gear in to be fixed. The reason is (knock on wood) that none of my new solid state mini-part gear has ever broken. In fact, I have never had a computer failure either. Len is correct, the new stuff is much more reliable. However, in the event that something does break, I will be sure to buy a recent handbook for instructions... :-)

1640. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 01:08:42 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <b9as6to5cvh5v967ipjhjjkuahvn6cjsa7@4ax.com>
Source record: 2040

w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:
> Do you think the fellow who asked the question about
>meters vs frequency found it easier to memorize all those
> frequency vs meters or to use 300/F?

I think a smart test taker will use the easiest method for each part of the test. Memorizing formulas and working out the answers is probably the easiest. And memorizing the questions and answers for complex technical questions is probably the easiest...

Professional ham engineers excepted... :-)

1641. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 01:08:43 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <3ias6tsioso9sfv97jcjv2mi2ijfhc1n8e@4ax.com>
Source record: 2041

w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:
>I think the real question to ask is what percentage of the US population were
>"technical hams" in 1960 as compared to the percentage of US population that
>are "technical hams" today?

Using the total US population for comparison might make us look better technically as a group simply because of the large growth of ham radio compared to the total population. There probably would be more of everything, from technical hams to liddy hams. But if you wanted to compare the average amount of technical hams in 1960 to the average amount of technical hams in 2000, it would have to be referenced as a percentage of total hams (for each time period) to reach any kind of valid comparison. I don't know how you would ever do that (for many reasons), but I have a definite opinion on what the answer would be... :-)

1642. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 01:08:45 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <dhas6tk7uvp4k5399scc1flvd7k9ao66d4@4ax.com>
Source record: 2042

Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net> wrote:
>Percentage-wise, it IS high. If you look at what inflation has been
>since 1997 when the League last upped the cost of yearly dues, it is
>outrageous.

Perhaps the rate increase does seem large. However in comparison to my hospitalization insurance which went up $200 a *month* or my property taxes which went up $2000 a year (my fault for moving to a nicer place), a $5 increase just didn't strike me as being all that bad... :-)

1643. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 01:09:28 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <94la08$ao0$0@208.207.71.175>
Source record: 2043

Jon Bloom wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > Jon Bloom wrote:
> > >
> > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Jon Bloom wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > Huh? The new rate represents a per-annum increase of about 3%.
> > > > >
> > > > > Huh??? $5 as a percentage of $34 comes out to be 14.7% on my Casio.
> > > >
> > > > 14.7% PER ANNUM (over 4 years), Dick? Your calculator's broken. Or maybe
> > > > it just needs a new battery.
> > > >
> > > > Jon
> > >
> > > 'Tis not my calculator that is broke, $5 is 14.7& of the %34 *annual*
> > > membership fee.
> > > Looks like an attempt to invoke New Math as yet another Newington Smoke
> > > Screen. Doesn't work any better than it ever did.
> >
> > This is one of the reasons I don't hang around rrap much any more -- too
> > many people like Dick who (willfully? ignorantly?)

Try plainspokenly. Why can't you folks at Newington just state the
facts in plain language?

misinterpret simple,
> direct statements and then use their misinterpretation as "evidence" of
> unethical behavior on the part of the other party.

So you assert that you folks at Newington never "spin" things to make
them appear just a little better than they actually are? You say that
the increase is only 3 percent per annum, gee, that isn't much. But the
simple fact is that it amounts to a 14.7 percent increase each and every
year, henceforth. If you had said it in plain terms your statement would
have made note of that.
Intended or not-and I fully accept that it was not-, your statement was
ambiguous to anyone not current on accounting terms.

> Guess my stomach for
> idiocy like this isn't as strong as Ed's.

Well, Jon, don't let it give you an ulcer. I apologize for stirring you up. Was not intended.

1644. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 01:12:23 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <94la5n$ao0$1@208.207.71.175>
Source record: 2044

K0HB wrote:
>
> "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net> wrote:
>
> > I think the "at this time" language in your post and in the
> > resolution is pretty important. IMHO, the Board is saying
> > that it will leave it to the correct time to deal with the issue.
>
> "Boldness has genius, power and magic in it."
> --von Goethe
>
> I was disappointed that the BoD display this "go with the flow -
> wait and see" attitude. Having sat in that room in the past,
> I know that boldness is often punished, but this seemed like
> the perfect time to display some leadership and vision.
>
> Opportunity lost. Sigh!

Hans! Whatcha doing, politicking for Head Honcho of NCI?

>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB
> --
> "We are fellow travelers on a journey between two
> eternities, and it's a trip far too brief for me
> to be concerned with whether or not you have passed
> a Morse code test."

Me too, but I realize if you haven't you likely will never learn it.

1645. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 01:13:53 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <X0qb6.1152$e5.2820823@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 2045

Len Over 21 <lenover21@aol.com> wrote:

> >> > FURTHER RESOLVED, it is the opinion of this Board at this time that

> >Isn't the statement really saying that the ARRL is not seeking to change
the
> >US regulations at this time?

> Is it?

That is what I felt the meaning of "at this time" means.

> The US Congress mandated the FCC to perform biennial reviews
> of regulations. "Biennial" is defined as every two years, not four.

I will gladly put a lobster dinner wager on whether the FCC revisits the Morse code testing as part of its next biennial review. I would go for dessert that they don't even make major changes the next time around.

> I thought ITU-R standards are voted and adopted, not "ratified."
> The "treaty" is a statement that the USA is a member of the
> ITU and supports it, not the individual standards for any particular
> radio service.

I may be wrong, and will defer to those who know, but after the ITU adopts the standard, does it require ratification by Congress in any form? Larry? Phil?

> I thought that any sort of "policy" affects the future. The decision
> could have just as easily been made to read that it (the BoD)
> supports that the FCC should begin changing the code test
> requirement as soon as S25.5 is deleted or amended to void the
> code test for a below-30-MHz-privilege amateur radio license.

It could have been made. I don't think that it could have been made "easily" considering the strong differences of opinion amongst ARRL members.

> >A lot can change in the membership, in Amateur Radio and in the
> >makeup of the Board in the intervening 4 years.

> Yes, a meteor can fall or aliens invade the earth...

My views have gone through some evolution over the past 4 years. Every single Director who serves on the Board now will be facing an election cycle over the next 3 years.

And as to the meteor, as compared to 1997, ARRL has a new President; two of the three Vice Presidents are new; the International Affairs Vice President is new and 9 of the 15 Director slots are filled by different people than

held the job in January 1997.

> I see the BoD as thinking more of its and the ARRL's future
> insofar as membership numbers. Hard-line PCTAs are
> more likely found in ARRL membership than outside. That's
> as it should be since the ARRL need only be concerned
> about its membership.

Do you believe that ARRL's concerns about the overall health and well being of the Amateur Radio Service are not int the best interests of its membership? I also think that the overall health and well being of the Amateur Radio Service are what is good for the ARRL.

> >The Board dealt with the international treaty now because now is when the
> >decisions need to be made.

> Disagree. The time to act, to show the leadership and vision
> stated by Hans Brakob, should have come at least two years
> earlier. Stating that time-now was "the time to act" looks
> more like a rubber-stamp approval of whatever the BoD does.

I agree; in my personal opinion, two years ago would have been better. Would the Board have reached the same decision two years ago? Did it?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1646. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 01:19:44 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <94lajg$cj3$0@208.207.71.175>
Source record: 2046

Jon Bloom wrote:
>
> Figures don't lie, but...

Precisely the problem. If you don't make it clear what your point is- and the use of "3 percent per annum" with no further clarification won't work much of the time- and when it is clear that it's gonna cost 14.7% additional each year to subscribe, well, I think you can see the problem. Not everyone thinks in accountingese. I'd venture that most people don't.

1647. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 01:23:53 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <jaqb6.1154$e5.2821247@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 2047

Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

> Precisely the problem. If you don't make it clear what your point is-
> and the use of "3 percent per annum" with no further clarification won't
> work much of the time- and when it is clear that it's gonna cost 14.7%
> additional each year to subscribe, well, I think you can see the
> problem. Not everyone thinks in accountingese. I'd venture that most
> people don't.

Did you not know that the last dues increase was in 1997?

Was the information that the standard dues rate was going from $34 to $39 somehow mislead you. Was its point not clear?

The term 3% per annum means 3% per year. A statement that the dues rate did not exceed the inflation rate because is has increased at 3% per year since the last dues increase in 1997 is not "accontingese," Dick; those concepts were taught to me in junior high school.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1648. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 01:26:02 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <kcqb6.1155$e5.2821439@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 2048

Larry Klose <lklose@net-link.net> wrote:

> interest of about half of its members. The ARRL Board would have acted more
> responsible by presenting both side of the matter, and telling members to
> file their own comments with the FCC. In stead it chose side against a
> large number of its members and further dividing the community.

When the restructuring occured, ARRL presented its reasons for its decisions to its membership, then encouraged members to file their own comments with the FCC.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1649. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 01:29:37 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <Hfqb6.1156$e5.2821807@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 2049

Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com> wrote:

> I think a smart test taker will use the easiest method for each part
> of the test. Memorizing formulas and working out the answers is
> probably the easiest. And memorizing the questions and answers for
> complex technical questions is probably the easiest...

I provided a good example for the formula-based questions; can you supply a good example for the complex technical questions that are best memorized without understanding?

I do agree that a few questions fall into that category. When I answered the question about parasitic oscillations in 1964, I didn't have a clue what one was. Amateur Radio surviced and I think that giving me a ticket worked out okay for the Amateur Radio Service. In my own small way, I have made contributions.

73,
Ed Hare,W1RFI

1650. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 01:33:39 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <94lbdjegr0@208.207.71.175>
Source record: 2050

K0HB wrote:
>
> In article <3A6DD706.6FD7EF08@IEEE.org>,
> Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
>
> > Is a one year ARRL membership fee going from $34 to $39 or is it
> > going up by one dollar each year for the next five years?
>
> It went up a $1.25 a year in 98, 99, 00, and 01, but the increase is
> not imposed until July 01.

No, actually it went up on suddenly July 1, 2001 to $39 per year which
was a 14.7 % yearly increase.
Ah, semantics.

1651. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 01:35:08 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <Tkqb6.1157$e5.2821994@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 1851

Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com> wrote in message
news:3ias6tsioso9sfv97jcjv2mi2ijfhc1n8e@4ax.com...

> Using the total US population for comparison might make us look better
> technically as a group simply because of the large growth of ham radio
> compared to the total population. There probably would be more of
> everything, from technical hams to liddy hams. But if you wanted to
> compare the average amount of technical hams in 1960 to the average
> amount of technical hams in 2000, it would have to be referenced as a
> percentage of total hams (for each time period) to reach any kind of
> valid comparison. I don't know how you would ever do that (for many
> reasons), but I have a definite opinion on what the answer would be...
> :-)

I think that we are approaching the same idea from two different directions.
(Imagine that!) Most of the "high-tech" folks will enter ham radio whether
we have a test that is very easy or one that really taxes them. The number
of highly technical hams is not apt to change.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1652. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 01:39:26 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <94lboefao0@208.207.71.175>
Source record: 1852

"Ed Hare, W1RFI" wrote:
>
> Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote:
>
> > > > > > > Huh? The new rate represents a per-annum increase of about 3%.
>
> > > 'Tis not my calculator that is broke, $5 is 14.7& of the %34 *annual*
> > > membership fee.
> > > Looks like an attempt to invoke New Math as yet another Newington Smoke
> > > Screen. Doesn't work any better than it ever did.
>
> > This is one of the reasons I don't hang around rrap much any more -- too
> > many people like Dick who (willfully? ignorantly?) misinterpret simple,
> > direct statements and then use their misinterpretation as "evidence" of
> > unethical behavior on the part of the other party. Guess my stomach for
> > idiocy like this isn't as strong as Ed's.
>
> I think, Jon and Dick, that the term "per annum" may have been
> misunderstood. If applied to a 4-year term, a per-annum rate is applied
> each year. After all, if one puts money in a savings account at a per-annum
> rate, they certainly would understand the term if the bank only applied the
> interest to one year. :-)
>
> So, lets take it step by step, over 4 years.
>
> Year 1: $34.00 + (.035 * $34.00) = $35.19
> Year 2: $35.19 + (.035 * $35.19) = $36.42
> Year 3 : $36.42 + (.035 * $36.42) = $37.69
> Year 4: $37.69 + (.035 * $37.69) = $39.00
>
> This worked out to 3.5% increase each year,except that no one had to pay the
> $35.19, the $36.42 or the $37.69; it stayed at $34.00 for those years.
>
> Does that help?

Sure it helps. It helps to understand that the only possible reason for
computing it that way is to avoid stating up front that membership fees
are going up by 14.7%. Professional accountants and other bean counters
excepted, of course.

1653. Re: Will you let them take away your guns?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 01:41:37 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010123204137.00714.00003709@nso-md.aol.com>
Source record: 1853

In article <94j7ad$k2a$2@208.207.71.147>, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
writes:

>Larry can always drag out an old illfitting uniform...
>

Dick:

Uh, don't look now, but I still fit into my old Air Force uniforms quite
nicely! I seem to have managed to avoid the seemingly inevitable
30 - 50 lb. weight gain that seems to immediately afflict most
retirees. I also have not adopted the pony tail and scraggly beard,
either. I could report back for duty on any given day of the week,
assuming I had *current* uniforms, since they've changed since
my retirement in 1994.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1654. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 01:41:37 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010123204137.00714.00003710@nso-md.aol.com>
Source record: 1854

In article <aI5b6.1110$e5.2751402@news.ntplx.net>, "Ed Hare, W1RFI"
<w1rfi@arrl.net> writes:

>At
>>$100k per 30-second spot on prime time, I am not sure mass-media ads are
>the answer.

Ed:

It may be a case of "We can't afford *not* to!" How else are we going
to get national exposure for our hobby? And what happened to my
idea of amateur-licensed celebrities being involved in the process --
donating their time, talent, and industry influence to assist with
production?

>What percentage of people that might be interested in ham radio do you feel
>do not know about its existence?

At least 80% of the general population probably don't have a clear
idea of what the thing called "ham radio" is about. The rest, if they
understand the basic concept at all, are probably more likely to
confuse us with CB than they are to have an accurate picture in
their minds of ham radio and what hams do.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1655. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 01:41:38 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010123204138.00714.00003711@nso-md.aol.com>
Source record: 1855

In article <3K5b6.1111$e5.2751455@news.ntplx.net>, "Ed Hare, W1RFI"
<w1rfi@arrl.net> writes:

>> Nor should you have to. Whenever I've been involved in ham radio
>> instruction, I've always told the class right from the beginning that I am
>> there to show them the way, but there is a lot of hard work that needs
>> to be done and I'm not going to do it for them. That usually causes
>> about a 90-percent attrition rate right from the beginning, ...
>
>In the classes I have helped teach here in Newington, we skip the lecture
>and have a much higher graduation rate than 10%. Now, if ARRL is going to
>spend all that money on mass-media ads for you, Larry, we expect you to
>score better than a 10% on your "final exam."

Ed:

There is no need to concern yourself about me. I am no longer involved
in amateur radio instruction. The licensing requirements are so
dumbed-down now that I don't want to be publicly associated with the
concept that prospective hams may actually need assistance in
meeting them. That, IMHO, would be an insult to the intelligence of
the general public.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1656. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 01:41:39 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010123204139.00714.00003712@nso-md.aol.com>
Source record: 1856

In article <lL5b6.1112$e5.2751517@news.ntplx.net>, "Ed Hare, W1RFI"
<w1rfi@arrl.net> writes:

>
>It appears to me, Larry, that the guy's concern with ham radio helped him to
>attain a major basic life skill, with some help from Fred. That must say
>more to me about the value of ham radio than it does to you.
>
>73,
>Ed Hare, W1RFI

Ed:

Well, I disagree on this one, partly due to personal experience. I've
always been one of those "Math-challenged" people -- my father is
the same way. I had to take a "Math for Dummies" course at the
local community college in order to fulfill the requirement for my
Bachelor's degree. It was a self-paced course, and it took me
two semesters to complete it with a grade of "B" -- the highest
Math grade I ever received in my life. Ham radio, even the "old timey"
written tests I took in the pre-VE days, did nothing to inspire me
to learn advanced mathematics to the point where I can exploit
that knowledge on a daily basis today. For this, and a lot of other
reasons, I don't think ham radio can be the educational salvation
of an already illiterate person. If it wasn't enough of a motivator to
make me a Math-capable person, I don't have faith in it being a
motivator to make a person able to read and write, either.
Moreover, my personal preference would be to steer the
illiterate AWAY from ham radio, in order to demonstrate that
gaining literacy skills MUST take priority over hobbyist activities.
My reasoning is that a person who learns to read only to pass
their ham radio tests may throw that skill away once they barely
succeed -- much the same way Morse code skill is discarded
once HF operating privileges have been attained. The fact that
a ham radio ticket is an "end game" to the learning process for
many "hams" means that to me, it doesn't seem like the
powerful educational tool some hams claim it to be.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1657. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 01:42:41 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A6E3311.C7B96D42@IEEE.org>
Source record: 1861

n2ey@aol.com wrote:
> Much of what you have written about me is simply not true, Cecil. I
> have pointed out your mistakes above. You will not admit them, of
> course.

A simple statement is all that it would take for me to change my mind
and you have refused to provide it. What am I to infer from that?

> I'm sorry you are so bored that you have
> to spend time trying to "get other people's goats".

And I'm sorry you won't condemn code-tested hams who use Morse code
equipment for jamming.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

1658. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 01:43:38 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <Rsqb6.1158$e5.2822489@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 1858

Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

> Sure it helps. It helps to understand that the only possible reason for
> computing it that way is to avoid stating up front that membership fees
> are going up by 14.7%. Professional accountants and other bean counters
> excepted, of course.

Yeah, the League should have just come out and said that the dues went up by $5 and not tried to hide it. Maybe we can get them to rewrite the news story to just say that they went from $34 to $39 a year.

Dick, Jon's initial statement was made in response to Dave's claiming that the dues increase had exceeded the rate of inflation. In that context, what he said was perfectly accurate and useful. He didn't say it hoping to confuse you. You did that part on your own. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1659. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 01:44:01 UTC
From: Larry Klose <lklose@net-link.net>
Message-ID: <3a6e336f$0$30013$44a10c7e@news.net-link.net>
Source record: 1857

"Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:Ysob6.1139$e5.2814845@news.ntplx.net...
> Larry Klose <lklose@net-link.net> wrote:
>
> > FCC gave the ARRL plenty of opportunity to show some
> > leadership, but the Board said "no change".
>
> The ARRL's comments to the FCC were plenty of change,
> Larry. Trying to rewrite history here?

No Ed, I talking about before the FCC issued its NPRM for
WT Docket #98-143. The ARRL had setup committee
to study license restructuring, the committee recommend
changes, but the Board reject all three motions.
Bad decision, had they followed committee recommendation,
the FCC probably would have adopted it, NCI would not have
been formed or been motovated to act. As you say, that all
history now and can not be rewitten.

> > The FCC's Report and Order said that Morse code exam
> > requirement served "no regulatory purpose".
> > So what does the ARRL Board do?
> > They demand the FCC continue 5 wpm code exams.
>
> When? In its comments to the FCC for restructuring?

January 20, 2001

> NCI agreed that a 5 wpm test was needed to satisfy the treaty?

No, NCI ask for no code exams, but conceded that it may not
be possible for the FCC to take that action, and reccomend in that
case that only a 5wpm test be used until S25.5 is supressed.

> Now? Can you tell me where and when
> the ARRL communicated their "demand" to the FCC?

Strike demand; insert influence, lobby, comment, recommend, etc.

> The language of the ARRL policy was clear enough
> to me that the League is choosing not to change its
> policy wrt US testing at this time.

How does that serve the public interest and
the interest of members that oppose the
Morse code exam requirement?

What purpose is served by the Board using
all members due against the say a third of the
member interest?

> You are misrepresenting facts, Larry.

No, Ed you just do not like the true facts.

> It does not reflect well on you or your goals.

Personal attacks do reflect well on you.

> > I personally advocate petitioning the United States/FCC to adopt a WRC
2003
> > policy to: (1) suppress ITU rule S25.5, (2) take exception to S25.5 in
the
> > WRC 2003 Final Acts if it is nor suppressed, and (3) delete 47 CFR
> > 97.503(a) after the conclusion of WRC 2003 without any futher
proceedings.
>
> Now that sounds a bit more realistic. :-)

If would you like to sign the petition, send be your address,
and send you a copy to sign.

Larry KC8EPO

1660. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 01:49:21 UTC
From: Larry Klose <lklose@net-link.net>
Message-ID: <3a6e34af$0$30005$44a10c7e@news.net-link.net>
Source record: 1859

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:3A6E17C6.FA205D61@dvol.com...
>
> Larry Klose wrote:
>
> > I personally advocate petitioning the United States/FCC to adopt a WRC
2003
> > policy to: (1) suppress ITU rule S25.5, (2) take exception to S25.5 in
the
> > WRC 2003 Final Acts if it is nor suppressed, and (3) delete 47 CFR
97.503(a)
> > after the conclusion of WRC 2003 without any futher proceedings.

> Don't get real upset if it doesn't quite work out your way.

I won't, but thanks for caring.

Larry

1661. Re: Black helicopters (WAS:Re: No-code kills)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 01:51:03 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010123205103.00714.00003714@nso-md.aol.com>
Source record: 1860

In article <94k5qjrvl1@nnrp1.deja.com>, K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org> writes:

>> Don't look now, but the ARRL just upped membership dues. The
>> black helicopters are back in the budget.
>
>Hey, great! And do they have any openings for jack-booted thugs?
>You and I could apply. I'm sure Cecil and Brian would give us
>glowing recommendations.

Hansl:

I don't know, but I've got my resume ready to send in at a
moment's notice, complete with a picture of my spit-shined
jack boots and Luftwaffe-issue CW key. All they gotta do is
send a black helicopter to pick me up and take me to
Newington!

73 de Larry, K3LT

1662. Re: Will you let them take away your guns?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 01:51:59 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A6E353F.B144E7B8@IEEE.org>
Source record: 1867

Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> Cecil wrote:
> > I believe we are talking about a rebellion to restore U.S. Constitutional
> > government.
>
> Really? Since you seem to know all about this, what happened to the US
> Constitutional government that made a restoration necessary in the first
> place?

Liberals happened.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

1663. Re: Will you let them take away your guns?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 01:54:59 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A6E35F3.9F297134@IEEE.org>
Source record: 1868

Dick Carroll wrote:
> I gathered that Larry was referring to the possibility that
> somehow the government had become so tyranical, in violation of the
> Constitition, that someone concluded that armed rebellion was again in
> order.

Maybe we could start by arresting all the Clinton people who sabotaged
government property by destroying the 'W' on all the PC keyboards while
packing and leaving.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

1664. Re: Will you let them take away your guns?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 01:55:59 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A6E362F.190C54B2@IEEE.org>
Source record: 1869

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> Uh, don't look now, but I still fit into my old Air Force uniforms quite
> nicely!

You mean you were that fat way back then? :-)
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

1665. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 01:56:47 UTC
From: Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com>
Message-ID: <3A6E365F.93FB1A4D@dvol.com>
Source record: 1862
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,alt.radio.family,rec.radio.cb

Dana wrote:

> What are those freqs for the family radio service?

>
14 channels between 462.5625 and 432.7125 Mhz, narrow-band FM.
>
See http://members.tripod.com/~jwilkers/frsfreqs.html
>
w3rv

1666. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 02:01:26 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <uods6tk7f3c9sn3eff0hed7099aefeilh0@4ax.com>
Source record: 1863

"Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net> wrote:
>Since the Morse code exam is a public policy matter and the amateur radio
>community is about evenly divided, the NCI Board could have elected to take
>no position and not interfere...

Gosh Ed, are you actually using a three dit ending... :-)

1667. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 02:01:28 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <lnds6t8b21r1jsujelsmtskeveoq8jd672@4ax.com>
Source record: 1864

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
>Given the past emphasis on morse code abilities thought
>necessary for all radio amateurs...

I'm curious Len. When the code test if finally abolished will you go
ahead and get an amateur license?

(This is not meant as an insult or a put down in any way.)

1668. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 02:01:29 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <ands6t4julj26b4qealdk8rj9r08rv11tc@4ax.com>
Source record: 1865
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.policy

n2ey@aol.com wrote:
>I don't post to policy anymore. I made this exception...

I know you formally announced that you were leaving rrap Jim, but why don't you come on back anyway. I for one would be glad to see you return...

1669. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 02:01:31 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <nmds6t4dgivsgnslmln6q4e724ho94hs7p@4ax.com>
Source record: 1866

Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>'Tis not my calculator that is broke, $5 is 14.7& of the %34 *annual*
>membership fee.
> Looks like an attempt to invoke New Math as yet another Newington Smoke
>Screen. Doesn't work any better than it ever did.

I think that they're pro-rating it over a few years. That makes it
look better. Car salesman's tactics... :-)

1670. Re: Black helicopters (WAS:Re: No-code kills)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 02:07:23 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <bPqb6.1159$e5.2823825@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 1870

Larry Roll K3LT <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote:

> I don't know, but I've got my resume ready to send in at a
> moment's notice, complete with a picture of my spit-shined
> jack boots and Luftwaffe-issue CW key. All they gotta do is
> send a black helicopter to pick me up and take me to
> Newington!

I will go you one better, Larry; I will pick you up in my infamous 1978 GMC pickup. QST's QRP columnist lovingly dubbed it the Deathmobile. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1671. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 02:13:43 UTC
From: Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com>
Message-ID: <3A6E3A57.C96CF9A8@dvol.com>
Source record: 1871

Larry Klose wrote:

>
> The Board spent thirty years constructing that wall, now it scheduled
> for removal in 2003.

>
Nah, more like 86 years ago when HPM put the ARRL together in 1915. The Great Wall of China was built 2,700 years ago and hasn't been removed yet.

> Larry KC8EPO

>
w3rv

1672. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 02:21:35 UTC
From: Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com>
Message-ID: <3A6E3C2F.17BF3CC5@dvol.com>
Source record: 1872

Jon Bloom wrote:

>
> Figures don't lie, but...

>
The dues starting 1 July will go up a freaking 1.3699 cents a freaking day. We're
ALL sick!
>

> Jon

>
w3rv

1673. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 02:21:42 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <C0rb6.1160$e5.2824651@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 1873

Larry Klose <lklose@net-link.net> wrote:

> > > They demand the FCC continue 5 wpm code exams.

> > When? In its comments to the FCC for restructuring?

> January 20, 2001

Who authored the letter to the FCC? What form did it take? Why did not this action with the FCC appear in any of the writeup about the Board meeting that took place at the same time? This was not discussed at the HQ staff meeting that took place after the Board meeting, nor did any of my friends on the Board discuss it with me afterwards. Why would the ARRL ask the FCC to continue something that it is already continuing? The FCC has not proposed to change the rules. Are you sure you don't have it mixed up with something else? No matter, I am sure we will read about this secret demand -- I mean request -- on the FCC web page later in the week, if you are correct.

> > NCI agreed that a 5 wpm test was needed to satisfy the treaty?

> No, NCI ask for no code exams, but conceded that it may not
> be possible for the FCC to take that action, and reccomend in that
> case that only a 5wpm test be used until S25.5 is supressed.

Isn't that what I said? :-)

> > Now? Can you tell me where and when
> > the ARRL communicated their "demand" to the FCC?

> Strike demand; insert influence, lobby, comment, recommend, etc.

Okay, can you tell me where and when the ARRL communicated their recommendation to the FCC?

> > The language of the ARRL policy was clear enough
> > to me that the League is choosing not to change its
> > policy wrt US testing at this time.

> How does that serve the public interest and
> the interest of members that oppose the
> Morse code exam requirement?

It was not intended to serve the interests of anyone; it is a decision not to change the present policy at this time.

> What purpose is served by the Board using
> all members due against the say a third of the
> member interest?

If those figures are correct -- that you believe that 1/3 of ARRL members support the removal of the US requirements for Morse code testing, then what purpose would be served by using all members' dues against 2/3 of the members interests?

Larry, stop seeing the Devil behind the bush. Stirring up trouble where none exists will weaken the effect of the ARRL's position wrt the international requirement, don't you think? The League simply clarified to its members that its decision not to oppose the elimination of the international treaty is not tied in with its position wrt the US testing requirements.

> > You are misrepresenting facts, Larry.

> No, Ed you just do not like the true facts.

I do indeed like true facts, Larry; I just don't think that your reading all sorts of things into the League's policy is at all useful.

> > It does not reflect well on you or your goals.

> Personal attacks do reflect well on you.

Do you believe that all who disagree with you are "attacking" you. You are mistaken on that, too.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1674. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 02:22:48 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <D1rb6.1161$e5.2824803@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 1874

Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com> wrote:

> >Since the Morse code exam is a public policy matter and the amateur radio
> >community is about evenly divided, the NCI Board could have elected to
take
> >no position and not interfere...

> Gosh Ed, are you actually using a three dit ending... :-)

Yes, you counted them correctly.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1675. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 02:24:09 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <V2rb6.1162$e5.2824797@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 1875

Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com> wrote:

> Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

> >'Tis not my calculator that is broke, $5 is 14.7& of the %34 *annual*
> >membership fee.
> > Looks like an attempt to invoke New Math as yet another Newington Smoke
> >Screen. Doesn't work any better than it ever did.

> I think that they're pro-rating it over a few years. That makes it
> look better. Car salesman's tactics... :-)

Perhaps it would have been more honest to just say that the dues were
increasing from $34 to $39 a year.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1676. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 02:27:52 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <o6rb6.1163$e5.2825004@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 1876

Larry Roll K3LT <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote:

> >>$100k per 30-second spot on prime time, I am not sure mass-media ads are
> >the answer.

> It may be a case of "We can't afford *not* to!" How else are we going
> to get national exposure for our hobby?

Do you believe that most of those who are inclined to be hams are not aware
of the existance of Amateur Radio?

> And what happened to my idea of amateur-licensed celebrities being
involved in the process --
> donating their time, talent, and industry influence to assist with
production?

The PSAs I saw at HQ had some celebreties on them, Larry.

> >What percentage of people that might be interested in ham radio do you
feel
> >do not know about its existence?

> At least 80% of the general population probably don't have a clear
> idea of what the thing called "ham radio" is about. The rest, if they
> understand the basic concept at all, are probably more likely to
> confuse us with CB than they are to have an accurate picture in
> their minds of ham radio and what hams do.

Probably correct. Are you saying that you feel 80% of the population are
interested in ham radio or did you read my question too quickly?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1677. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 02:30:18 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <3A6E3E3A.D3D9B206@arrl.org>
Source record: 1878

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> Jon Bloom wrote:
> >
> > Figures don't lie, but...
>
> Precisely the problem. If you don't make it clear what your point is-
> and the use of "3 percent per annum" with no further clarification won't
> work much of the time- and when it is clear that it's gonna cost 14.7%
> additional each year to subscribe, well, I think you can see the
> problem. Not everyone thinks in accountingese. I'd venture that most
> people don't.

In context, the remark was perfectly clear. I can't help that it took
you a while to figure it out.

Jon

1678. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 02:30:24 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <8gfs6tc0o2db62107lieaeug9mangmo7l6@4ax.com>
Source record: 1877

"Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net> wrote:
> When I answered the question about parasitic oscillations in 1964,
>I didn't have a clue what one was.

Did you get the answer to that clueless question right?? :-)

>Amateur Radio surviced

Amateur radio will survive the Bash like test we have today too.
That's not the question though. The question is: Do you think that a
test that allows people to pass without knowing the material is a good
test...

>In my own small way, I have made contributions.

There's no doubt about that Ed. Your accomplishments are outstanding ,
and I mean that sincerely. On the other hand, I've done absolutely
nothing for the ARS except use it. But what does that have to do with
our discussion on the merits of today's ham tests... :-)

1679. Re: Will you let them take away your guns?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 02:36:15 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A6E3F9F.77B98DBC@uci.edu>
Source record: 1880

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Not me. I gathered that Larry was referring to the possibility that
> somehow the government had become so tyranical, in violation of the
> Constitition, that someone concluded that armed rebellion was again in
> order. I can't imagine that, but I suppose it can't be completely ruled
> out.

Things would have to be a lot different than anything the framers of the Constitution ever imagined. I think they were trying to obviate the necessity for such things when they created that document.

But if it ever were to come to that, it sure as heck wouldn't be Brown Bess's and swords.

73, Jim AC6XG

1680. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 02:36:18 UTC
From: W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com>
Message-ID: <94lf3b$k6k$1@iac5.navix.net>
Source record: 1879

If I may disagree Larry, it is difficult to decide not to read, once you learn how. It is impossible to drive down the street and not read a billboard or two.

This particular guy was never allowed to attend school because his parents were uneducated fundamentalists. He was told most of his life he was not able to go to school because he was mentally handicapped.

He originally came to the lessons at my house because his buddies did. When he was having real problems with the code, I asked him to come over by himself a few nights.

The stupid one was me! It took me three nights before I finally realized he was illiterate.
When I finally asked him if he knew how to read he was very embarrassed. I asked him if he would like to never be embarrassed again. Then we started to work on learning. I learned as much as he did. I did not know how to teach someone to read, I have that skill now.

Within a year he was reading at a 10th grade level and we went to the Knoxville Hamfest for him to take his test. He came out of the session with a ticket and you couldn't have wiped the smile off his face with a shovel. I was like a proud father and I must admit to a few tears rolling down my face in joy.

I do not know if ham radio was the motivator or the vehicle, neither do I care.

--
Fred W4JLE

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20010123204139.00714.00003712@nso-md.aol.com...
> In article <lL5b6.1112$e5.2751517@news.ntplx.net>, "Ed Hare, W1RFI"
> <w1rfi@arrl.net> writes:
>
> >
> > >It appears to me, Larry, that the guy's concern with ham radio helped him
to
> > >attain a major basic life skill, with some help from Fred. That must say
> > >more to me about the value of ham radio than it does to you.
> > >
> > >73,
> > >Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
> Ed:

>
> Well, I disagree on this one, partly due to personal experience. I've
> always been one of those "Math-challenged" people -- my father is
> the same way. I had to take a "Math for Dummies" course at the
> local community college in order to fulfill the requirement for my
> Bachelor's degree. It was a self-paced course, and it took me
> two semesters to complete it with a grade of "B" -- the highest
> Math grade I ever received in my life. Ham radio, even the "old timey"
> written tests I took in the pre-VE days, did nothing to inspire me
> to learn advanced mathematics to the point where I can exploit
> that knowledge on a daily basis today. For this, and a lot of other
> reasons, I don't think ham radio can be the educational salvation
> of an already illiterate person. If it wasn't enough of a motivator to
> make me a Math-capable person, I don't have faith in it being a
> motivator to make a person able to read and write, either.
> Moreover, my personal preference would be to steer the
> illiterate AWAY from ham radio, in order to demonstrate that
> gaining literacy skills MUST take priority over hobbyist activities.
> My reasoning is that a person who learns to read only to pass
> their ham radio tests may throw that skill away once they barely
> succeed -- much the same way Morse code skill is discarded
> once HF operating privileges have been attained. The fact that
> a ham radio ticket is an "end game" to the learning process for
> many "hams" means that to me, it doesn't seem like the
> powerful educational tool some hams claim it to be.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

1681. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 02:42:31 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <3A6E4117.8D1B0DEB@arrl.org>
Source record: 1881

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> Jon Bloom wrote:
> > This is one of the reasons I don't hang around rrap much any more -- too
> > many people like Dick who (willfully? ignorantly?)
>
> Try plainspokenly. Why can't you folks at Newington just state the
> facts in plain language?

It seemed plain enough to me.

> misinterpret simple,
> > direct statements and then use their misinterpretation as "evidence" of
> > unethical behavior on the part of the other party.
>
> So you assert that you folks at Newington never "spin" things to make
> them appear just a little better than they actually are? You say that
> the increase is only 3 percent per annum, gee, that isn't much.

What I said was that it wasn't very different from the rate of inflation
over the same period. I didn't say it "wasn't much" of an increase. In
fact, I said that ARRL members would decide that question for
themselves. Why do you "spin" things to make them just a little worse
than they are?

> But the
> simple fact is that it amounts to a 14.7 percent increase each and every
> year, henceforth. If you had said it in plain terms your statement would
> have made note of that.

If the topic had been the percentage increase over the $34 dues rate, I
would have used the 14.7% number. But it wasn't, so I didn't.

> Intended or not-and I fully accept that it was not-, your statement was
> ambiguous to anyone not current on accounting terms.

For the record, I didn't intend to confuse anyone.

> > Guess my stomach for
> > idiocy like this isn't as strong as Ed's.
>
> Well, Jon, don't let it give you an ulcer. I apologize for stirring you
> up. Was not intended.

Apology accepted, with thanks.

Jon

1682. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 02:51:16 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nospam.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.g7n3jh0.pminews@ca.news.verio.net>
Source record: 1882

On Wed, 24 Jan 2001 01:08:45 GMT, Aaron Jones wrote:

>Perhaps the rate increase does seem large. However in comparison to
>my hospitalization insurance which went up $200 a *month* or my
>property taxes which went up $2000 a year (my fault for moving to a
>nicer place), a $5 increase just didn't strike me as being all that
>bad... :-)

I just found a way to save an extra $5 a week if I wanted
to....my favorite frozen yoghurt place just closed its
doors.....

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

1683. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 02:53:39 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <Burb6.1164$e5.2826036@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 1885

Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com> wrote:

> > When I answered the question about parasitic oscillations in 1964,
> >I didn't have a clue what one was.

> Did you get the answer to that clueless question right?? :-)

I think I did; there was only one answer that had the word interference in it, if memory serves.

> >Amateur Radio surviced

> Amateur radio will survive the Bash like test we have today too.
> That's not the question though. The question is: Do you think that a
> test that allows people to pass without knowing the material is a good
> test...

Already answered. Now if you will admit that the question is not at all related to amateur radio testing, I may answer it differently, right after I ask you why you keep bringing it up in threads about amateur testing it if is not related. :-)

> >In my own small way, I have made contributions.

> There's no doubt about that Ed. Your accomplishments are outstanding ,
> and I mean that sincerely.

No, I did mean small contributions. Much of what I have done is to coordinate the learned work of others. Valuable, perhaps, but not brilliant.

> On the other hand, I've done absolutely nothing for the ARS except use it. But what does that have to do with
> our discussion on the merits of today's ham tests... :-)

The fact that I took a test in 1964 for which I did what I feel most people are doing today -- a combination of learning, memorizing, lucky guessing and skipping a few tough topics. I don't believe that the scope or difficulty or relative learning of todays tests are easier than they were in 1964, to the contrary; I believe that the difficulty is somewhat higher. Why would you expect me not to discuss today's tests it the context of tests I actually took?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1684. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 02:53:46 UTC
From: W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com>
Message-ID: <94lg42$kq3$1@iac5.navix.net>
Source record: 1883

I hate it when people do stuff and then fudge the math to say they did
something else.

If you got a pay raise for the first time in 3 years, do you divide the 10%
increase over 3 years and tell your wife you got a 3.3% raise, or the actual
10% you received. That per year stuff may work for a bean counter but it is
a 14.7% over my last dues for me.

Increases not made during previous years only enter the picture if you use
the Clintonista type math. I am a big kid, I understand that dues increase,
just don't blow smoke up my kilt and justify it with non-retroactive
increases.

--
Fred W4JLE

"Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:Rsqb6.1158$e5.2822489@news.ntplx.net...
> Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>
> > Sure it helps. It helps to understand that the only possible reason for
> > computing it that way is to avoid stating up front that membership fees
> > are going up by 14.7%. Professional accountants and other bean counters
> > excepted, of course.
>
> Yeah, the League should have just come out and said that the dues went up
by
> $5 and not tried to hide it. Maybe we can get them to rewrite the news
story
> to just say that they went from $34 to $39 a year.
>
> Dick, Jon's initial statement was made in response to Dave's claiming that
> the dues increase had exceeded the rate of inflation. In that context,
what
> he said was perfectly accurate and useful. He didn't say it hoping to
> confuse you. You did that part on your own. :-)
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
>

1685. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 02:54:37 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <1rgs6tgh3ru4sot762u121mqe9jt84lebk@4ax.com>
Source record: 1884

"Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net> wrote:
>Perhaps it would have been more honest to just say that the dues were
>increasing from $34 to $39 a year.

Well let's see...
Jon first calls Dick ignorant (among other insults) and then calls Cecil a liar. I think everybody knew it was a 5$ increase. The difference in opinion was in how the percentage was figured. Do you think that Headquarters handled their part of the argument civilly??

Jon to Dick:
"14.7% PER ANNUM (over 4 years), Dick? Your calculator's broken. Or maybe it just needs a new battery.This is one of the reasons I don't hang around rrap much any more -- too many people like Dick who (willfully? ignorantly?) misinterpret simple, direct statements and then use their misinterpretation as "evidence" of unethical behavior on the part of the other party. Guess my stomach for idiocy like this isn't as strong as Ed's.

Jon to Cecil:
Figures don't lie, but... [liars figure]

1686. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 02:55:42 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <wwrb6.1165$e5.2826236@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 1887

W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com> wrote:

> Within a year he was reading at a 10th grade level and we went to the
> Knoxville Hamfest for him to take his test. He came out of the session
with
> a ticket and you couldn't have wiped the smile off his face with a shovel.
I
> was like a proud father and I must admit to a few tears rolling down my
face
> in joy.

> I do not know if ham radio was the motivator or the vehicle, neither do I
> care.

Nor do I, Fred. I am sure he is thankful that you decided to be
"politically correct." Others would have not bothered because they "knew" it
was hopeless.

73, OM,
Ed, W1RFI

1687. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 02:56:14 UTC
From: W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com>
Message-ID: <94lg8m$ks3$1@iac5.navix.net>
Source record: 1886

Then why all the bull crap math? I have no problem with the increase. I have one hell of a problem with the Clintonesque explanation.

--
Fred W4JLE NHI

"Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net> wrote in message news:V2rb6.1162$e5.2824797@news.ntplx.net...
> Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com> wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>
> > >'Tis not my calculator that is broke, $5 is 14.7& of the %34 *annual*
> > >membership fee.
> > > Looks like an attempt to invoke New Math as yet another Newington Smoke
> > >Screen. Doesn't work any better than it ever did.
>
> > I think that they're pro-rating it over a few years. That makes it
> > look better. Car salesman's tactics... :-)
>
> Perhaps it would have been more honest to just say that the dues were
> increasing from $34 to $39 a year.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
>
>

1688. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 03:02:47 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <9Drb6.1166$e5.2826478@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 1888

Larry Roll K3LT <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote:

> Well, I disagree on this one, partly due to personal experience. I've
> always been one of those "Math-challenged" people -- my father is
> the same way. I had to take a "Math for Dummies" course at the
> local community college in order to fulfill the requirement for my
> Bachelor's degree. It was a self-paced course, and it took me
> two semesters to complete it with a grade of "B" -- the highest
> Math grade I ever received in my life.

Might explain why you think that everyone else memorizes tests without understanding. :-) The level of math on the General is being taught in 6th grade, though, Larry; it really isn't that hard.

> If it wasn't enough of a motivator to make me a Math-capable person, I
don't have faith in it being a
> motivator to make a person able to read and write, either.

Fred told us the tale of his experiences. While I don't think they are typical, I think it also happened.

> My reasoning is that a person who learns to read only to pass
> their ham radio tests may throw that skill away once they barely
> succeed -- much the same way Morse code skill is discarded
> once HF operating privileges have been attained.

And you are reinforcing that by telling them that this is what they are supposed to do.

> The fact that a ham radio ticket is an "end game" to the learning process
for
> many "hams" means that to me, it doesn't seem like the
> powerful educational tool some hams claim it to be.

"Many?" Care to put a percentage on that? (Warning, trick question!) I just don't accept the premise that most hams are becoming hams not to learn things.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1689. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 03:20:29 UTC
From: W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com>
Message-ID: <94lhm3lnd1@iac5.navix.net>
Source record: 1889

You response left me in a dilemma Ed, I understand you felt I had done a good thing, and in your way acknowledging it was a good thing to do.

I was troubled by the "politically correct" remark. There was no politically correctness involved. It was one human being helping another, a ham mentoring someone who wanted to be come a ham.

This is the antithesis of "political correctness". Which is defined as giving lip service, to enhance ones standing with other like minded, ribbon wearing liberals, and results in little if any real change.

Fred W4JLE

> > I do not know if ham radio was the motivator or the vehicle, neither do
I
> > care.
>
> Nor do I, Fred. I am sure he is thankful that you decided to be
> "politically correct." Others would have not bothered because they "knew"
it
> was hopeless.
>
> 73, OM,
> Ed, W1RFI
>
>

1690. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 03:24:37 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <94lhtf$5df$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1891

In article <94la5n$ao0$1@208.207.71.175>,
Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>
>
> K0HB wrote:
> >
> > "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net> wrote:
> >
> > > I think the "at this time" language in your post and in the
> > > resolution is pretty important. IMHO, the Board is saying
> > > that it will leave it to the correct time to deal with the issue.
> >
> > "Boldness has genius, power and magic in it."
> > --von Goethe
> >
> > I was disappointed that the BoD display this "go with the flow -
> > wait and see" attitude. Having sat in that room in the past,
> > I know that boldness is often punished, but this seemed like
> > the perfect time to display some leadership and vision.
> >
> > Opportunity lost. Sigh!
>
> Hans! Whatcha doing, politicking for Head Honcho of NCI?

As the guy on TV sez, "Gimme a break!"

I do not support the destructive agenda of NCI.
They are a splinter group of a few dozen loud
mouths like Carl, Larry, Bryan, etc., snapping at
the heels of the Amateur Radio service, claiming
credit for some sort of 'victory' which was decided
by the power of technology 20 years or more before
they were organized.

If I had my preference, there would continue to
be a Morse test as part of the entry to Amateur
Radio.

But that war is lost.

It is time for me to use whatever energy is left
to me to advance other important issues which have
NOT yet been decided.

When I lived on Guam in the mid 60's, twenty years
after VJ Day, there were still a few Japanese soldiers

hiding in the caves and jungles of southern Guam, fiercely loyal to the Emperor of Japan, who did not know the war was over. They were proud but pathetic creatures, warriors in the service of a cause which had been defeated two decades earlier. Their weapons were rusted to uselessness, their uniforms a distant memory, and their country and the world had passed them by.

They were called "The Stragglers".

The war for Morse testing has been lost. Rather than become one of "The Stragglers" of this war, a faded warrior defending the Emperor of Morse Tests, I'm turning in my uniform and musket, and turning my energies to other Amateur Radio issues which need attention.

73, de Hans, K0HB

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1691. ARRL Life Membership

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 04:04:19 UTC
From: rasta567@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010123230419.18743.00000881@ng-fg1.aol.com>
Source record: 1892

Can anybody tell me what are the benefits of becoming a Life Member of the ARRL. Thanks

1692. Re: FCC Proposal for New Novice Class License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 04:11:59 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net>
Message-ID: <3A6E560F.6F7E7E4A@ovis.net>
Source record: 1893

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3A6D31C5.D8F4C50F@ovis.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net> writes:
>
> >For Pete's sake, Len. You've been babbling here for years and many
> >might like to dissuade you, it hasn't yet worked.
>
> Quite true and not just for "Pete's sake."
>
> >No one can bar you
> >from expressing your opinions even if we don't share them or like them.
> >I, for one, reserve the right to call you a fat head if I disagree with
> >your views.
>
> You have done more than that, especially when not receiving
> any praise over the "clever" use of CW as an order-wire for
> a State Department FSK TTY circuit. :-)

I don't know whether you are not being forthright or are just forgetful
in your old age. I did not seek any praise. I did not come up with the
circuit. I simply used what was already in place. As I recall, you
tried telling me that what I stated was untrue. State didn't replace
the last model 28 in Africa until 1991, Len.

> >That's the other side of free speech. Being able to tell
> >you that I think you bring little to the table is MY right.
>
> Si, el Jefe. What you say is all right. What others say is
> all wrong unless it coincides with your light right.

What I say is my opinion and I have the same right to mine as you claim
for yours. I also have the right to disagree with you. Based on your
past views and some fairly recent ones, that disagreement will likely
continue.
>
> So...all readers can now expect name-calling to be a
> "tradition" in this newsgroup now that you are retired from
> government service?

I think we need a little clarification as to what you mean by your
statement.

> >Where is it mandated that I must be any more "politically correct" in
> >putting forth my disagreement with something you might have written?
>
> Nobody is mandating Dave Heil. He is El Jefe and will call

> anyone a "fat head" if he feels like it. :-)

Len you've come up with dozens of cutesy little names for folks who have disagreed with you or crossed swords with you. I don't have to be chef d'newsgroup to call you a fat head. That happens to be my opinion of you.

> >Political correctness is another way of dancing around what one really
> >means. Folks are worried today about damaging the self esteem of
> >another. I'm not worried about your self esteem, Len.
>
> I am not worried about my self esteem, El Jefe.
>
> I think El Jefe is worried about his self-image.

Why would that be?

> >I would be most
> >interested in hearing you explain how the amateur radio service is doing
> >anything close to illegality or against the principles espoused in the
> >U.S. Constitution in disageeing with the views of Leonard Anderson.
>
> No you would not. You say the above to troll for another bout
> of Heilian ascerbicity to get even with another who did not
> please you in a newsgroup exchange.

You made comments as if they were fact and you did not bother to back them up. Thus, your comments are the usual load of crap.

> >Wrap yourself in the flag and get up on that soapbox, Len. Strike a
> >pose while I snap a photo. I'm sure that Ed can arrange to have it
> >appear in an upcoming issue of QST.
>
> How will that resolve anything, El Jefe? Why would QST bother
> with any photo of a non-amateur? QST is a membership
> magazine of the ARRL, isn't it?

Remember, Len, no man is a total loss. He can always serve as a horrible example.
>
> >> Just an observation from someone who believes in and
> >> once took a serious oath to defend the United States
> >> Constitution with his life if needs be.
> >
> >Oh my...
>
> Ah, so an expression of patriotism for the USA is suddenly
> passe'? Strange coming from a former employee of the US
> government. It was the United States government, wasn't it?

Don't play patriot with me. Anyone who has served in the military or worked for the Federal Government takes the same oath. Funny--I don't remember that oath saying anything about, "with my life". Did you make

that up?
>
> To who (or whom) is El Jefe's allegiance owed?

You say the above to troll for another bout of Andersonian ascerbicity
to get even with another who did not please you in a newsgroup exchange.
See ya later, El Hefty Cabesa.

Dave K8MN

1693. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 04:18:55 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net>
Message-ID: <3A6E57AF.4020B4B7@ovis.net>
Source record: 1894

Jon Bloom wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > Jon Bloom wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil wrote:

> > >
> > > Huh? The new rate represents a per-annum increase of about 3%.
> >
> > I hope some of that money finds its way into funding for remedial math
> > skills for you, Jon. $3.40 would be a hike of 10%. 3% would be $1.02.
> > Now how much would a five dollar hike be?
>
> Per-annum, Dave. You know, the same basis on which inflation is usually
> stated.

But that wasn't stated by me or by you, Jon. Without the qualifier, the
one-time hike is much steeper.

Dave Heil K8MN

1694. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 04:30:50 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net>
Message-ID: <3A6E5A7A.3DAF9E4C@ovis.net>
Source record: 1895

Ed Hare, W1RFI wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>
> > Sure it helps. It helps to understand that the only possible reason for
> > computing it that way is to avoid stating up front that membership fees
> > are going up by 14.7%. Professional accountants and other bean counters
> > excepted, of course.
>
> Yeah, the League should have just come out and said that the dues went up by
> $5 and not tried to hide it. Maybe we can get them to rewrite the news story
> to just say that they went from $34 to $39 a year.
>
> Dick, Jon's initial statement was made in response to Dave's claiming that
> the dues increase had exceeded the rate of inflation. In that context, what
> he said was perfectly accurate and useful. He didn't say it hoping to
> confuse you. You did that part on your own. :-)
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

I don't think I made that statement, Ed. All I said was that inflation
was low. I never used the per annum term nor keyed the dues hike to the
annual rate of inflation.

Dave K8MN

1695. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 05:06:18 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <9nos6tsk10380lkec0in7bfnfa180knkfc@4ax.com>
Source record: 1896

"Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net> wrote:

>Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com> wrote:
>> Do you think that a test that allows people to pass
>> without knowing the material is a good test...

> if you will admit that the question is not at all
>related to amateur radio testing, I may answer it differently...

But my question *is* related to ham testing. Did not our very own Kim
say that she passed the Technician exam without knowing the material?
And further that many of the hams that she knew did the same thing...

> Why would you expect me not to discuss today's tests it the
> context of tests I actually took?

Because when you equate today's tests with the tests of 40 years ago
it doesn't prove that today's tests are any good. It just says that
you think those old tests weren't any worse...

1696. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 05:08:20 UTC
From: jamesrhampton@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <94lo00$a9a$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1897
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Hans, when I was active on HF back in the 60s, that was the common expression. "The handle here is ..." was the norm. Apparently, CB picked up on this and therefore everyone now says this is a CB term. Oh well. I got my knuckles rapped for this once. I don't get upset anymore. We had a guy on 440 FM ranting on about the importance of CW. We tried to change the subject, but he wouldn't let up. Fortunately, the repeater owner was on the repeater in the group so ... he and I switched to F-2 emission - about 40 WPM. That ended that. Whatever someone wants, now I try to accommodate them. This even included (many years ago) switching to American Morse on the air!

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim

In article <94286f$7a9$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org> wrote:
> For those who get their shorts all knotted up about CB lingo on the ham
> bands, here is an excerpt from a book written 60 years ago by Clinton
> DeSoto.
>
> "Among radio amateurs there is a genuine brotherhood and informal
> camaraderie. Everyone is called by his "handle" -- his first name
> or nickname. The president of the Chicago Stock Exchange and the
> mechanic in a Birmingham garage are just "Paul" and "Joe" when
> they meet on the air."
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB
> --
> > >Frisbeetarianism: The belief that when you die,
> > >your soul goes up the on roof and gets stuck.
>
> > What roof would this be?
>
> The Roof of the Universe. And in the Last Days,
> when the Great Frisbee that shineth in the sky
> hath gone out, then shalt the Almighty Thrower
> ascend the Ladder of Life and collect the souls
> of those who have flown free, and take them The
> Eternal Park, where we shall sail upon the Spring
> Breezes for ever and ever, and be Fetched by the
> Holy Dog. Amen.
>
> Sent via Deja.com

> http://www.deja.com/
>

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1697. Re: ARRL Life Membership

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 05:31:25 UTC
From: Keith Wood <kw@bctv.com>
Message-ID: <3A6E68AD.B49B121@bctv.com>
Source record: 1898

Rasta567 wrote:
>
> Can anybody tell me what are the benefits of becoming a Life Member of the
> ARRL. Thanks

Well, they can't raise membership rates on you -- the only way to get
more money per year of your membership is to kill you.

1698. Re: The Real Bill Clinton Legacy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 05:38:46 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3A6E6A4D.CD334D0C@sccoast.net>
Source record: 1899
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Cecil wrote:
>
> Dwight Stewart wrote:
> > There has been much talk about the
> > Clinton legacy. As William J.
> > Clinton leaves office, lets take a
> > look at a few things around the
> > country to discover the real Clinton
> > legacy.
>
> Dwight, you deliberately omitted the
> educational things BJ (Billy Jefferson)
> did - like a months long discussion of
> oral sex on nationwide TV. :-)

True. I'm sorry. There were indeed some positive things. In addition to what you mention, there is also a renewed awareness of semantics, which can be very helpful for those having an affair (I did not have sex with that women - I don't define "oral sex" as sex). Boy, that can be stretched to fit many sexual activities (which is what makes it so useful), but I'll leave that to the imagination of others. ;-)

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net

1699. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 05:59:25 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A6E6F3C.956C6A65@IEEE.org>
Source record: 1900

Aaron Jones wrote:
> Jon to Cecil:
> Figures don't lie, but... [liars figure]

I assumed Jon was talking about himself. :-)
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

1700. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 07:41:15 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <94m0urafl0@208.207.71.142>
Source record: 1951

Larry Klose wrote:

> The so called "bridge" you claim the Board can not see is in fact a great
> wall that surround Newington, casting a shadow over Board's vision.
>
> The Board spent thirty years constructing that wall, now it scheduled
> for removal in 2003.

So tell us, who on the BOD was there even 10 years ago, much less 30?

1701. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 10:17:35 UTC
From: Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com>
Message-ID: <3A6EABBF.3B6233B6@dvol.com>
Source record: 1952

"Ed Hare, W1RFI" wrote:

>
> Not at all, but it will take me 2-3 days to put together the info just on
> VDSL, Home Networking and a few of the other immediate threats. ARRL should
> put together more stuff like:
>
> http://www.arrl.org/tis/info/rfiteljx.html

>
Yeah, I read that shortly after it appeared, good example of what can be
accomplished.
>

>. . . . You are correct; all of this cannot be

> done justice by one person; some of those areas are seeing a growing
> backlog. I am not saying this to brag, but in support of your view that a
> full-time effort toward just the RFI component is needed.

>
It's a critical problem, something close to justifying an RFI department. Wrong
place for backlogs to be building.
>

>
> > Considering your background and the ogre content of the exponential
> escalation of the number
> > of Part 15 devices (among other threats) SOMEBODY gotta put full time into
> it.
>
> Yes, indeed; I expect to see the Help Wanted ad for the several new HQ
> positions that will be created as a result of the last Board meeting hit QST
> for the March issue, and it the ARRL Web page, probably tomorrow. Check
> http://www.arrl.org/announce/jobs/ over the coming couple of days to see the
> general scope of the position.

>
OK, good, things are moving in the right directions. It's all about putting the
money to work where it should be spent.
>

> I may continue to do some of the industry
> committee liaison work because it is going well,

>
I think that the industry liason work should take top priority. We gotta focus

on stopping the production of devices which generate RFI rather than "fixing"
the RFI sfter it shows up per your 3.5 Mhz modem work. That's like closing the
gate after the horse got loose. These computers are hideous RFI generators, nag
the FCC, this is ridiculous.
>

> but I definately want to
> see a full-time effort go into addressing the growing problem of RFI to
> hams.

>
Could not agree more. The CC&R problem is another one which needs more input.
>

> That will also let me work some on some of the R&D and noise studies
> that I have been hoping to find some time to do, and to occasionally work a
> 40 hour week. :-)

>
You know of course that your management will cheerfully let you keep on working
OT unless you put your foot down?
>

>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

>
w3rv

1702. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 10:18:14 UTC
From: Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com>
Message-ID: <3A6EABE6.A1C50DB0@dvol.com>
Source record: 1953

"Ed Hare, W1RFI" wrote:

> When I was a Nervous, those articles on the basics were really neat and
> exciting; they were high-tech to me. Now that I am a seasoned old vet, the
> same articles are "really dumbed down" in QST.

>
Of course. Not that I would admit that I still pick up a trick or two from the
dumbed-down squibs . .
>

> Go back and look at those old articles with today's eyes.

>
SWR? What's an SWR? Heh!
>

> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI
> >

>
w3rv

1703. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 10:18:34 UTC
From: Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com>
Message-ID: <3A6EABFA.74ED70A6@dvol.com>
Source record: 1954

"Ed Hare, W1RFI" wrote:

>
> Two good sources of info are:
>
> http://www.arrl.org/tis/info/pdf/9808035.pdf - Part 1- a spectrum analyzer
> construction project
> http://www.arrl.org/tis/info/pdf/9809037.pdf - Part 2
> http://www.science-workshop.com/Joe_Carr%27s_NV_article.htm - Poor man's
> spectrum analyzer

>
The Science Workshop kits look like a winner, the cable tuner trick is a gooder.

>
>
> A tutorial on spectrum analyzers is found at:
>
> http://www.science-workshop.com/

>
Tnx!
>

> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

>
w3rv

1704. Re: Suzy Steals Toilet Paper

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 10:30:29 UTC
From: Stuart Hawkins <anonymous@anonymous.com>
Message-ID: <3A6EAEC5.FB34C746@anonymous.com>
Source record: 1890
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.fan.furry,alt.test

KC8JBO wrote:
>
> In article <3A6B5BB2.A2E39BFE@houston.net>,
> Stagger Lee <SLee@houston.net> wrote:
> > Buzzsaw wrote:
> >
> > > Atlanta, GA (AP)--- Suzy Da Pig's plan to drive off with a
> truckload of
> > > stolen toilet paper went straight down the toilet.
> >
> > Poor thing. One wonders what would drive someone to such desperation
> > over toilet paper. Suzy must be very troubled, and charitable people
> > should really find a way to try and help out.
> >
> > Do you think that a toilet paper drive would help out? Concerned
> > amateurs could simply mail a package to Suzy and eliminate the
> middleman
> > that so often burdens the act of charitable giving.
> >
> > This is just an idea, because I'm sure that there are many clever
> people
> > out there who can come up with some way to help Suzy. Let's discuss
> > ways to help Suzy out; it is in the best traditions of amateur radio.
> > -- SL
> >
>
> Maybe you two can beg and get a brain to share between you......
>
> --
> 73 de Roger, KC8JBO
> EM99 |ARRL|VE [ARRL & W5YI]|ARES |RACES
> Yaesu FT-920 |Inverted Vee @ 40 ft.
> Yaesu FT-90R
>
> Sent via Deja.com
> http://www.deja.com/

1705. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 10:32:04 UTC
From: Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com>
Message-ID: <3A6EAF24.D7F4957@dvol.com>
Source record: 1955
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,alt.radio.family,rec.radio.cb

Brian Kelly wrote:

> Dana wrote:
>
> > What are those freqs for the family radio service?
>
> >
> 14 channels between 462.5625 and 467.7125 Mhz, narrow-band FM.
> >
> See http://members.tripod.com/~jwilkers/frsfreqs.html
> >
> w3rv

1706. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 11:51:22 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010124065122.13180.00000821@ng-mb1.aol.com>
Source record: 1956

>From: "W4JLE" Fred@w4jle.com

>I was troubled by the "politically correct" remark.

I'm sorry; I was directing that to some on this forum who call every instance of one ham not being unkind to another "political correctness."

>It was one human being helping another, a ham
>mentoring someone who wanted to be come a ham.

I agree wholeheartedly, although I am sure someone one will tell you that you were a bleeding heart with your love beads doing only because you are politically correct. :-)

Hey, wasn't it YOU who brought love beads into this? :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1707. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 11:59:22 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010124065922.13180.00000822@ng-mb1.aol.com>
Source record: 1957

>From: Aaron Jones nomail@nomail.com

>Using the total US population for comparison might make us look better
>technically as a group simply because of the large growth of ham radio
>compared to the total population.

I agree. I also think it is more accurate to use the entire body of evidence
for comparison.

>But if you wanted to compare the average amount of technical
>hams in 1960 to the average amount of technical hams in 2000, it would have to
be referenced as a
>percentage of total hams (for each time period) to reach any kind of
>valid comparison.

I disagree. As you said, comparing to the whole gives a better idea about the
relative number of technical hams. Which do you think is a better goal -- to
have more technical hams, irrespective of the total number of hams, or to have
a greater percentage of technical hams, irrespective of the total number of
technical hams? If all of the non-technical hams (I don't even know how you
would define that -- perhaps you could keep asking them on usenet if a test
that doesn't test knowledge is a test) quit, the percentage of technical hams
would be 100%; would the technical value of Amateur Radio change in the
positive direction? I think not, because those "non-technical hams," are not
totally devoid of technical knowledge; this is not another black and white or
yes and no answer.

> I don't know how you would ever do that (for many
>reasons), but I have a definite opinion on what the answer would be...
>:-)

I am sure the answer would have to be "yes" or "no" or you would keep asking
the question. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1708. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 12:03:05 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010124070305.13180.00000823@ng-mb1.aol.com>
Source record: 1958

>From: Aaron Jones nomail@nomail.com

>Because when you equate today's tests with the tests of 40 years ago
>it doesn't prove that today's tests are any good. It just says that
>you think those old tests weren't any worse...

That is exactly what I am saying. Although I do see ways that the present tests should be improved, I think that testing that has not created major problems in 40 years of being at about the same level is not an invalid test, to use your words.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1709. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 12:06:16 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010124070616.13180.00000824@ng-mb1.aol.com>
Source record: 1959

>From: Aaron Jones nomail@nomail.com

>I have never had to resort to the embarrassment of sending my ham gear
>in to be fixed.

I have. I sent my Ten Tec back to the factory after giving up on fixing the IF board. The fixed it to the component level; the cost was about $50.00. Saved me a LOT of time.

>In fact, I have never had a computer failure either.

Then you lead a charmed life. I have had two of them get flaky on me.

>However, in the event that something does break, I will be
>sure to buy a recent handbook for instructions... :-)

Maybe I will have to condense that chapter into an article. It has a lot of good troubleshooting tips that are useful for today's complex SMD rigs.

Tell you what, Aaron; send me your mailing address and I will send you a 2000 Handbook I salvaged from the bent-cover bin. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1710. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 12:09:40 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010124070940.13180.00000825@ng-mb1.aol.com>
Source record: 1960

>From: xjim@my-deja.com

>> I have not read much in the press about the failure of emergency
>devices in
>> emergencies. Do we need a media coverup to make this all plausible?

>Well... My take on the press, is that they don't even know that the
>water is cold until they run into an iceburg, and even then they get
>the color wrong. But that's another story.

I agree, but if it is sensational, the press will cover it. They may get it wrong, but they will get it.

>The problem with gadgets and emergencies, is that you need a real
>emergency in order to test their efficiency.

I am not sure that the emergency equipment of today is all that complex. If I designed it, I would design it such that the operator pushed a button and the "SOS" was sent. I bet that such equipment is more reliable than the HW-7 that you used as an example.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1711. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 12:11:31 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010124071131.13180.00000826@ng-mb1.aol.com>
Source record: 1961

>From: Brian Kelly kelly@dvol.com

>The Science Workshop kits look like a winner, the cable tuner trick is a
>gooder.

I agree; I like that one better than the ARRL article. Too bad I can't ask Joe
to write a QST version of the article (K4IPV SK). :-(

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1712. Re: FCC Proposal for New Novice Class License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 12:14:11 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010124071411.13180.00000827@ng-mb1.aol.com>
Source record: 1962

>From: Steven J Robeson, K4YZ

>> The old Novice was the easiest.

> Your OPINION, one not supported by archived facts.

Search and find my post that included the entire text of the 1963 ARRL study guide for the Novice.

In my opinion, the old Novice license was the easiest amateur exam in history.

What is your opinion of it?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1713. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 12:20:54 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010124072054.13180.00000828@ng-mb1.aol.com>
Source record: 1963

>From: Dave Heil k8mn@ovis.net

>> Per-annum, Dave. You know, the same basis on which inflation is usually
>> stated.

>But that wasn't stated by me or by you, Jon.

Sure it was, Dave. You stated that the dues rate was excessive wrt inflation. Inflation has an implied "per time" factor built in to the very meaning of the word. In the context you used it, the only way to compare the dues increase to inflation is to go back to the last dues increase and compare the increase to inflation over that time. Most inflation figures are reported on a percentage vs time basis (usually annual) so the easiest way to compare them is to give the annual rate of the dues increase as a percentage. Jon did so, and added the per-annum qualifier to make it more clear.

> Without the qualifier, the one-time hike is much steeper.

If you feel that the ARRL should increase the dues every year at a rate that matches the general inflation rate instead of catching up every four years, you should suggest that to your Director. When you do, keep in mind the way the League did t this time saved you about $7.00 over the 4 years it did not increase the dues.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1714. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 12:27:39 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010124072739.13180.00000829@ng-mb1.aol.com>
Source record: 1964

>From: "W4JLE" Fred@w4jle.com

>If you got a pay raise for the first time in 3 years, do you divide the 10%
>increase over 3 years and tell your wife you got a 3.3% raise, or the actual
>10% you received. That per year stuff may work for a bean counter but it is
>a 14.7% over my last dues for me.

Why, I would tell her I got the 10% increase. Of course, the other three years
I would have had to tell her I got a 0% increase.

Which would you rather get, a 10% raise every 4 years (3.33% * 4 years) or a 3%
raise every year?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1715. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 12:28:32 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010124072832.13180.00000830@ng-mb1.aol.com>
Source record: 1965

>From: "W4JLE" Fred@w4jle.com

>I hate it when people do stuff and then fudge the math to say they did
>something else.

The ARRL article about the dues increase said that the dues went from $34 to
$39. Can you explain how the math was fudged?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1716. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 12:29:28 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010124072928.13180.00000831@ng-mb1.aol.com>
Source record: 1966

>From: Aaron Jones nomail@nomail.com

>Jon first calls Dick ignorant (among other insults) and then calls
>Cecil a liar. I think everybody knew it was a 5$ increase. The
>difference in opinion was in how the percentage was figured. Do you
>think that Headquarters handled their part of the argument civilly??

I did. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1717. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 12:34:25 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010124073425.13180.00000832@ng-mb1.aol.com>
Source record: 1967

>From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

> and when it is clear that it's gonna cost 14.7%
>additional each year to subscribe, well, I think you can see the
>problem.

How much would it cost you each additional year after this if the dues had increased 3.5% every year since the last dues increase? The number are the same from this point onward whether the dues increase happened in one chunk as it did, or at a 3.5% rate every year. The way it is done, you have $7 more in your pocket; I can't see why you are displeased.

> Not everyone thinks in accountingese. I'd venture that most people don't.

Dick, this is not complex; it is junior high school math.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1718. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 12:40:37 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010124074037.13180.00000833@ng-mb1.aol.com>
Source record: 1968

>From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

> I will say this - the existance of the ARRL web page will play a large
> part in my decision on whether or not I want to remain a member.
> That is probably the most useful tangible thing that ARRL has done,
> outside of your ongoing efforts in RFI/EMI, in recent years.

> I do get a lot of use out of it. Its expansion should definitely be >
encouraged.

I agree, although we may start seeing more of those web services be made available on a members-only basis. IMHO, the line should be set such that the things that benefit Amateur Radio as a whole are on the public site, while those things that are a help to an individual ham should be a membership service. IMHO, however, helping new hams get started is for the Good of the Service, so that info will remain public. Over the coming months, I may be moving some of the QST reprints on the TIS page to members-only.

This last dues increase did drive home a point to me that the work ARRL does that benefits all hams (the RFI program and the web pages are excellent examples) is being funded by members. Those non-members that make use of those services should at least send an ARRL member a thank you. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

>Dick
>
>
>
>
>
>

1719. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 12:48:18 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010124074818.13180.00000834@ng-mb1.aol.com>
Source record: 1969

>From: Brian Kelly kelly@dvol.com

>>http://www.arrl.org/tis/info/rfiteljx.html

>Yeah, I read that shortly after it appeared, good example of what can be
>accomplished.

Yes, but it is also a good example of what kind of information about ARRL activities should be made available to members. I will use my own work as an example because I can criticize what I haven't done without offending anyone, I think. :-) I did not write up or publish the papers I presented to the T1E1.4 VDSL standards committee, nor describe much about the work I have done with the HomePhoneNetworking folks that helped them include a notch from 7.0-7.3 MHz in their product specification, although we did feature a web piece on some of the testing we did over Thanksgiving weekend. I could go on, but the point is that, IMHO, ARRL has not done a good job communicating this sort of thing to its members. I can give you my excuses -- I moved on to the next emergency. Fortunately, one of the justifications I used for hiring someone to tackle RFI to hams head on was that it WOULD give more time to document the work we do; as a Member, I want to know as much as I can about ARRL's advocacy work. It is THE principle reason I am a member, even after the Board may set a policy that I would have preferred to be set differently. Relatively small details about the choice of words in the recent Board resolution pale, IMHO, in comparison to some of the critical work being done to protect spectrum. (Protection from noise from unlicensed devices is almost as important as keeping the allocation.)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1720. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 12:53:30 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010124075330.13180.00000835@ng-mb1.aol.com>
Source record: 1970

>From: Brian Kelly kelly@dvol.com

>These computers are hideous RFI generators, nag
>the FCC, this is ridiculous.

You may not know how ridiculous. A "legal" signal from an intentional radiator on 3.5 MHz would be S9+15 dB to a dipole 100 feet away. This isn't going to change, unless Amateur Radio can document widespread interference. The complicating factor is that there are other rules that stipulate that if harmful interference occurs, the Part 15 device operator has to correct it. In cases like the AT&T PX-421 modem jack problem, AT&T is doing the right thing. So far, 90% on the recall. Can't take THAT one to the FCC. What the ARRL RFI Task Group tasked me to do is to identify several clear-cut cases where there is actual harmful interference, and an operator who refuses to do the "right" thing. We are then going to take them to the FCC. IF the FCC will enforce the no-interference clause, then it can be relied upon. If not, then we cannot live with the limits.

See http://www.arrl.org/tis/info/part15.html for ARRL's info on Part 15 devices. Don't tell Len; he gets very unhappy when I post the URL. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1721. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 13:08:11 UTC
From: W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com>
Message-ID: <94mk45$9hu$1@iac5.navix.net>
Source record: 1971

All I know is if you add 18 feet to your coax them SWRs come right down. 8>)

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:3A6EABE6.A1C50DB0@dvol.com...
>
> "Ed Hare, W1RFI" wrote:
>
> > When I was a Nervous, those articles on the basics were really neat and
> > exciting; they were high-tech to me. Now that I am a seasoned old vet,
the
> > same articles are "really dumbed down" in QST.
>
> >
> Of course. Not that I would admit that I still pick up a trick or two from
the
> dumbed-down squibs . .
> >
>
> > Go back and look at those old articles with today's eyes.
>
> >
> SWR? What's an SWR? Heh!
> >
>
> > 73,
> > Ed Hare, W1RFI
> > >
>
> >
> w3rv
>
>

1722. Anthony Hancock

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 13:15:29 UTC
From: "G8ASO;;;;;" <not@here.com>
Message-ID: <94mkih$eb4dt$1@ID-67923.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 1972
Cross-posted to: aus.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

http://members.nbci.com/g8arsehole/

The "lad" himself and arguably the most famous radio ham of them all!

Converted to mono and only a 4MB file in zipped MP3 for free download, the full episode "The Radio Ham"

Download with Go!Zilla to resume partial downloads, link on my site above.

G8ASO

http://laughingpoliceman.com LPWS representative on Earth.

1723. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 13:49:06 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A6EDD52.DBB98490@IEEE.org>
Source record: 1974

W1RFI wrote:
> ... keep in mind the way the
> League did t this time saved you about $7.00 over the 4 years it did not
> increase the dues.

Say Ed, exactly where is that $7.00 located? :-)
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

1724. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 13:52:43 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <3A6EDE2B.CBA18B33@arrl.org>
Source record: 1973

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> Jon Bloom wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> > >
> > > Jon Bloom wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil wrote:
>
> > > >
> > > > Huh? The new rate represents a per-annum increase of about 3%.
> > >
> > > I hope some of that money finds its way into funding for remedial math
> > > skills for you, Jon. $3.40 would be a hike of 10%. 3% would be $1.02.
> > > Now how much would a five dollar hike be?
> >
> > Per-annum, Dave. You know, the same basis on which inflation is usually
> > stated.
>
> But that wasn't stated by me or by you, Jon.

Sure it was stated by me, when I said "per annum" the first time. I thought that was a well understood term. I've since found out that there are some on this NG who don't understand it.

> Without the qualifier, the
> one-time hike is much steeper.

But the qualifier is necessary if you want to make a valid comparison between the dues increase and inflation. You can compare the anual rate of inflation to the per-annum dues increase, or you can compare the total inflation since 1997 to the percentage dues increase. In neither case is the result "outrageous" as you initially claimed. It only looks outrageous if you compare the total dues increase to the annual rate of inflation, but doing that ignores the years in which there was no change in dues and thus distorts the truth.

Jon

1725. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 14:42:30 UTC
From: "Leland C. Scott" <no-spam@junk-mail.net>
Message-ID: <t6tqesg0j735fe@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 1975

"Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:jqnb6.1130$e5.2810580@news.ntplx.net...
> It is very much appropriate to start working on the ARRL Board now, by
> sharing your views and either convincing your ARRL Director why they
should
> hold sway or by voting the guy out and voting a new guy in. What is your
> Director's views on the US requirements?

I am not totally sure, but I feel he is not completely for removing CW
testing requirements.

> You may find that your job is
> already done. :-) Of course, others may be trying to persuade him in the
> other direction.

So his view may not really matter. He is after all there to represent the
membership. So writing lets him know what at least one ARRL member thinks.

> Tom Frenaye already knows my views, but I took the time to
> reiterate them before the Board meeting.

That's what it's all about. Get your views, one side or the other, across to
the board.

--
Leland C. Scott
KC8LDO

1726. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 14:51:12 UTC
From: Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com>
Message-ID: <3A6EEBE0.70A0B241@dvol.com>
Source record: 1976

W1RFI wrote:

> . . . What the ARRL RFI
> Task Group tasked me to do is to identify several clear-cut cases where there
> is actual harmful interference, and an operator who refuses to do the "right"
> thing.

>
Strikes me as a situation where members should get involved. Lotta leg work indicated.
>

> We are then going to take them to the FCC. IF the FCC will enforce the
> no-interference clause, then it can be relied upon. If not, then we cannot live
> with the limits.

>
If it's well documented, etc. I would expect Riley would move on it. The problem I see with it is that the FCC can readily spank an owner of an RFI source but there are two perps involved. One being the owner who refuses to go QRT which the FCC can shut down, the other is the manufacturer of the widget who probably sold a jillion of the things. Gets very complex but it's absolutely gotta be done. I vote for getting the limits for Class B devices 'way down, kill it before it shows up on the shelves and be done with it.
>

> See http://www.arrl.org/tis/info/part15.html for ARRL's info on Part 15
> devices. Don't tell Len; he gets very unhappy when I post the URL. :-)

>
Been there, read that. Can't imagine why Len would have a problem with it.
>

> . . . I did not write up or publish the papers I presented to the T1E1.4
> VDSL standards committee, nor describe much about the work

>
Lack of time?
>

> I have done with the
> HomePhoneNetworking folks that helped them include a notch from 7.0-7.3 MHz in
> their product specification, although we did feature a web piece on some of the
> testing we did over Thanksgiving weekend. I could go on, but the point is
> that, IMHO, ARRL has not done a good job communicating this sort of thing to
> its members.

>
I agree. Gets right back to the concept of monthly staff reports in QST. Provide a brief summary per department or noteworthy invidual's news in QST povide the the link to the full text stored in the Web server. Or something. Needs to become a regular column. It'll be a lot easier when QST is published on CDs.
>

> I can give you my excuses -- I moved on to the next emergency.
> Fortunately, one of the justifications I used for hiring someone to tackle RFI
> to hams head on was that it WOULD give more time to document the work we do;

>
A manger playing help desk is nuts.
>

> as
> a Member, I want to know as much as I can about ARRL's advocacy work. It is THE
> principle reason I am a member, even after the Board may set a policy that I
> would have preferred to be set differently.

>
Oh, these boils over BOD policy decisions are even nuttier, they've been underway the whole half century I've been aware of what's up in ham radio and the sky hasn't falled despite the sporadic uproars. Ham radio has only gotten better over the years, most of the beneficial changes started with BoD decisions and mandates. I agree, my subsciption to QST is not why I'm an ARRL member.
>

> Relatively small details about the
> choice of words in the recent Board resolution pale, IMHO, in comparison to
> some of the critical work being done to protect spectrum. (Protection from
> noise from unlicensed devices is almost as important as keeping the
> allocation.)

>
I'm a lot more concerned about losing spectrum space to interefernce than I am to somebody nipping pieces of spectrum space for use by other services.
>

> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

>
w3rv

1727. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 15:17:41 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <3A6EF215.CDDA8AC@arrl.org>
Source record: 1977

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> Ed Hare, W1RFI wrote:
> > Dick, Jon's initial statement was made in response to Dave's claiming that
> > the dues increase had exceeded the rate of inflation. In that context, what
>
> I don't think I made that statement, Ed. All I said was that inflation
> was low. I never used the per annum term nor keyed the dues hike to the
> annual rate of inflation.

You said:
> Percentage-wise, it IS high. If you look at what inflation has been
> since 1997 when the League last upped the cost of yearly dues, it is
> outrageous.

So are you now saying that the dues increase is outrageous even if it doesn't exceed the amount of inflation since 1997? Or are you saying that the rate of inflation since 1997 on a per-annum basis and the total inflation since 1997 are unrelated? (!)

Frankly, I think you are now in the Cecilian position of trying to reinterpret your original words to mean something other than what they say.

Jon

1728. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 15:18:48 UTC
From: Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com>
Message-ID: <3A6EF257.45578258@dvol.com>
Source record: 1978

Dick Carroll wrote:

> Actually, I don't see where it matters more than trivially anyway,
> since FCC today pretty well ignores ARRL.
> Hang around long enough, you'll find out how it works.

>
If that's fact I think it's far more due to today's dumbed-down FCC than it is with anything the ARRL has or hasn't done. I think it's been pretty clearly demonstrated that the FCC could care less about ham radio. The whole history of the FCC with respect to ham radio over decades has been a litany of disengagement maneuvers. When it comes to changing the regs the first thing the FCC seems to do is ask itself "First priority, guys: how can we jerk this R&O around to make life easier for US?" Once that's decided they pay cerimonial attention to commenters like the ARRL.
>
w3rv

1729. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 15:23:20 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <3A6EF368.4D2DB82A@arrl.org>
Source record: 1979

Aaron Jones wrote:
>
> "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net> wrote:
> Well let's see...
> Jon first calls Dick ignorant (among other insults) and then calls

It's not an insult. Dick admitted he was ignorant of the meaning of the term "per annum." Hey, I'm ignorant of lots of things. So are you (shocking!)

> Cecil a liar.

Cecil likes to twist things, and I don't think its uncivil to point that out.

> I think everybody knew it was a 5$ increase. The
> difference in opinion was in how the percentage was figured. Do you
> think that Headquarters handled their part of the argument civilly??

Ah, yes, the argument about how to argue. Yet another pointless rrap exercise.

Jon

1730. Re: ARRL Life Membership

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 15:35:49 UTC
From: Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com>
Message-ID: <3A6EF655.F9C7508D@dvol.com>
Source record: 1980

Rasta567 wrote:

> Can anybody tell me what are the benefits of becoming a Life Member of the
> ARRL. Thanks

>
Over a long period one can save a huge number of dollars for dues. I forget when life memberships became available, 1970 or so?? Dunno. I think the original cost of a life membership was around $150. If those numbers are in the ballpark a ham who bought a life membership in 1970 paid roughly $4.83 per year this year and it keeps getting lower the longer he's a member. In the limit it becomes essentially free. Depends on whether ya wanna grunt now and buy one as a long-term investment. Very long term.
>
w3rv

1731. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 15:43:22 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <94mt6q$m18$0@208.207.71.144>
Source record: 1981

W1RFI wrote:
>
> >From: Aaron Jones nomail@nomail.com
>
> >Because when you equate today's tests with the tests of 40 years ago
> >it doesn't prove that today's tests are any good. It just says that
> >you think those old tests weren't any worse...
>
> That is exactly what I am saying. Although I do see ways that the present
> tests should be improved, I think that testing that has not created major
> problems in 40 years of being at about the same level is not an invalid test,
> to use your words.
>

Ed: I agree completely with your remarks, with the everpresent caveat
that the applicant must actually read forunderstanding and answer the
questions on that basis.

I have downloaded the entire current question pool, and am
disaappointed to find that, alas, there are very few questions
presrented in the sort of format of those few that you posted a few days
ago.
My wish is that a far greater percentage of the test questions would
be formatted in just that fashion. Were all the tests to be redone in
that way, I could agree completely that the tests were indeed a valid
assesment of the applicants knowledge. But you already knew that.

73, Dick W0EX

1732. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 15:44:24 UTC
From: Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com>
Message-ID: <3A6EF858.1280A4F7@dvol.com>
Source record: 1982

W1RFI wrote:

> This last dues increase did drive home a point to me that the work ARRL does
> that benefits all hams (the RFI program and the web pages are excellent
> examples) is being funded by members. Those non-members that make use of those
> services should at least send an ARRL member a thank you. :-)

>
No freeloader access to info which only benefits them.
>

>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

>
w3rv

1733. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 15:56:19 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <94mtv3$o4a$0@208.207.71.144>
Source record: 1983

W1RFI wrote:
>
> Tell you what, Aaron; send me your mailing address and I will send you a 2000
> Handbook I salvaged from the bent-cover bin. :-)

such as

Occupant
P O BOX 10101
Anywhere, AZ 77000 ?

Ed, I don't think you'll ever smoke him out! :-)

Dick

1734. The Ignorance of us all!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 16:02:27 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <94muaa$96t$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1984

"Hey, I'm ignorant of lots of things. So are you (shocking!)"
--Jon Bloom

"Beware of the man who works hard to learn something,
learns it, and finds himself no wiser than before.
He is full of murderous resentment of people who
are ignorant without having come by their ignorance
the hard way."
--Bokonon

"I savour the warm glow of being much more ignorant than
ordinary people, who are only ignorant of ordinary things."
--Hans, K0HB

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1735. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 16:20:50 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A6F00E2.690A2489@IEEE.org>
Source record: 1986

Jon Bloom wrote:
> Frankly, I think you are now in the Cecilian position of trying to
> reinterpret your original words to mean something other than what they
> say.

The first thread I noticed was where Dick said $5 is 14.7% of $34
and you disagreed. I had no "original words" on the subject because
I wasn't reading the thread.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

1736. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 16:25:16 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <94mvktahh1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1985

In article <20010124074037.13180.00000833@ng-mb1.aol.com>,
w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:

> I agree, although we may start seeing more of those web services
> be made available on a members-only basis.

Awhile ago I said this to the ARRL webmaster.

Whoever is setting the policy for the ARRL web site has it perfectly
backwards.

The main page, open to members and non-members alike, rivals QST as a
source of the latest news in ham radio. It is well done, timely, and
attractive. Just the sort of thing we're willing to pay our dues to
have. But we don't need to pay any dues to see it.

For those of us who pay dues, there is a "Members Only" news area. It
contains lame things like Stan "surfin' the web", "youth@hamradio.fun",
etc.

He wasn't impressed, and nothing changed. The "members only" side is
still lame.

Good luck on this one now!

73, de Hans, K0HB
--
"I *AM* the ARRL"

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1737. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 16:57:07 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <n82u6t89710khcnod2gdnk8ddp31ee330i@4ax.com>
Source record: 1987

w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:
>Which do you think is a better goal -- to have more technical hams,
>irrespective of the total number of hams, or to have
>a greater percentage of technical hams, irrespective of the total number of
>technical hams?

I think it would be best to have the largest number of technical hams possible in any time period. But that's not what I was commenting on. I was comparing the 50's era average ham's technical abilities to the technical abilities of today's average ham. I think the 50's average ham wins hands down...

>non-technical hams (I don't even know how you would define that --

Perhaps it's similar to what one judge said about pornography. It's hard to define but you know it [a tech-ham] when you see it... :-)

>perhaps you could keep asking them on usenet if a test
>that doesn't test knowledge is a [good] test)

They would probably answer the question the first time I asked it. Unless of course their answer would undermine their own position on the validity of today's ham tests... :-)

1738. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 16:57:08 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <b82u6tgoscj6mufq2ur00ukn1a4vr33e1m@4ax.com>
Source record: 1988

w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:
>I think that testing that has not created major problems
>in 40 years of being at about the same level is not
>an invalid test, to use your words.

So your position is that even though today's ham tests are faulty,
that's okay because it causes no major problems??

1739. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 16:57:10 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <d62u6t46mith2b28m8n9vr4h1bj8u9grli@4ax.com>
Source record: 1989

w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:
>Tell you what, Aaron; send me your mailing address and I will send you a 2000
>Handbook I salvaged from the bent-cover bin. :-)

How about a Handbook in the CD version?
Do you have a bent CD bin... :-)

1740. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 16:57:11 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <752u6t0ejmlo1q54nfl02nkufs4utcimv9@4ax.com>
Source record: 1990

Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com> wrote:
>SWR? What's an SWR? Heh!

I used a short piece of twin lead with flashlight bulbs soldered at
each end taped to my folded dipole's lead in to check SWR...

1741. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 16:57:13 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <l42u6tsp7vm3a2jvdnalkla7m13qcdgiur@4ax.com>
Source record: 1991

w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:
>Why, I would tell her I got the 10% increase. Of course, the other three years
>I would have had to tell her I got a 0% increase.
>
>Which would you rather get, a 10% raise every 4 years (3.33% * 4 years) or a 3%
>raise every year?

Like I said, car salesman's math.
Making the unpalatable tasty... :-)

1742. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 16:57:14 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <u22u6ts1n8apkldop9bc57peilhbeoeh4d@4ax.com>
Source record: 1992

w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:
>The number are the same from this point onward whether
>the dues increase happened in one chunk as
>it did, or at a 3.5% rate every year.
>The way it is done, you have $7 more in
>your pocket; I can't see why you are displeased.

I should be happy because my house burned down
this year, instead of 3 years ago?? Same logic... :-)

1743. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 16:57:15 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <o02u6tg65llg1ssc93m9g5f638bgmms7fb@4ax.com>
Source record: 1993

w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:
>Those non-members that make use of those
>services should at least send an ARRL member a thank you. :-)

Since I will be paying more income tax than you this year,
will you please post a thank you note to me... :-)

1744. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 16:57:17 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <rv1u6tgj723sr26tbtr8rdn1ih1cdoc57b@4ax.com>
Source record: 1994

Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote:
>It's not an insult.
>Dick admitted he was ignorant...
>So are you [ignorent] (shocking!)...

I guess this isn't an apology... :-)

>Cecil likes to twist things,
>and I don't think its uncivil to point that out.

By calling him a liar?? Seems uncivil to me...

>Yet another pointless rrap exercise.

So why do you keep returning if you don't like it?
Ed handles the headquarters end quite well,
and with much class I might add...

1745. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 17:26:05 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <3A6F102D.5B27556F@arrl.org>
Source record: 1995

Aaron Jones wrote:
>
> >Yet another pointless rrap exercise.
>
> So why do you keep returning if you don't like it?

I mostly confine myself to discussions that I think have some point.
When they degenerate into silliness like this I'll stick around until
I'm no longer entertained, then leave.

Jon

1746. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 17:33:13 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <3A6F11D9.18545692@arrl.org>
Source record: 1996

Cecil wrote:
>
> The first thread I noticed was where Dick said $5 is 14.7% of $34
> and you disagreed. I had no "original words" on the subject because
> I wasn't reading the thread.

In the not-twisted-by-Cecil version I said it's not 14.7% per annum over
4 years.

Jon

1747. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 18:19:38 UTC
From: Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com>
Message-ID: <3A6F1CBA.1AACC5C9@dvol.com>
Source record: 1997

K0HB wrote:

>
> He wasn't impressed, and nothing changed. The "members only" side is
> still lame.

>
Depends on what you're looking for, I've made good use of the Members Only
side. Locking some of the current freebies behind a password ought to be n
the right direction.
>
It's a little early in the game Hans, it's not unresonable to expect the
site to eventually have some multiple volumes more "stuff" in it than it
has now. It ain't even started, Rome, etc.
>
There's another aspect to the whole scene. The ARRL site is very much in
competion with other ham website which was not the case just a few years
ago, as in QST and the ARRL are faced with a whole new ballgame as far as
necessarily being the primary attention-grabber and "source of all good
things" vs the good old days. Hell, dial into the ac6v site and you have
more ham radio than you can deal with.
>

>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB
> --
> "I *AM* the ARRL"

>
I'll vote for that.
>
w3rv

1748. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 18:32:33 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010124133233.25954.00001427@nso-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 1902

In article <X0qb6.1152$e5.2820823@news.ntplx.net>, "Ed Hare, W1RFI"
<w1rfi@arrl.net> writes:

>Len Over 21 <lenover21@aol.com> wrote:

>> The US Congress mandated the FCC to perform biennial reviews
>> of regulations. "Biennial" is defined as every two years, not four.
>
>I will gladly put a lobster dinner wager on whether the FCC revisits the
>Morse code testing as part of its next biennial review. I would go for
>dessert that they don't even make major changes the next time around.

I have too many other activities going on to take a trip to
the New England area, Ed. If we could make it a red
trout dinner (dessert optional) then I know an excellent new
restaurant in the unlikely place of Green River, Utah, that
serves a most delicious red trout. Call it a "middle
ground." :-)

The bet is on for the middle ground payoff. I say there
will be some kind of major change, but not what you
expect.

>> I thought that any sort of "policy" affects the future. The decision
>> could have just as easily been made to read that it (the BoD)
>> supports that the FCC should begin changing the code test
>> requirement as soon as S25.5 is deleted or amended to void the
>> code test for a below-30-MHz-privilege amateur radio license.
>
>It could have been made. I don't think that it could have been made
>"easily" considering the strong differences of opinion amongst ARRL members.

I was surprised the BoD even put it on the table!

>> Yes, a meteor can fall or aliens invade the earth...
>
>My views have gone through some evolution over the past 4 years. Every
>single Director who serves on the Board now will be facing an election cycle
>over the next 3 years.

As a non-member of the ARRL I am not obliged to any "Director."
Not to any "Board," not to any "official" of the League.

As a citizen of the USA I have elected government officials who
will get my input plus organizations of the US government who
make laws and regulate various things. I am not concerned
with "elections" in private organizations. In fact, I won't depend

on ANY private organization to "cast any ballot" of any kind for me.

>Do you believe that ARRL's concerns about the overall health and well being >of the Amateur Radio Service are not int the best interests of its >membership?

I would presume that the membership has already chosen which "side" they are on and simply let the League do any lobbying for them while they play with their radios. Those that are in the upper echelons of the ARRL, particularly the BoD, cannot be said to be completely altruistic as to the overall health and well being of the US ARS. They are not a government yet they put on trappings and organizational structure as if they were a pseudo-government. That's a ready-made environment for individuals who can afford to not work for a living and also experience the heady power of control over a membership of 170 thousand plus. Control is a subtle drug, Ed, once achieved it is hard to let go.

I'm not saying anyone on the BoD or in upper echelons is like that, Ed, just pointing out the what COULD happen. That DOES happen with elected government officials and private organizations do not have checks-and-balances and laws against them close to elected government officials. Why can't it happen in private organizations?

The ARRL BoD makes policy of the ARRL, Ed. That policy influences all output from the ARRL, everything from news-letters to QST to the website to legal representation and lobbying in Washington, DC. Everything. If some members did not agree at first, the inundation from ARRL material will eventually bring them around, even if in a state of ennui.

At this point you are no doubt planning a response which will place the ARRL in the best possible light. That would be "spin" but you will argue it is not. :-) Save the effort, please.

>I also think that the overall health and well being of the >Amateur Radio Service are what is good for the ARRL.

Non-sequitur. Voting membership in the ARRL can only come from amateurs already licensed in amateur radio.

That brings up another point. The ARRL seeks to determine amateur radio licensing requirements through policy statements and lobbying in DC. It is rather obvious to those NOT members that such influence by already-licensed amateurs (in the membership) would have them set policy so as to keep requirements that the members met. That is simply human nature...and the continuation of hazing rituals. If They had to struggle with some requirements, then,

by Hiram, everyone else must also struggle (to be as good as
They are now).

You say they don't do such things? There's evidence all
around that they do. Look at the whole morse code thing,
from use to license test (never mind that some have fun with
morse code, people have fun with all kinds of stuff). Those
who struggled to achieve proficiency in morse code once
are now older, more set in their ways, and have the time
to want to continue with it. Those favor the morse code and
are more inclined to favor keeping it. After a couple
generations plus publishing influence favoring that, there is
a de facto "standard" that morse code somehow MUST
continue as the prime standard of excellence of amateur
radio. Those that favor such become self-styled
episcopates who continue to promote their singular skill.

It takes an enormous act of intellectual struggle to overcome
a personal favored skill in order to look at the broader
picture of "all amateur radio" and attempt to see what other
(lesser?) people favor. Why should the episcopate care?
They are now in their "senior" years and wish to enjoy what
they have accomplished in their youth. They can afford to
lay back and do not wish to struggle with new environments,
either physical or mental.

I congratulate the BoD on achieving a modicum of success
in enough (not all) overcoming their personal desires and
realizing a future that is not how they wish it to be.

>> >The Board dealt with the international treaty now because now is when the
>> >decisions need to be made.
>
>> Disagree. The time to act, to show the leadership and vision
>> stated by Hans Brakob, should have come at least two years
>> earlier. Stating that time-now was "the time to act" looks
>> more like a rubber-stamp approval of whatever the BoD does.
>
>I agree; in my personal opinion, two years ago would have been better. Would
>the Board have reached the same decision two years ago? Did it?

I cannot divine what is in the minds of the episcopate, that
group of "bishops" who would set out standards of everything
for a congregation. Everyone can only surmise their actions
based on past decisions...which has been rather constant in
certain things since the apostles first gathered in 1914.

Now how can you reasonably expect non-members and the
unlicensed to be dictated to in regards to overall amateur radio
policy? What made this episcopate divine? They did. They
struggled from a simple oligarchy to a virtual religion
complete with dogma and icons and faith (see "Amateur's

Code" number 2).

Keep in mind that not everyone was baptized into some amateur radio faith in their teen years. Patronizing attitudes of past BoDs "We know what is best" for amateur radio or any other thing does not sit well with adults capable of independent reasoning and experience. It is only accurate to say that past BoDs "know what is best for themselves." By demonstration.

didit

1749. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 18:32:33 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010124133233.25954.00001428@nso-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 1999

In article <lnds6t8b21r1jsujelsmtskeveoq8jd672@4ax.com>, Aaron Jones
<nomail@nomail.com> writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
>>Given the past emphasis on morse code abilities thought
>>necessary for all radio amateurs...
>
>I'm curious Len. When the code test if finally abolished will you go
>ahead and get an amateur license?

You have to keep tuning in to find out yes or no. :-)

Why do you think that everyone MUST have some sort
of personal reason to argue anything? Isn't the effort of
modernizing amateur regulations enough? Amateur
radio is a hobby, not a lifestyle. Or is it?

Is freedom in an avocation such a dreaded thing? Must
avocations have a strict regimentation in everything such
that some consider it a surrogate military service?

>(This is not meant as an insult or a put down in any way.)

Could have fooled me. Even if you are sincere, AJ, there
are plenty of frustrated hams who would jump at the chance
to slam somebody, anybody who isn't a lodge hall member.
They have, they are almost eager to do so. You've seen
their output in here. :-)

Tell me why I should bow down to these self-professed
"superior" individuals who want to dictate morals, ethics,
jargon, and activities in a hobby? We are talking dictate
as with a heavy hand, whip, chains, the whole S&M bit
if one doesn't do as they order...and then respond by
saying "Thank you, sir, may I have more?" Noooo, not
that way, AJ, no thanks. Another way, maybe, but keep
tuning in...you never know? :-)

didit

1750. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 18:32:35 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010124133235.25954.00001429@nso-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 2000

In article <3A6E29A5.99589F63@dvol.com>, Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com> writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>
>> Such an instrument could be designed and built as a
>> club project, made available for club members' use.
>> It doesn't have to be an integral part of any individual
>> radio amateur's equipment.
>
>An article on "How to Build the Black Box" which feeds the Firewire port in
>the back of Le Machine should work even better with a bunch less hardware. .

One doesn't NEED a computer interface, doesn't need any UHF
TV tuner for a front end, doesn't need a computer-specific
interface unless fancy display lettering on the display that will
print to any computer printer. I've seen two, used one such
PC Card type spectrum analyzer and both versions suffer from
inaccurate and limited logarithmic range.

The Log-Amp-Detector from Analog Devices solves the log
range and accuracy problems. What was once a large PCB
full of certain semiconductors and precision resistors is now
collapsed into one package. The VCOs for the first LO
sweeper are off-the-shelf from Mini-Circuits. Front end filters
can be almost kluged together out of what parts are in the
junk box. This isn't rocket science gee-whizzery.
>
>> It is a good receiving tool
>> if used as an indicator of received signals a la the old
>> "Panadapter." Icom has made receivers with an
>> auxilliary 1st IF output specifically for an external
>> spectrum analyzer connection.
>
>Old as the hills, had a Heathkit version (HO-10?) in the early 60s fed by my
>75A4. Been there, done 'em, trust me, they're useless panel clutter for
>real-world ham listening ops. Decent modulation checkers but that was about
>the extent of their usefulness.

Then you haven't used anything with more than 20 db dynamic
range. I agree that the old-style 1940s Panadaptor wasn't much
good with its semi-linear (not logarithmic) vertical display.

What I was talking about is an indicator of signals going from
S1 on up to 40 db over S9 on a display without needing to
change knob settings. You would be able to see "weak
ones" pop up from the noise floor, see how far they were from

your current frequency, then tune over to hear them as fast as you could tweak the tuning knob. No searching around, all the signals within sweepwidth settings are visible. 50 or 100 KHz sweep width no problem to see CW or any other kind of modulation on those incoming signals. Everything is on the display at once. A 1960s consumer-electronics item this ain't...none of those had as much as 60 db of accurate dynamic range. With some extra work, 100 db of dynamic range is possible (but one has to start thinking of using a display larger than 5" diameter to ease the eyes). Analog Devices has a stock Log package that can handle 100 db.

Sound interesting? :-)

didit

1751. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 18:32:36 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010124133236.25954.00001430@nso-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 1901

In article <Kzpb6.1149$e5.2819002@news.ntplx.net>, "Ed Hare, W1RFI"
<w1rfi@arrl.net> writes:

>Len Over 21 <lenover21@aol.com> wrote:
>
>> >Very few hams have a spectrum analyzer.
>
>> On one hand, a TxPorter from Motron is considered "valuable" at
>> $800 for fingerprinting repeater kerchunkers, but a spectrum
>> analyzer is not considered good?
>
>Very few hams have fingerprinting equipment, too.
>
>I think the spectrum analyzer would be the more valuable of the two.
>
>> An MF to VHF amateur spectrum analyzer can be built for less
>> than $400 in essential parts, using an old oscilloscope for a
>> display. Analog Devices has some excellent logarithmic
>> amplifier-successive-detector ICs that can yield an 80 db

>Two good sources of info are:
>
>http://www.arrl.org/tis/info/pdf/9808035.pdf - Part 1- a spectrum analyzer
>construction project
>http://www.arrl.org/tis/info/pdf/9809037.pdf - Part 2
>http://www.science-workshop.com/Joe_Carr%27s_NV_article.htm - Poor man's
>spectrum analyzer

I saw the two-part ARRL TIS web-reprint. Too many parts,
not enough dynamic range, coupling of dispersion and
sweep rate not optimum.

Analog Devices has a choice of Log-Amp-Detectors which
have a bandwidth going beyond the usual MF-to-VHF
analyzer needs in frequency response, but the available
logarithmic range goes from 40 db to 100 db. No trimming,
no fooling around with old-style discrete log-amp parts.
One (thin-film?) package, under $50 in singles (Analog
Devices will sell single pieces). That is the heart of a
spectrum analyzer.

The very same family of Log-Amp-Detectors can be used
to make a wide-range Power Meter that can measure
power input over a 60 db range (log readout) with direct
frequency input up to 1 GHz and a tad beyond...or a 40 db
input range that will go just beyond 1.2 GHz.

A Power Meter _IS_ a valuable tool for pro HF to UHF
folks. It could directly measure the output of HF to UHF
Local Oscillators. With a measured directlional coupler
it can also measure forward and reverse power of any
transmission line carrying a transmit signal.

>A tutorial on spectrum analyzers is found at:
>
>http://www.science-workshop.com/

Joe Carr is a prolific author but those instruments are about
as useful as the "DPDT Switch Wiring" alluded to by
another. The Agilent website has _several_ PDF files on
spectrum analyzer tutorials and applications and has made
excellent spectrum analyzer instruments for more than
four decades. All of those files are FREE for download.

The Agilent/Hewlett-Packard Application Note site has
plenty of information for all kinds of instrumentation and
measurement. Why go to the equivalent of a backyard
garage workshop when one can access successful
laboratories for accurate FREE information???

didit

1752. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 18:32:37 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010124133237.25954.00001431@nso-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 1998

In article <3A6E3A57.C96CF9A8@dvol.com>, Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com> writes:

>Larry Klose wrote:
>
>> The Board spent thirty years constructing that wall, now it scheduled
>> for removal in 2003.
>
>Nah, more like 86 years ago when HPM put the ARRL together in 1915. The
>Great Wall of China was built 2,700 years ago and hasn't been removed yet.
>
>> Larry KC8EPO

The "wall" is rather an obvious reference to the BERLIN WALL,
completed in 1961, then torn down beginning in late 1989.
[how quickly some forget...] A barrier manned by Vopos who
killed quite a few attempting to go from east to west.

The Great Wall of China was an ineffective "WPA" structure and
did not keep out the barbarian hordes...worked about as well against
warriors with scaling ladders as European castles against siege
engines. The Great Wall of China is symbolic...as the morse
code is symbolic of amateur radio excellence. Artifacts.

didit

1753. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 18:35:23 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A6F206B.6154F86A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 1903

Aaron Jones wrote:
> But that's not what I was commenting on.
> I was comparing the 50's era average ham's technical abilities to the
> technical abilities of today's average ham. I think the 50's average
> ham wins hands down...

I don't know about that. I am infinitely more technical now than
I was in the 50s. How about you?
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

1754. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 18:47:40 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A6F234C.D2711867@IEEE.org>
Source record: 1904

Jon Bloom wrote:
>
> Cecil wrote:
> >
> > The first thread I noticed was where Dick said $5 is 14.7% of $34
> > and you disagreed. I had no "original words" on the subject because
> > I wasn't reading the thread.
>
> In the not-twisted-by-Cecil version I said it's not 14.7% per annum over
> 4 years.

It doesn't happen over 4 years - it happens *once* at renewal time.
It is a 14.7% step function. My heartbeat has averaged 5 beats per
minute over the past 1000 years but why does that matter?
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

1755. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 18:56:24 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <SAFb6.1176$e5.2873980@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 1905

Len Over 21 <lenover21@aol.com> wrote:

> I have too many other activities going on to take a trip to
> the New England area, Ed. If we could make it a red
> trout dinner (dessert optional) then I know an excellent new
> restaurant in the unlikely place of Green River, Utah, that
> serves a most delicious red trout. Call it a "middle
> ground." :-)

The last one I payed up was in Phoenix. I don't even want to tell you what it cost. :-)

> The bet is on for the middle ground payoff. I say there
> will be some kind of major change, but not what you
> expect.

I tend toward expecting that they will leave it alone. The biennial review is just that -- a review. They can meet the requirements and say that they think it just fine. I would guess, however, they would issue an NOI and see what changes the Service believes it needs, or that others feel are appropriate.

> >> I thought that any sort of "policy" affects the future. The decision
> >> could have just as easily been made to read that it (the BoD)
> >> supports that the FCC should begin changing the code test
> >> requirement as soon as S25.5 is deleted or amended to void the
> >> code test for a below-30-MHz-privilege amateur radio license.

> >It could have been made. I don't think that it could have been made
> >"easily" considering the strong differences of opinion amongst ARRL members.

> I was surprised the BoD even put it on the table!

I wasn't; they said that they would. :-) I think being the one sole nay vote at the R3 IARU meeting some months ago had an impact. I chatted with a friend on the Board and the reason that there was any discussion of the US requirements in the resolution was to ensure that ARRL members understood that the policy change wrt the international requirements was NOT a decision about the US requirements. At some point, the Board will have to address that, but they could do so by changing,or affirming, the present policy. My guess? Three to four years away.

> >> Yes, a meteor can fall or aliens invade the earth...

> >My views have gone through some evolution over the past 4 years. Every
> >single Director who serves on the Board now will be facing an election

cycle
> >over the next 3 years.

> As a non-member of the ARRL I am not obliged to any "Director."
> Not to any "Board," not to any "official" of the League.

As a member of ARRL, I am not obiliged to set my personal opinion to the ARRL Board, either. ARRL members may disagree with an ARRL Director, or even run against that Director in an election and throw the bum out. :-)

> As a citizen of the USA I have elected government officials who
> will get my input plus organizations of the US government who
> make laws and regulate various things. I am not concerned
> with "elections" in private organizations. In fact, I won't depend
> on ANY private organization to "cast any ballot" of any kind for
> me.

Nor should ARRL members. ARRL members should contact their Director to shape the policies of the ARRL, but when matters come up before the FCC that concern them, they should make their own views known to the FCC through the formal commenting process.

> I'm not saying anyone on the BoD or in upper echelons is
> like that, Ed, just pointing out the what COULD happen.

Whew, you had me worried about it for a minute, Len. :-)

> At this point you are no doubt planning a response which will
> place the ARRL in the best possible light. That would be
> "spin" but you will argue it is not. :-) Save the effort, please.

Your mind is already made up; no sense confusing it with facts? Well, as long as you stick to what "could" happen, no harm done. :-)

> That brings up another point. The ARRL seeks to determine
> amateur radio licensing requirements through policy
> statements and lobbying in DC. It is rather obvious to those
> NOT members that such influence by already-licensed
> amateurs (in the membership) would have them set policy
> so as to keep requirements that the members met.

If it was "rather obvious," perhaps the League could have "rather obviously" not chosen its new position wrt international code testing.

> Those who struggled to achieve proficiency in morse code once
> are now older, more set in their ways, and have the time
> to want to continue with it.

I struggled with and achieved proficiency in Morse code, Len.

> It takes an enormous act of intellectual struggle to overcome
> a personal favored skill in order to look at the broader
> picture of "all amateur radio" and attempt to see what other
> (lesser?) people favor.

The possession or lack therof of Morse-code copying skills does not make anyone greater than or less than me. That skill is a plus, lack of it is a minus, but that can be said for any of hundreds of other skills that are important to ham radio, some more so than Morse code ability.

> I congratulate the BoD on achieving a modicum of success
> in enough (not all) overcoming their personal desires and
> realizing a future that is not how they wish it to be.

> >I agree; in my personal opinion, two years ago would have been better.
Would
> >the Board have reached the same decision two years ago? Did it?

> I cannot divine what is in the minds of the episcopate, that
> group of "bishops" who would set out standards of everything
> for a congregation. Everyone can only surmise their actions
> based on past decisions...which has been rather constant in
> certain things since the apostles first gathered in 1914.

Getting a bit esoteric for me, Len. Can you restate that without all the fluff and 'buzzwords?'

> Now how can you reasonably expect non-members and the
> unlicensed to be dictated to in regards to overall amateur radio
> policy? What made this episcopate divine? They did. They
> struggled from a simple oligarchy to a virtual religion
> complete with dogma and icons and faith (see "Amateur's
> Code" number 2).

Ditto.

> Keep in mind that not everyone was baptized into some
> amateur radio faith in their teen years. Patronizing attitudes of
> past BoDs "We know what is best" for amateur radio or any
> other thing does not sit well with adults capable of independent
> reasoning and experience. It is only accurate to say that past
> BoDs "know what is best for themselves." By demonstration.

Ditto.

Thanks.

73,
Ed, W1RFI

1756. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 18:59:06 UTC
From: xjim@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <94n8lljmu1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1907

> I am not sure that the emergency equipment of today is all that complex. If I
> designed it, I would design it such that the operator pushed a button and the
> "SOS" was sent. I bet that such equipment is more reliable than the HW-7 that
> you used as an example.

They make something very much like that for small boats and have had such a thing for small aircraft for decades. They basically only scream for help on an emergency frequency that is located and monitored by satellite. If there is no need to state the nature of the emergency or the needs of the emergency, then the only thing to worry about is false alarms. These things are perfect for after the ship sinks or after the plane crashes and there are no survivors to push the button (totally automatic).

If you don't feel the need for a radio operator, and your oars are well tied down, what other emergency could you ever have? Which brings us to the awful question: Do you really need a radio operator at all, if you have a wife with a laptop, an e-mail account and a satellite account. Oh-Oh! There goes the battery again. Those satellite terminals are neat for truck drivers and everybody else for that matter, and I have demo'd a satellite phone that will operate anywhere in NA that looks like a laptop computer (antenna is in the lid) You open up the lid and move the whole unit around until the meter reads into the green and pick up the handset and make your call. There is also a cell phone that has an accessory attachment that contains a converter and satellite antenna that allows you to do the same thing.

Goodies like these would seem to make the radioman obsolete, but maybe you need someone on board to operate all these gadgets anyway. If that is the case wouldn't you want someone with a whole bunch of tricks in his arsenal, including ham radio and CW capability?

Wouldn't it be neat if life were like a bowling alley, where all life's messes are swept away and the pins reset automatically? But they still need someone to fix the jams on the pin machine.

What I'm getting at, If you can't depend on a telephone line, you probably need some kind of wireless intervention for your communications. And since no single device has the simplicity and versatility and operating procedures of the land-line telephone that we use every day, we will have to carry around a lot more than an emergency phone list. If I could only take one radio with me on the road, It would be an HF mobile and it would have CW capability because

I know what it is worth. If I could take two, I would add a cell phone.

Jim, ac6tk

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1757. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 19:12:05 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <yPFb6.1177$e5.2875551@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 1908

Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com> wrote:

> w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:

> >I think that testing that has not created major problems
> >in 40 years of being at about the same level is not
> >an invalid test, to use your words.

> So your position is that even though today's ham tests are faulty,
> that's okay because it causes no major problems??

That is incorrect. If it is your contention that my saying that a test that has not caused major problems is faulty, I think that this conversation is no longer conversation, but has devolved into some sort of game.

Sorry. I don't want to play. Please do engage me in conversation when you seriously want discourse and to hear my ideas.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1758. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 19:14:40 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <ZRFb6.1178$e5.2875747@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 1909

Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com> wrote:

> I think it would be best to have the largest number of technical hams
> possible in any time period. But that's not what I was commenting on.
> I was comparing the 50's era average ham's technical abilities to the
> technical abilities of today's average ham. I think the 50's average
> ham wins hands down...

With the additional provision that you also have to factor in "relative to the technology of the day," I agree.

The average ham of today may know more than the average ham of the 1950s. The highly technical ham of today probably does know more than the highly technical ham of the 50s, on average.

73, Ed Hare, W1RFI

1759. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 19:15:26 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <HSFb6.1179$e5.2875695@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 1910

Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:94mtv3$o4a$0@208.207.71.144...

> > Tell you what, Aaron; send me your mailing address and I will send you a
2000
> > Handbook I salvaged from the bent-cover bin. :-)

> such as

> Occupant
> P O BOX 10101
> Anywhere, AZ 77000 ?

> Ed, I don't think you'll ever smoke him out! :-)

ARRL ships UPS. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1760. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 19:18:34 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net>
Message-ID: <3A6F2A8A.4E26B40@ovis.net>
Source record: 1912

W1RFI wrote:
>
> >From: Dave Heil k8mn@ovis.net
>
> >> Per-annum, Dave. You know, the same basis on which inflation is usually
> >> stated.
>
> >But that wasn't stated by me or by you, Jon.
>
> Sure it was, Dave. You stated that the dues rate was excessive wrt inflation.
> Inflation has an implied "per time" factor built in to the very meaning of the
> word. In the context you used it, the only way to compare the dues increase to
> inflation is to go back to the last dues increase and compare the increase to
> inflation over that time. Most inflation figures are reported on a percentage
> vs time basis (usually annual) so the easiest way to compare them is to give
> the annual rate of the dues increase as a percentage. Jon did so, and added
> the per-annum qualifier to make it more clear.
>
> > Without the qualifier, the one-time hike is much steeper.
>
> If you feel that the ARRL should increase the dues every year at a rate that
> matches the general inflation rate instead of catching up every four years, you
> should suggest that to your Director. When you do, keep in mind the way the
> League did t this time saved you about $7.00 over the 4 years it did not
> increase the dues.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

Ed,

I did my saving nearly 25 years ago and made a committment to the League
at the same time by becoming a Life Member in 1977 or 1978. My concern
is for those who are not Life Members. You can't say that I'm guilty of
the "I've got mine" syndrome. I've been a League member for all but a
few years (during some of my time in the Air Force) since 1964. Had it
not been for the (then) pathetic wages paid by the League, I'd have been
a staffer in 1975.

Dave K8MN

1761. Re: Anthony Hancock

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 19:23:26 UTC
From: "{[G8ASO]}" <bajones@worcester.demon.co.uk>
Message-ID: <94na3u$88i$1@taliesin.netcom.net.uk>
Source record: 1911
Cross-posted to: aus.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

Got it and good advice too, as I have never heard it before. What a bloody hoot, now I know where they get it from.

"G8ASO;;;;;" <not@here.com> wrote in message news:94mkih$eb4dt$1@ID-67923.news.dfncis.de...
> http://members.nbci.com/g8arsehole/
>
> The "lad" himself and arguably the most famous radio ham of them all!
>
> Converted to mono and only a 4MB file in zipped MP3 for free download, the
> full episode "The Radio Ham"
>
> Download with Go!Zilla to resume partial downloads, link on my site above.
>
> G8ASO
>
> http://laughingpoliceman.com LPWS representative on Earth.
>
>
>
>

1762. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 19:32:29 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <94nakd$lj7$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1915

Cecil wrote:

> My heartbeat has averaged 5 beats per
> minute over the past 1000 years but
> why does that matter?

Hell, I saw picture of you at your web side and you didn't look a
day over 500!

73, Hans, K0HB
--
"We are fellow travelers on a journey between two
eternities, and it's a trip far too brief for me
to be concerned about your speed at the Code of
Morse."

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1763. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 19:33:02 UTC
From: Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com>
Message-ID: <3A6F2DEE.3C763E7B@dvol.com>
Source record: 1913

K0HB@USWEST.NET wrote:

> . . The "front page" of the web site is pretty damn good!

>
Yes it is.
>

> The members are paying somebody to do that for us, and the product is first
> class. Stuff I'd pay to subscribe to!
>
> And we're giving it away free -- part of >our< $5.00 dues hike will pay for
> it.

>
Buncha crap. The only stuff I'd leave in the free-access space would be material which promotes ham radio and ARRL membership, publications, etc. pretty much like it is. But TIS *absolutely* gotta be moved into the member's space. If I read one of his posts correctly, Ed is moving in that direction.

>
>
> 73, Hans, K0HB

>
w3rv

1764. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 19:36:10 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <7aGb6.1181$e5.2877130@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 1914

W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com> wrote:

> Then why all the bull crap math? I have no problem with the increase. I have
> one hell of a problem with the Clintonesque explanation.

The explanation was in response to a statement that the dues increase was not justifiable with the present low rate of inflation. I really can't think of a better way to have resonded than to express the dues increase in terms of a per-annum increase.

Do you have any suggestions as to how Jon could have answered it better?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1765. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 19:43:33 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010124144333.13433.00003694@nso-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 1916

In article <20010124075330.13180.00000835@ng-mb1.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>See http://www.arrl.org/tis/info/part15.html for ARRL's info on Part 15
>devices. Don't tell Len; he gets very unhappy when I post the URL. :-)

Why do you say that, Ed?

I think the ARRL Technical Information Service is good for amateur technical information. In what way did you think I was "unhappy" about such a web address?

didit

1766. Re: FCC Proposal for New Novice Class License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 19:43:34 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010124144334.13433.00003695@nso-cs.aol.com>
Source record: 1917

In article <3A6E560F.6F7E7E4A@ovis.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net> writes:

>> You have done more than that, especially when not receiving
>> any praise over the "clever" use of CW as an order-wire for
>> a State Department FSK TTY circuit. :-)
>
>I don't know whether you are not being forthright or are just forgetful
>in your old age. I did not seek any praise.

Sure you sought praise. You thought it was a clever idea...of yours.

You were indulging in relating a story of your expertise on
a government radio circuit, knowing full well that few on an
amateur radio newsgroup would have experience there
(with exception of a few ex-USN-radio-ops of earlier times).

Technically, switching over to CW from FSK TTY should be
possible but it is a most odd sort of thing to use as an
order-wire (a command circuit for radio circuit purposes).

You claimed the switchover was "necessary to synchronize"
the TTY circuit. TTYs have always self-synchronized since
the first Teletype Model 15s, whether on landline or radio
circuits. A Model 28 is no different in that regard.

On a following reply you stated that the "synchronizations"
were to "set schedules." That was illogical since, if the TTY
was operating correctly, it could be used as a TTY to send
schedules, copies printed at each end.

> I did not come up with the
>circuit. I simply used what was already in place. As I recall, you
>tried telling me that what I stated was untrue.

I said it was a dumb idea if you did it that way. I still think so.

While technically possible if the TTY transmitter also had OOK
CW capability, there were no technical justifications for this.
You seemed to be trying to get an "upper hand" in an on-going
argument in a newsgroup on the necessity to operate OOK CW
and preserve morse code testing for an amateur license.

You are now welcome to state why that particular switch from
TTY to CW was technically or opeationally necessary. For
any reason. It doesn't really matter but it will be interesting to
see the rationalizations and attempts to close with the last
newsgroup word. :-)

didit

1767. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 20:28:22 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <4XGb6.1186$e5.2881214@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 1918

Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:

> It doesn't happen over 4 years - it happens *once* at renewal time.
> It is a 14.7% step function. My heartbeat has averaged 5 beats per
> minute over the past 1000 years but why does that matter?

Jon didn't include a time period where there were no ARRL dues.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1768. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 20:34:16 UTC
From: K0HB@USWEST.NET
Message-ID: <94ne88$5nj$1@news.netmar.com>
Source record: 1906

In article <3A6F1CBA.1AACC5C9@dvol.com>, Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com>
writes:

> Locking some of the current freebies behind a password ought
> to be n the right direction.

My point exactly. The "front page" of the web site is pretty damn good!
The members are paying somebody to do that for us, and the product is first
class. Stuff I'd pay to subscribe to!

And we're giving it away free -- part of >our< $5.00 dues hike will pay for
it.

73, Hans, K0HB

----- Posted via NewsOne.Net: Free (anonymous) Usenet News via the Web -----
http://newsone.net/ -- Free reading and anonymous posting to 60,000+ groups
NewsOne.Net prohibits users from posting spam. If this or other posts
made through NewsOne.Net violate posting guidelines, email abuse@newsone.net

1769. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 20:36:49 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <%2Hb6.1187$e5.2881620@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 1919

Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com> wrote:

> >Those non-members that make use of those
> >services should at least send an ARRL member a thank you. :-)

> Since I will be paying more income tax than you this year,
> will you please post a thank you note to me... :-)

The minute paying income taxes becomes optional.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1770. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 20:48:17 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010124154817.14777.00001000@nso-bd.aol.com>
Source record: 1920

In article <SAFb6.1176$e5.2873980@news.ntplx.net>, "Ed Hare, W1RFI"
<w1rfi@arrl.net> writes:

>Len Over 21 <lenover21@aol.com> wrote:

>> I'm not saying anyone on the BoD or in upper echelons is
>> like that, Ed, just pointing out the what COULD happen.
>
>Whew, you had me worried about it for a minute, Len. :-)

Would you have come unglued if I changed a "might be" to a
"was?" If so, why?

>> At this point you are no doubt planning a response which will
>> place the ARRL in the best possible light. That would be
>> "spin" but you will argue it is not. :-) Save the effort, please.
>
>Your mind is already made up; no sense confusing it with facts? Well, as
>long as you stick to what "could" happen, no harm done. :-)

Sorry, Ed, but apologia for ARRL decisions criticized negatively
by others having opposite viewpoints is SPIN, or political
damage control. The ARRL BoD's decision on morse code
testing was political in nature (see following).

>> That brings up another point. The ARRL seeks to determine
>> amateur radio licensing requirements through policy
>> statements and lobbying in DC. It is rather obvious to those
>> NOT members that such influence by already-licensed
>> amateurs (in the membership) would have them set policy
>> so as to keep requirements that the members met.
>
>If it was "rather obvious," perhaps the League could have "rather obviously"
>not chosen its new position wrt international code testing.

No, Ed, RATHER OBVIOUS in terms of the last half century.

Note that the BoD did NOT make any definitive statement on
FCC regulations for amateur radio license testing...they simply
let it slide by saying it should stay the same. The change in
policy position was in regard to ITU-R S25.5, not Part 97. The
ARRL cannot vote in the ITU-R since it is not part of the
US administration party. The ARRL can be an observer and
advisor to the administration, but cannot itself vote.

What was decided was a POLITICAL viewpoint with relationship
to the IARU and other nations' amateur radio organizations...

with some relationship to influencing the USA administration
at future WRCs. Political viewpoints are expressed as Spin,
not as factual data.

>> Those who struggled to achieve proficiency in morse code once
>> are now older, more set in their ways, and have the time
>> to want to continue with it.
>
>I struggled with and achieved proficiency in Morse code, Len.

I wasn't specifically naming you in that regard, Ed.

As a GENERALITY of observation of human nature, those who
have struggled with something when young tend towards
retention of winning struggles with both ability and nostalgia.

What is dictatorial is that SOME who have achieved skill in
the past seek to impose the same need for all who come
later in time...especially so for morse code as an amateur
radio license test necessity when regulatory agencies have
stated that such skill is necessary for their license
determination requirements.

>> I cannot divine what is in the minds of the episcopate, that
>> group of "bishops" who would set out standards of everything
>> for a congregation. Everyone can only surmise their actions
>> based on past decisions...which has been rather constant in
>> certain things since the apostles first gathered in 1914.
>
>Getting a bit esoteric for me, Len. Can you restate that without all the
>fluff and 'buzzwords?'

It is not "fluff" or "buzzwords," but they ARE labels.

I was speaking in general to those who have a religious feeling
towards amateur radio and feel that the ARRL BoD is the
episcopate (a group of bishops) of "the church." The
"apostles" label is directed towards the supporters of the
first formation of the ARRL.

Some will not take kindly to such labels. TS. Neither is it
irreligious, but rather sarcastic. Again, TS. The almost-
religious devotion to the League by some is apparent to
others.

didit

1771. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 21:10:03 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <14hu6tokderpiu5r9cnqh4n8rjo470o059@4ax.com>
Source record: 1921

"Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net> wrote:
>That is incorrect. If it is your contention that my saying that a test that
>has not caused major problems is faulty,

You said that the tests from the 60's to now have caused no major
problems. I say that to judge whether a test is good or not has
nothing to do with it's causing no major problems...

>Sorry. I don't want to play. Please do engage me in conversation when you
>seriously want discourse and to hear my ideas.

Translation: Since you [Aaron] won't capitulate and agree with my
ideas on the ham test, I'm quitting and taking my marbles home... :-)

1772. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 21:10:05 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <h3hu6toavem6gkjkj6ma0mi8dedges5sra@4ax.com>
Source record: 1922

"Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net> wrote:

>Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com> wrote:
>> I think it would be best to have the largest number of technical hams
>> possible in any time period. But that's not what I was commenting on.
>> I was comparing the 50's era average ham's technical abilities to the
>> technical abilities of today's average ham. I think the 50's average
>> ham wins hands down...
>
>With the additional provision that you also have to factor in "relative to
>the technology of the day," I agree.

And the fault lies mainly with the complexity of the advanced
technology of today, and not the ability of the average ham of
today...

>The highly technical ham of today probably does know more than the highly
>technical ham of the 50s, on average.

I agree, but that's not saying much. It could also be said that the
average highly technical Railroad Morse communications officer knew
more on average than the highly technical Shawnee communications
officer (smoke signals) of 50 years earlier... :-)

1773. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 21:10:05 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <5ogu6tg6c7ravn5l961gkkinlc6mpapifg@4ax.com>
Source record: 1923

Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote:
>I'll stick around until I'm no longer entertained, then leave.

If you keep trying to have the last word,
you will be here forever... :-)

1774. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 21:10:06 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <qngu6t0q42qlqdqg9e5haiv6qmcrmu7e6s@4ax.com>
Source record: 1924

"Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net> wrote:
>Do you have any suggestions as to how Jon could have answered it better?

Leave out the insults?? :-)

1775. Re: ARRL Life Membership - Don't buy one!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 21:30:26 UTC
From: vlfiscus@mcn.net
Message-ID: <t6uibij7bi7bc9@news.supernews.com>
Source record: 1925
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.swap

rasta567@aol.com (Rasta567) wrote in
<20010123230419.18743.00000881@ng-fg1.aol.com>:

>Can anybody tell me what are the benefits of becoming a Life Member of
>the ARRL. Thanks
>

Don't buy any form of League membership if you care about the integrity
of your license or ham radio. The ARRL will screw you when your head is
turned. Buy a membership only if you believe that the natural progression
of amateur radio should be to become more like CB, for this is what the
ARRL board of directors believe.
The ARRL isn't working to improve anything. They say they're working to
protect your service but then they propose limp-wristed policy changes and
watch the service rot from within.
If you want to save ham radio, then cancel your League membership as
soon as possible if you have one. Don't be a part of the Leagues plan to
furthur dumb-down ham radio and don't support their slight-of-hand policy
changes which welcome ignorant operators and CB style operating practices.

1776. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 21:34:40 UTC
From: vlfiscus@mcn.net
Message-ID: <t6uijg63dko953@news.supernews.com>
Source record: 1926

w1rfi@arrl.net (Ed Hare, W1RFI) wrote in
<0Z2b6.1094$e5.2740969@news.ntplx.net>:

>Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com> wrote:
>
>> Do you also think that it does no harm to the hobby for a ham to get
>> a license to simply operate, and never improve himself technically?
>
>For an individual ham? No harm at all. For all hams to choose to take
>that path? I don't think Amateur Radio would survive long.

Too bad your employer doesn't agree with your above statement Ed.

KB7ADL

1777. Re: Follow the Money

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 21:39:07 UTC
From: vlfiscus@mcn.net
Message-ID: <t6uirrb1fk4ge0@news.supernews.com>
Source record: 1927
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,alt.radio.family,rec.radio.cb

Stuart, Why don't you get together with the ARRL and destroy ham radio
together. Make it a group effort.

horseshoestew@my-deja.com wrote in <94am2q$fc8$1@nnrp1.deja.com>:

>In article <94aed5$8mn$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
> K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org> wrote:
>> When you don't understand why somebody is doing something which seems
>> senseless to you, sometimes it pays to try to "follow the money".
>>
>> In this case it led me to a company called "PubCel". According to
>> their web site, that company is involved in:
>>
>> "Wireless Entertainment and Communications Solutions:
>>
>> - MURS and ARS Voice and Data Communications Systems
>>
>> - FRS and GMRS Voice Communication Systems"
>>
>> I think it is safe to say that the "ARS" acronym might mean "Amateur
>> Radio Service".
>>
>> Also according to their web site, the company President is none other
>> than Stewart Teaze, N0MHS.
>>
>> Suddenly this proposal for the "Barbie Doll" Amateur Radio license
>> isn't quite so senseless.
>
>I've never tried to hide the fact that I'm trying to create a
>business. Quite the opposite - why would I list the web site on the
>signature to all my posts, if I was trying to hide something
>
>Hey, Hans, I wonder why you switched your approach to this slimly
>veiled "personal attack"? It couldn't be that I was right about the
>point regarding inductors and capacitors on the Novice test, could it?
>
>Let's stick to the point at hand. You made a good point about the lack
>of digital modes in the proposal - THIS is the kind of stuff I'm
>looking for.
>
>> 73, Hans, K0HB
>
>--
>------- Stewart - N0MHS --------

>Wireless Entertainment/Communication Devices, Networks, and
>Public Radio Services Information(MURS,FRS,GMRS,ARS,CB):
>http://www.pubcel.com
>
>
>Sent via Deja.com
>http://www.deja.com/
>

1778. Re: This Just In . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 21:55:58 UTC
From: vlfiscus@mcn.net
Message-ID: <t6ujre1tf95g30@news.supernews.com>
Source record: 1928
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in <3A6CCEB3.B3879178@dvol.com>:

>From today's ARRL Bulletin:
>>
>"The Board's Morse Code resolution declared that deletion of the Article
>S25 international requirement at WRC-03 ''should not automatically or
>immediately mean a similar removal of the Morse code from Part 97 of the
>FCC rules.'' Morse code, the Board affirmed, deserves continued support
>as an important operating mode as well as in terms of spectrum and
>''should be retained as a testing element in the US.'' The resolution
>also called on ARRL Headquarters staff to ''develop a program designed
>to promote the use of Morse.''
>>
>w3rv

I saw this coming. Another ARRL screw job.

Can you say: "CQ Breaker, CQ Breaker, this here's Good-Buddy-Ham on twenty meters, anyone got their ears on? c'mon back. Ten-four Ten-four good-buddy, I got ya and yer gettin out..."

KB7ADL

1779. Re: Anthony Hancock

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 21:57:58 UTC
From: bigpimp <bigpimp@ntlworld.com>
Message-ID: <NdIb6.1956$vc.57072@news6-win.server.ntlworld.com>
Source record: 1930
Cross-posted to: aus.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

G8ASO;;;;; <not@here.com> wrote in message

>
> The "lad" himself and arguably the most famous radio ham of them all!
>
> Converted to mono and only a 4MB file in zipped MP3 for free download, the
> full episode "The Radio Ham"
>
already got it.....
and my local repeater in Nottingham loves it !!!!!

M1ADU/M5ADU.......They dont like it up 'em

1780. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 21:58:23 UTC
From: vlfiscus@mcn.net
Message-ID: <t6ujvv4pht7f5c@news.supernews.com>
Source record: 1929

oldtimer@nonsuch.net (Old_Timer) wrote in <3A6CF211.2319703D@nonsuch.net>:

>Does the League's newly announced substantial dues hike in these times
>of low inflation strike anybody else as being excessive?
>

Just ask Ed, They need to purchase new equipment for the tech lab when
they start doing product reviews on CB rigs, echo-mics, and amps.

1781. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 22:27:16 UTC
From: "R.L. Tannehill, P.E." <rickw7rt@firstinter.net>
Message-ID: <3A6F56C4.1BEA4007@firstinter.net>
Source record: 1931

Old_Timer wrote:
>
> Does the League's newly announced substantial dues hike in these times
> of low inflation strike anybody else as being excessive?
>
> I noted Dave Sumner's talk of the ARRL being involved in the kinds of
> things which dues and publication sales would not cover. My feeling is
> that there is little that the League should be doing which could not be
> covered by dues and publication sales.
>
> My own feeling is that $39 per year is high for value received since the
> League already charges now for services which were formerly provided at
> no cost to members. QST is almost void of good articles these days.
> There is a dearth of technical content. Contest covereage and DX news
> are minimal. If I wasn't already a life member I'd have think hard to
> come up with enough reasons to justify renewal.
>
> Since he was a part of the inner circle for a while, perhaps Hans can
> share his views on the announced increase in ARRL dues.
>
> Dave Heil K8MN

I believe that the League's dues are a good _value_ for the price. The ARRL supports a similar level and type of activities as the IEEE. For the IEEE membership, I pay $113/year base rate (includes US Regional assessment), but excluding technical societies I choose to belong to. This is about 3 times the new ARRL dues rate for a similar type service. I just don't see how anyone can say that memberships are overpriced, especially when we see the League activities that benefit all hams. Now if we could just get more of those "all hams" to join :)

I believe if the League were to drop their opposition to elimination of mandatory US Morse cw testing, they could attract a significant percentage of the rapidly growing Tech class licensees. Especially if they were to offer a first-year, half price special. Give it some thought Jon. (I keep beating up on my Director about the code issue)

Rick Tannehill
W7RT

1782. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 23:03:45 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010124180345.12047.00001256@ng-fl1.aol.com>
Source record: 1932

>From: vlfiscus@mcn.net (Vince Fiscus, KB7ADL)

>>For an individual ham? No harm at all. For all hams to choose to take
>>that path? I don't think Amateur Radio would survive long.

>Too bad your employer doesn't agree with your above statement Ed.

I must have left off what I believe to be the logical addition that, Vince; although I am certain that some hams will choose that path, I think it highly unlikely that most will choose not to learn within ham radio. Almost all of us here have learned a lot more than we learned to take our tests. I believe that a desire to learn is what motivates most hams to become hams in the first place.

Sorry I left it off, but I guess I didn't think it necessary to say it. I didn't mean to make you misunderstand.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1783. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 23:06:49 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010124180649.12047.00001259@ng-fl1.aol.com>
Source record: 1933

>From: Aaron Jones nomail@nomail.com

>Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote:
>>It's not an insult.
>>Dick admitted he was ignorant...
>>So are you [ignorent] (shocking!)...

>>Cecil likes to twist things,
>>and I don't think its uncivil to point that out.

Aaron likes to twist things, too, it would seem. Did you snip the middle part of Jon's paragraph because you thought it irrelevant to the discussion at hand? Did you not realize that the way you quoted it very much changed the meaning of the original statement.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1784. Re: ARRL Life Membership

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 23:07:37 UTC
From: GAR GARIGUE <garigue@home.com>
Message-ID: <3A6F6D0E.34DDFBCC@home.com>
Source record: 1934

You don't get bothered 4 months before your subcription is up. 73 Tom
KI3R

Rasta567 wrote:
>
> Can anybody tell me what are the benefits of becoming a Life Member of the
> ARRL. Thanks

1785. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 23:21:33 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010124182133.18775.00001114@ng-da1.aol.com>
Source record: 1935

>From: Cecil Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>> ... keep in mind the way the
>> League did t this time saved you about $7.00 over the 4 years it did not
>> increase the dues.

>Say Ed, exactly where is that $7.00 located? :-)

It was your money, Cecil; I think it was your responsibility to remember what
you did with it.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1786. keyclowns on rec.radio.cb

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 23:22:49 UTC
From: N8WWM@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <94no3u$367$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1937

Hey guys! You ought to pop in at rec.radio.cb and see these dorks blow chunks and gaskets when I tell them they are illegal. Come on and get in on the fun f'n with the illegal keyclowns. Lots of neat sites also. Easy to piss off these loosers bwaaaaaaahahahaaaaaa

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1787. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 23:26:13 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010124182613.18775.00001115@ng-da1.aol.com>
Source record: 1936

>From: xjim@my-deja.com

>Do you really need a radio operator at all, if
>you have a wife with a laptop, an e-mail account and a satellite
>account. Oh-Oh! There goes the battery again.

The same battery you will use to power the HW-7, or a different battery?

> If that is the case wouldn't you want someone with a whole bunch of tricks in
>his arsenal, including ham radio and CW capability?

Sure, and if I go camping, and something goes wrong, I would want someone
around trained in wilderness rescue.

>If I could only take one radio with me on the
>road, It would be an HF mobile and it would have CW capability because
>I know what it is worth. If I could take two, I would add a cell phone.

Depending where I was going, I would choose either a cell phone, an HT or an
all mode rig. If I felt using the all-mode rig, I would use SSB as my first
choice; it conserves battery power and in plain language, I can communicate a
lot of information in a small amount of time.

If all that failed, I would be glad I know Morse code.

I will add that, as a CW op, if I ran across the 1 wpm SOS from someone using a
lookup chart, I would stick it out.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1788. Re: "They oughta require a license....blah, blah, blah"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 23:29:06 UTC
From: N8WWM@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <94nofl$3cd$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1940

In article <9431vd$4j$1@iac5.navix.net>,
"W4JLE" <Fred@w4jle.com> wrote:
> Can you say 666 boys and girls?
>
> "Jake Brodsky" <frussle@erols.com> wrote in message
> news:fh496t4af7l94gv4vnep9npbjhb5v6tn62@4ax.com...
> > On Tue, 16 Jan 2001 12:20:38 -0500, "Leland C. Scott"
> > <no-spam@junk-mail.net> wrote:
> >
> > >
> > >"K0HB" <k0hb@my-deja.com> wrote in message
> > >news:941ml3$mb4$1@nnrp1.deja.com...
> > >
> > >> Every so often a new guy like Leland comes up with the mistaken
> > >> idea of placing restrictions on the wide availability of
> > >> amateur radio equipment and supplies.
> > >
> > >And why should that be a mistake? You have to provide proof of insurance
> to
> > >get plates for a vehicle, provide a prescription from your doctor at the
> > >drug store for powerful drugs, a photo ID (normally a driver's license)
> to
> > >pass a check, same thing with trying to buy booze, or get a drink at a
> bar,
> > >cops wants to see your driver's license when you get pulled over etc. The
> > >list goes on and on. There are many things we are required to provide
> proof
> > >that we are who we say we are, and that we can do something, or we are
> > >authorized to be where we are. Normally we just don't think about all the
> > >cases. Asking to see your FCC license is not a big deal.
> > >
> > >So when you get pulled over by a cop, and he notices you are getting
> public
> > >service calls over your mobile rig, and tells you that you can't have a
> > >scanner in your vehicle. You going to tell him you are a Ham, then
> refuse
> > >to show you license when he asks to see it, and then tell him to go
> bugger
> > >off because you don't have to?
> >
> > Sigh. The question is really "Is there a problem which is bad enough
> > that we would insist on the expense and the enforcement of checking
> > for a license before the sale?"
> >

> > That's a judgement call.
> >
> > >> These are the folks who
> > >> suggest it be a crime to own amateur equipment without a
> > >> license, and who are not thrilled about the fact that
> > >> Radio Shack sells a line of UHF/VHF amateur equipment right out
> > >> under the nose of the impressionable public.
> > >
> > >I have been to plenty of Hamfests where the policy is NOT to give a
> winner
> > >of the door prizes a Ham Radio TX of any kind UNLESS they have a license.
> > >Instead they give them cash in the case they are unlicensed. So in a way
> > >it's already being done. I bet you never even thought about it, even
> > >bothered to notice.
> >
> > Personally, I don't think it's that big a problem.
> >
> > The real problem is that the FCC isn't enforcing its own laws very
> > well. Laws against unlicensed operation exist. Maybe the FCC would
> > consider licensing something like an Official Radio Monitor (Kind of
> > like the ARRL OO, but with some sort of legal standing in a court of
> > law) who could be called at a moment's notice to DF a signal they
> > can't afford to track down.
> >
> > Then the real problem would disappear.
> >
> > Leland, I respect your position, but I can't help thinking that you're
> > fighting the symptom, not the disease.
> >
> > 73,
> >
> >
> > Jake Brodsky, AB3A mailto:frussle@erols.com
> > "Beware of the massive impossible!"
>
>

the illegal keyclowns are the ones that cause problems for everyone. Assist me my brothers in ridding the airways of trash like the butt monkeys in rec.radio.cb its fun to piss off illegal keyclowns

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1789. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 23:35:21 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010124183521.18775.00001116@ng-da1.aol.com>
Source record: 1938

>From: "Leland C. Scott" no-spam@junk-mail.net

>I hope so. I just wrote a short E-mail to George Race (Great Lakes Division
>Director) asking that the ARRL board reexamine the issue of
>retaining/dropping Morse Code testing when it is finally dropped from the
>ITU treaty requirements.

I have little doubt that the ARRL Board will re-examine the issue when it appears that it will come up at the US regulatory level. I don't know what decision the Board will reach. That will depend on member input, I am sure. Rest assured, I will be communicating with Tom on a regular basis on a lot of issues, and this will be one of them. I would imagine that your note to Mr Race told him what you thought the results of the re-examination should be. The Board will probably re-examine it, but could decide to drop it, to keep it the same, or to ask for some sort of change.

My personal view is that the "Sohl" proposal, as I call it after his Correspondence piece in QST, to keep some code-copying testing in the exams, but include the results of the questions along with all of the other questions. That keeps code testing on a par with other modes that are important to amateur radio operation.

As a code guy, I think it is important that the applicant be exposed to the code from the getgo and that he or she be given as much opportunity to learn it as other modes. To me, this is probably a compromise position that both sides should consider.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1790. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 23:37:33 UTC
From: lagniappe <lagniappe@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <94novs$3sb$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1943
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna,alt.radio.family,rec.radio.cb

Not necessary - any kid ready to "experiment" should
be capable of passing the codeless tech, even if by rote
memory. My girlfriend knew nothing about radio, and it
took her 2 weeks with practice exams to earn a perfect
score.

Martin

In article <948o9h$4mg4$1@newssvr05-en0.news.prodigy.com>,
"Stewart R Teaze" <HORSESHOE7@prodigy.net> wrote:
> The rapidly-expanding Family Radio Service has exposed millions of
young
> people to the world
> of radio communications. But now, where is a young kid to go who has
is
> interested in experimenting
> with radios and get more range than the typical 1/2 mile of FRS? MURS

>

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1791. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 23:37:41 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010124183741.18775.00001117@ng-da1.aol.com>
Source record: 1939

>From: Brian Kelly kelly@dvol.com

>> support and foster support in Region 2, for elimination of S25.5 at
>> WRC2003. Then, in 2004, we will have another go-round on the US testing
>> issue. By then, the opposition of many of the Board hard-liner PCTA's
>> may be a dead issue, literally.

>But it could just as well go the other way, too. Hmmm?

I think so. The ARRL Board will have another interesting meeting, I am sure. Member input, now, and when it comes up again, will be important. I think the Board should hear from all sides of this issue. This time, however, I wish that they would hear from more people in the middle. With that in mind, I will tell Tom when I next bother him about this that although I express views, I don't think that Morse code testing is in the top 10 imporant issues facing Amateur Radio. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1792. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 23:42:16 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010124184216.18775.00001118@ng-da1.aol.com>
Source record: 1941

>From: Cecil Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>The next board may be made up of completely different people.

If memory serves, the ARRL Board has as members 9 people who were not Directors
the last time the Board set ARRL policy.

>If you believe your opinion to be the majority opinion, it shouldn't
>take too much work to load the next board with pro-code-test people.

Or vice versa. Member input is important. I do know that the member input in
some Divisions was quite different from the member input in others. At least
one Director immediately recognized the "organization-based" input, with a
group of pro-code folks all writing at the same time, then a group of
no-code-test folks writing a bit later, as FISTS and NCI asked its members to
contact ARRL. :-) The hard part, IMHO, is figuring out how important this
issue is to the folks in the middle.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1793. Re: Before responding to the Colt thread.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 23:44:16 UTC
From: lagniappe <lagniappe@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <94npce$49v$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 1944
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <94biur$59q$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
Steven J Robeson, K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com> wrote:
> In article <20010119225146.19838.00000247@ng-fj1.aol.com>,
> qrm2000@aol.com (Qrm2000) wrote:
>
> >>"alt.radio.family" IS a valid forum for his ideas, as irrelevant as
> >>they may be.
>
> >A copy of my message to Stewart is in rec.radio.cb. It asks him to
> >post to alt.radio.family separately. The reason is based on past
> >experience with his posts.
>
> OK, here's the direct question: As well intentioned (and I
> understand your frustrations...he CAN be tiring...) as your efforts to
> redirect his posts, ON WHOSE AUTHORITY do you do it? What writ of law
> do you bear that carries any weight to try and force his hand?
>

QRM, Steven has a valid point. Stewart may put forth
mostly silly ideas, but I don't recall any that weren't
on-topic to the extent that they involved FRS radio.

Your idea to have him post separately to each newsgroup
would certainly limit the number of responses we see,
but I imagine that he does not want that limitation.

Martin

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1794. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 23:45:24 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010124184524.18775.00001120@ng-da1.aol.com>
Source record: 1942

>From: "Leland C. Scott" no-spam@junk-mail.net

>That's what it's all about. Get your views, one side or the other, across to
>the board.

Yes, and to the Board of other organizations that you think may also file
comments to the FCC.

Most important, though, is when this comes up as a rulemaking issue, whether as
a Notice of Inquiry or NPRM, make your views known to the FCC.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1795. Re: ARRL Life Membership - Don't buy one!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 23:54:39 UTC
From: Spurious@StarBand.net
Message-ID: <Xns9033A308FF9AFFrog207Junocom@127.0.0.1>
Source record: 1946
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.swap

>>Can anybody tell me what are the benefits of becoming a Life Member of
>>the ARRL. Thanks

Please don't pay any attention to the rantings from Vince. He
apparently has a beef with ARRL. While the ARRL's policies may not be
agreeable to every ham, they are the only organization with any clout to
stand between the amateur community and the FCC and a Spectrum hungry
Congress that would love to sell off our frequencies to business users..
As for benefits to becoming a life member, kinda depends on your motives
and your age. If you're young, it's probably fiscally prudent. If you
wish to support the ARRL and its objectives, that would be good too.

Ed WB6SAT

1796. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-24 23:57:05 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010124185705.18775.00001125@ng-da1.aol.com>
Source record: 1945

>From: vlfiscus@mcn.net (Vince Fiscus, KB7ADL)

>Just ask Ed, They need to purchase new equipment for the tech lab when
>they start doing product reviews on CB rigs, echo-mics, and amps.

Care to put a lobster-dinner wager on whether QST runs a Product Review on a CB transmitter, an echo-microphone or an 11-meter amplifier before the next dues increase?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1797. Re: ARRL Life Membership

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-25 00:01:45 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010124190145.18765.00001188@ng-da1.aol.com>
Source record: 1947

>From: GAR GARIGUE garigue@home.com

>You don't get bothered 4 months before your subcription is up.

What would bother me is if they didn't ask me to renew until 4 months AFTER my subscription was up. :-)

Actually, the other magazines to which I subscribe have about the same time frame. If everybody else gave you 4 months to pay a bill, would you call it a bother? :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1798. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-25 00:05:05 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010124190505.18765.00001189@ng-da1.aol.com>
Source record: 1948

>From: Aaron Jones nomail@nomail.com

>I should be happy because my house burned down
>this year, instead of 3 years ago?? Same logic... :-)

I *would* be happy if they raised the rates on my adjustable rate mortgage this year in response to inflation rather than 3 years ago. Real logic.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1799. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-25 00:05:22 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A6F6DC2.C776E7DA@uci.edu>
Source record: 1949

Larry Klose wrote:
> I personally advocate thpetition the United States/FCC to adopt a WRC 2003
> policy to: (1) suppress ITU rule S25.5, (2) take exception to S25.5 in the
> WRC 2003 Final Acts if it is nor suppressed, and (3) delete 47 CFR 97.503(a)
> after the conclusion of WRC 2003 without any futher proceedings.

You might try meeting the present requirements as a means of first
demonstrating that it is not for personal gain that you make these
esteemed and learned recommendations.

73, Jim AC6XG

1800. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-25 00:13:44 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010124191344.18765.00001190@ng-da1.aol.com>
Source record: 1950

>From: Brian Kelly kelly@dvol.com

>No freeloader access to info which only benefits them.

Maybe. There is significant value to having good information available on the public site, too.

A good analogy I like to use is a store. If the merchandise is not displayed, no one will know it is there. How much would you buy if you could only look at the outside of the box? How would you react if you walked into a store and the proprietor asked you if you had ever been there before and if you said no, told you you couldn't come in unless you bought something first. Not a warm welcome to a new customer.

What about help for the new ham? Is it not in the interests of Amateur Radio to help new hams get started so they stay hams? What about industry and the FCC and a host of others who look at web sites on amateur radio for a number of reasons. Should I make http://www.arrl.org/tis/info/rfi-elect.html a members-only feature? How about RFI in general, or the page on the RF-exposure regulations?

And should the public page not have news about Amateur Radio and the ARRL? Of all of the member-association sites I know of with members-only sections, most have significant public information. The "news feed" on all of these sites is public. I think that having significant public information lets a ham who may not know much about ARRL judge what the organization is, what it does and whether he or she feels it important to be a member.

And, from an organizationally selfish point of view, bringing hams to the site makes it easier to sell them books that help keep the cost of your membership down. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1801. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-25 00:16:03 UTC
From: "Leland C. Scott" <no-spam@junk-mail.net>
Message-ID: <7fKb6.44635$ft6.1018722@typhoon.mw.mediaone.net>
Source record: 2051

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20010124183521.18775.00001116@ng-da1.aol.com...
>
> As a code guy, I think it is important that the applicant be exposed to
the
> code from the getgo and that he or she be given as much opportunity to
learn it
> as other modes. To me, this is probably a compromise position that both
sides
> should consider.

Ed, it's hard not to bump in to CW on the air. I don't see why retaining a CW test element would expose one to any more CW than what they are likely to experience on the air operating. Opportunities to learn CW are there for the asking, tapes at Radio Shack, CW programs for the computer free on the Internet, CW practice sessions on the local repeater, and so on, so I fall to see how a CW test element can "improve" the "opportunities" much.

If a Ham likes CW they will learn it on their own, and will work at it to improve their proficiency. For those who don't, even force feeding CW can't stop them from spitting it out once the spoon is removed so to speak. It's really a case if you like it you use, you don't you won't.

--
73's,

Leland C. Scott
KC8LDO

ARRL member
NCI member

"You ask what Morse Code is good for? I'll tell you. Morse
Code is used exclusively by Electronics Based life forms to
communicate amongst themselves using advanced Organic
Digital Signal Processors, running state of the art Artificial
Intelligence Software, to perform the highly complex
transmit encryption, receive decryption and error correction
functions."

1802. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-25 00:21:40 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010124192140.18765.00001191@ng-da1.aol.com>
Source record: 2052

>From: K0HB K0HB@arrl.org

>He wasn't impressed, and nothing changed. The "members only" side is
>still lame.

Do you think the ability to download all of the Product Reviews since 1/1/1980 is "lame?" Do you think the Lab's Expanded Test Reports, up to 40 pages of additional data, charts and graphs from the Lab tests of rigs is lame? How about the parts of QST that are downloaded as soon as the magazine goes to the printer. What about the email-forwarding service? The QST/QEX seach engine that the ARRL Lab categorized back to 1970, with additional selected categorization back to the 40s and 50s? (The article Mid-Michigan Skyhook now comes up if you type in tower as the search word). DXCC awards listings if you are a DXer; a discussion forum about the Doctor column; a discussion forum that is the first step in determining what members want to see in the ARRL Educational and Certification courses.

I think, Hans, that your use of the term "lame" was not accurate. I am personally not very interested in many of the members-only features either, but the pages do have things of value to me.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1803. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-25 00:23:40 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010124192340.18765.00001192@ng-da1.aol.com>
Source record: 2053

>From: K0HB@USWEST.NET

>My point exactly. The "front page" of the web site is pretty damn good!
>The members are paying somebody to do that for us, and the product is first
>class. Stuff I'd pay to subscribe to!

Hans, the news feed used to be in a weekly publication called the ARRL Letter.
I think 1 or 2% of members subscribed. Were you a subscriber to that in the
mid 80s?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1804. all the wrong places

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-25 00:47:09 UTC
From: N8WWM@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <94nt2a$7ij$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2055

I think I was looking for love in all the wrong places. Illegal keyclowns said for me to get me elmer in here. I elmered more than they can ever dream. Any suggestions fellers? Whats the best way to get back at these illegal keyclowns for harming my good name?

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1805. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-25 00:56:39 UTC
From: Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com>
Message-ID: <3A6F79C7.166FB123@dvol.com>
Source record: 2054

W1RFI wrote:

> I think so. The ARRL Board will have another interesting meeting, I am sure.
> Member input, now, and when it comes up again, will be important.

> I think the
> Board should hear from all sides of this issue. This time, however, I wish
> that they would hear from more people in the middle.

>
There are three kinds of hams out here: Those who strongly support code testing, those who strongly oppose code testing, and those "middle people" who could care less one way or the other. So the Directors won't hear from those. The next brawl will be "The Second Battle of the Rabid Partisans". Like the Second Battle of Bull Run. With the emphasis on "bull".
>
I've been noticing much more widespread interest in the topic recently than we had while 143 was cooking. For one our Director actively pursued opinions on the matter going into the recent BoD meeting this time which he has not done previously. Yeah, it's still a hot topic. It ain't gonna be over until the FCC finally closes the matter for many years whenever that might happen some indeterminate number of years out. I wouldn't bet a dime on any of it.
>

> With that in mind, I will
> tell Tom when I next bother him about this that although I express views, I
> don't think that Morse code testing is in the top 10 imporant issues facing
> Amateur Radio. :-)

>
At this point certainly. Since you brought it up, what are the top ten more important issues?
>

>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

>
w3rv

1806. Re: This Just In . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-25 01:04:23 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A6F7B97.A6BE2105@IEEE.org>
Source record: 2058
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Vince Fiscus, KB7ADL" wrote:
> Can you say: "CQ Breaker, CQ Breaker, this here's Good-Buddy-Ham on twenty
> meters, anyone got their ears on? c'mon back. Ten-four Ten-four good-
> buddy, I got ya and yer gettin out..."

Wow, words from an obvious expert.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

1807. Re: frg9600 uses mouth on sheep rectum! (Was: Re: Roger doesnt use foul mouth !)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-25 01:05:54 UTC
From: KC8JBO <roger_kc8jbo@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <94nu5d$8hu$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2061
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <9o%96.833$t5.75684@news1.frmt1.sfba.homo.com>,
"frg9600" <frg9600@homo.com> wrote:
>

Poor frg9600..... he's a little man, in a big man's body...
Try and pick yourself up a life or some clue or something. I know it's
rough on you, barely getting by on food stamps, but you have to try,
dropout.

> KC8JBO <roger_kc8jbo@my-deja.com> wrote in message
> news:949h6h$c3m$1@nnrp1.deja.com...
> > In article <949e70$dk0$1@news.bewellnet.com>,
> > "Keith Casey" <kc7kc@bigfoot.com> wrote:
> > > The VE's were incorrect to ask for another fee to take the extra.
> > That
> > > should have been covered under the one fee.
> > >
> > > Also, the VE group can keep a part of the fee, but only enough to
> > cover
> > > their expenses. Their time cannot be charged. The rules did just
> > change on
> > > keeping records of expenses incurred.
> > >
> > > Keith, KC7KC
> >
> > According to the ARRL VE Manual , Eith Ed. , 2000, p. 50,
> > under "Retesting,"
> > "An applicant who fails an element at an ARRL/VEC-coordinated
session
> > may retake that element at the same session, if (1) the
administering
> > VE team has a different version of that element, which the applicant
> > hasn't taken (section 97.509), (2) the VE team has the time and
> > resources and is willing to readminister the additional version; and
> > (3) the applicant pays an ADDITIONAL (emphasis mine) TEST FEE
(because
> > the candidate is then considered a walk-in candidate who just
arrived,
> > even if he or she arrived at the beginning of the session). Again, a
> > retest fee charge is only required if an element is retaken, after
> > being failed at your session."
> >
> > The W5YI VE manual has the same thing .

> >
> > The reimbursement fee (test fee) is the only fee that may be
charged at
> > a test session. Now, if the test session occurs at a hamfest,
> > instruction class, or other gathering, an admission fee may be
charged
> > and it has to be kept seperate from the test fee. If you're just
going
> > to the test sesion at a hamfest, you shouldn't be charged a fee.
> >
> >
> >
> > > "K7MEM" <jda@rupert.tds-az.lmco.com> wrote in message
> > > news:3A65DD87.3F54BC7E@rupert.tds-az.lmco.com...
> > > > John Passaneau wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > The ARRL VE book, said, 1 fee for each test session, and it
> > covered
> > > > > as many elements as the test taker wanted to take, or the VE
have.
> > > > > But it is a new fee to retake a failed element. So as long as
you
> > > > > keep passing you can do as many elements as you can pass for 1
> > fee.
> > > > > Remember though that most VE sessions have only 2 or 3
versions
> > > > > of a test element available and if you flunk all that they
have,
> > > > > your done for that session.
> > > > >
> > > > > Dick Carroll"wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Steve Woodruff wrote:
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > ..but i was suprised tonight to learn that i had to
> > > > > > > pay the $10 fee for EACH exam i took. I upgraded to
general,
> > > > > > > and had intentions of attempting the extra class exam....
> > > > > > > but when i found out it would cost me an additional $10
> > > > > > > i figured i'd wait until next month when i could be
> > > > > > > reasonably sure that i'd pass with ease.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > If that is permissable evidently they have changed the
rules.
> > When I
> > > > > > ran a VE team ('85 thru '93) the rules said one fee for all
> > tests
> > > taken
> > > > > > at that session. Later it was deemed permissable to charge
an

> > > additional
> > > > > > fee for a retest of a failed element at the same session,
but
> > we never
> > > > > > did.
> > > > >
> > > > It's been a few years, but when I made General, I took the Tech,
> > > > General, and 13 WPM code at the same time for one fee ($6.45).
> > > > At another session I took the Extra and the 20 WPM code tests
> > > > again for one fee ($6.45). At the time, I was under the
impression
> > > > that this fee went directly to the ARRL, to cover the cost
> > > > of the testing materials that they supplied. That ment that the
> > > > club, which was running the VE session, was really charging
> > > > nothing for their time.
> > > >
> > > > Was I correct in my reasoning? Aren't they, the club, also
allowed
> > > > to charge a small fee to cover their expenses?
> > > >
> > > > Martin K7MEM
> > > >
> > > > --
> > > > Martin E. Meserve K7MEM
> > > > martin.e.meserve AT lmco.com
> > > >
> > > > I respond to news groups and E-Mail on my own time and
therefore
> > > > my responses may not be as timely as you, or I, would like them
to
> > > > be. If I seem to be ignoring you, send me another E-Mail to jog
my
> > > > memory. Opinions are my own and do not reflect the opinions of
my
> > > > employer.
> > >
> > >
> >
> > --
> > 73 de Roger, KC8JBO
> > EM99 |ARRL|VE [ARRL & W5YI]|ARES |RACES
> > Yaesu FT-920 |Inverted Vee @ 40 ft.
> > Yaesu FT-90R
> >
> >
> > Sent via Deja.com
> > http://www.deja.com/
>
>

--
73 de Roger, KC8JBO
EM99 |ARRL|VE [ARRL & W5YI]|ARES |RACES
Yaesu FT-920 |Inverted Vee @ 40 ft.
Yaesu FT-90R

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1808. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-25 01:12:20 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010124201220.18765.00001202@ng-da1.aol.com>
Source record: 2056

>From: Brian Kelly kelly@dvol.com

>> We are then going to take them to the FCC. IF the FCC will enforce the
>> no-interference clause, then it can be relied upon. If not, then we cannot
>> live with the limits.

>If it's well documented, etc. I would expect Riley would move on it.

Actually, it may be better to take it to the Part 15 folks, but your point is taken. I am not so confident. What will the FCC do with the neighbor of a ham who buys a touch lamp at the local K Mart and causes interference.
I chose that example on purpose because in one very clear cut case, the FCC paid a visit on the neighbor after months of the ham begging. The FCC told the neighbor that he had to stop using the light, shook everyone's hand and then drove away. The van no sooner was out of sight than the noise returned. So far, no further action. That's one of the cases I need and I am going to use it. Another case involves a commercial wireless LAN on 2.4 GHz. The operator actually did the right thing and turned off channels -- until they realized it was the Amateur Radio Service. Jim Haynie is still working with the FCC on that one. That's two, but I can't promise how the cases will turn out. OTOH, the FCC has been good about writing advisory letters to electric utilities, as a followup to the letters I write first. (I hear from about 75% or so, with generally good cooperation, although 50-50 on the actual resolution.)

But how does a ham and the FCC tell the neighbor of a ham that the device he just bought at K Mart is being operated in violation of federal law?

> ... the FCC can readily spank an owner of an RFI source but
>there are two perps involved. One being the owner who refuses to go
> QRT which the FCC can shut down, the other is the manufacturer of
> the widget who probably sold a jillion >of the things.

Actually, there is only one perp under the law in most cases. The manufacturer is required to build the devices to the requirements of Part 15. Some devices must be Certificated -- the manufacturer or importer has to send test data to the FCC and the Commission approves the device for sale in the US. Others are "Verified," meaning the rules require the manufacturer to test it and keep test data if the FCC ever asks. (Really!)

Once those requirements are met by the manufacturer, the device can be sold. A "legal" device on 3.5 MHz can cause S9+15 dB to a dipole located 100 feet away. This is, of course, harmful interference if it lands on a frequency an amateur is using.

Even that may not be so clear cut. The definition of harmful interference requires that communication be repeatedly disrupted. The FCC has made decisions wrt cable leakage that merely hearing the signal (S9 is typically legal for a

cable leak) break squelch is not harmful interference. 145.25 the usual frequency, and if there is no repeater in the area, there is no harmful interference.

In my estimation, more instinct than fact, the FCC would not view an S1 or S2 signal on HF as harmful interference. S6+ almost certainly is. I don't have a clue how the FCC would view things in the middle. How about a signal that is a 1-second burst every few minutes? Harmful interference? How about the frequency agility that is a natural part of the Amateur Radio Service? Would the FCC feel we should use the flexibility they have given us to avoid interference that is on a single frequency? I don't know, but I could imagine that they would.

The real issue, however, is that under the rules, the operator of the device, ie, your neighbor, that local business, a school, is responsible for resolving actual interference. I don't know about you, but I sure would not want to have that conversation with my neighbor. He bought an arc welder at Sears and I gotta' tell him he is using in violation of federal law? He is a nice enough fellow under most circumstances, but don't think he would see things my way. Now what? A letter from the FCC? There goes my next tower variance, eh? And what do I say if he says, "So, the tables have turned, have they?"

> Gets very complex but it's absolutely gotta be done.

Complex, indeed. That is why Mark Wilson tolerates me in the Lab. :-)

> I vote for getting the limits for Class B devices 'way down, kill it
> before it shows up on the shelves and be done with it.

The ARRL fought that fight, and lost. I guess the big boys had more expensive lawyers. Realistically, unless we can show serious and repeated harm to the Amateur Radio Service, I don't think we have a prayer, and even then, I think we would lose. And, what the manufacturers say is that the rules offer complete protection against harmful interference; how much more protection do we want than absolute?

I can live with this,IF the FCC is willing to enforce the rules. I can live with ARRL having to take a lot of the first steps, in preparing information and in trying to resolve some of these problems with the device operators, IF the FCC is willing to take the last steps and deal with those cases where a reasonable cooperative effort is not enough. How that works remains to be seen, but if the FCC won't do it, I think ARRL's comemnts to the FCC may be very different the next time a high-level of radiated emissions is proposed as being okay because of the non-interference rules.

In the meantime, what can be done? Even with what it has for staff resources (me,part time on RFI), quite a lot. It all started with the old Phonex PX-421 wireles modem jacks on 3.53 MHz. Man, I can hardly tell you how much time I have into that one. It took over two years, but it is actually starting to pay off. Phonex did the right thing immediately, learning of widespread harmful interference and literally stopping production and making engineering changes in a few weeks. About a month later, a new model was in production, operating outside the ham bands. TCI, now AT&T, bought them by the thousands. That was the hard part. They were very cooperative on the national level, but had a lot

of local problems getting the job done. After a long while, they switched over to a 100%-recall mode, and are, in MOST sytems, 90% done. (The areas that are still behind the curve are San Francisco/San Jose and the Dallas area, but Dallas is coming up to speed pretty fast.) Whew!

Unfortunately, and fortunately, that isn't it. Other technologies such as VDSL, HPNA, and HomePlug threaten HF. Fortunately, that isn't it. I somehow managed to put togehter the web pages at http://www.arrl.org/tis/info/rfiteljx.html. This is, of course, seen by a lot of hams (not all of which are members... :-)). Many hams work in industry, so this info got the attention of those organizations. In many cases, work to protect amateur radio was already underway, I might add. The bottom line is that these organization are willing to address RFI from the getgo, and are doing so, to one degree or another. All 3 product specs contain at least 20 dB more protection for amateur radio than the rules require, with the very specific intent of preventing inteference to large numbers of hams.

Will there be cases anyway? Yes, there will, just like there are cases of TVI involving ham radio. But these manufacturers are voluntarily including protection, and they are going to radiate about 60 dB less energy in our ham bands than the rules permit us to radiate in our neighbors' TV bands.

Now, the real problem is probabliy 2.4 and 5.6 GHz. Can you say Bluetooth and wireless digital? There can be no protection added because these devices are using the shared ISM bands that we also share. The manufacturers know, too, that our use of the 2.4 GHz bands is a lot less than our use of HF, so the likelihood of *actual* harmful interference is pretty small. The ARRL's ad hoc Spectrum Strategy Committee is discussing just what CAN be done to help protect these bands. Asking for Part 15 rules changes may be one of the end results. The committee has been in place about 4 months or so, and just reported to the ARRL Board in January. As a "spectrum-strategy," the full report may not be made public -- no sense telling the opposition how we intend to defend the bands, but I will sed what I can shake loose for a public report.

>> . . . I did not write up or publish the papers I presented to the T1E1.4
>> VDSL standards committee, nor describe much about the work

>Lack of time?

Lack of time, on the the next emergency. That has to change, and I told my boss that. :-)

>I agree. Gets right back to the concept of monthly staff reports in QST.
>Provide a brief summary per department or noteworthy invidual's news
> in QST povide the the link to the full text stored in the Web server.

Even it only appeared on the web, it would be a start. Once I get my new staffer hired, and up to speed, I am going to have to get things documented. (Man, I hope I can find the right RFI guru in a tight employee market and a salary range that is not at IEEE standards. The saving grace is that this is a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to work with ARRL, industry and the FCC to make a BIG difference in something really important. I will either get the semi-retired EMC engineer or the new grad who wants something REALLY impressive

on his or her resume.)

>A manger playing help desk is nuts.

I am a working supervisor, so I gotta' do something. :-) What I may continue doing myself, depending on the qualifications of whoever I hire, is the committee-level and some of the first-contact with industry and utility companies,etc. It has been working out pretty well.

>I'm a lot more concerned about losing spectrum space to interefernce than I
>am to
>somebody nipping pieces of spectrum space for use by other services.

ALL amateur spectrum is shared, most of it with Part 15. That sharing can protect us as well as hurt us; even the Part 15 folks are afraid of congestion on 2.4 GHz. Time will tell what can be done, but I, for one, am going to give it a go.

Anyway, I probably gave you (all) more of an answer than you wanted. To find out how many read this far, send me an email to W1RFI@arrl.org or W1RFI@aol.com. I will do a drawing of all those that do to award the 2000 "bent-cover" Handbook, now that I offered it to Aaron but he didn't accept the terms. I will add that you have to look REAL close to see the bent cover. But I did want to give a snapshot of what I have been up to over the past few months. The details are, well, a bit more detailed. :-) I figure that it is the least I can do after disagreeing with you so often on code testing. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1809. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-25 01:13:39 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nospam.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.g7othk0.pminews@ca.news.verio.net>
Source record: 2057

On Wed, 24 Jan 2001 18:59:06 GMT, xjim@my-deja.com wrote:

>They make something very much like that for small boats and have had
>such a thing for small aircraft for decades.

Not only "small boats". Every vessel required by law to carry
radio (all cargo vessels over 300 tons, all passenger-carrying
vessels) must carry an EPIRB. IIRC all aircraft licensed by
the FAA must carry an ELT (I may be wrong about the "all" but
certainly "large" aircraft are required to have ELTs).

>Goodies like these would seem to make the radioman obsolete, but maybe
>you need someone on board to operate all these gadgets anyway. If that
>is the case wouldn't you want someone with a whole bunch of tricks in
>his arsenal, including ham radio and CW capability?

Replacing the old "Gibson Girl" or equivalent hand-cranked CW
transceiver, all lifeboats are required to carry two or more
battery-operated marine VHF transceivers to talk to the SAR
aircraft who are usually first on the scene.

BTW - the American Red Cross uses SATCOM radio-telephones as
its backbone communication in disaster services.

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

1810. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-25 01:15:18 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010124201518.18765.00001206@ng-da1.aol.com>
Source record: 2059

>From: "Leland C. Scott"

> I don't see why retaining a CW test element would expose one to
> any more CW than what they are likely to experience on the air operating.

You are probably correct, but I also see no reason to completely eliminate testing for one popular mode on the tests. The method I described does indeed test CW, but to the same standard as other modes.

At any rate, this is the gist of what I believe today. Who knows what I will feel a few years hence.

73, Ed Hare, W1RFI

1811. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-25 01:17:13 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010124201713.18765.00001209@ng-da1.aol.com>
Source record: 2060

>From: Jim Kelley jwkelley@uci.edu

>You might try meeting the present requirements as a means of first
>demonstrating that it is not for personal gain that you make these
>esteemed and learned recommendations.

Why? Most of the comments made to the FCC are by people seeking personal gain from the result. The FCC accepts that. Even if there is personal gain involved, and there almost always is, the FCC knows that it must make its decisions in the public interest. In general, I think they do.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1812. Re: ARRL Life Membership - Don't buy one!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-25 01:23:46 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010124202346.18765.00001211@ng-da1.aol.com>
Source record: 2062

><Vince> apparently has a beef with ARRL.

I believe the majority of his current disagreement is that he is not pleased with ARRL's position wrt restructuring (4 classes of license, 0, 5,12,12 wpm, and asking that more comprehensive written exams be given.)

>As for benefits to becoming a life member, kinda depends on your motives >and your age.

I think I can address what may have been the original question. Life members do not receive benefits that are any better or different than annual-paying members. It can be an investment in the future for some, a way of not having to bother renewing every year for others and a "contribution" to ARRL by others. The League does invest the life-member dues, to ensure that it is not building a house of cards. That life-member who joined for $125 back when $125 was a lot of money is still being funded from the way that investment has grown.

Do the math, consider your options and if you want to join the League, do it in the way that is best for you.

See http://www.arrl.org/join.html for info on dues and life membership.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1813. Top 10 Problems facing Amteur Radio? (was Re: ARRL code test resolution)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-25 01:28:06 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010124202806.18765.00001213@ng-da1.aol.com>
Source record: 2063

>From: Brian Kelly kelly@dvol.com

>At this point certainly. Since you brought it up, what are the top ten more
>important issues?

The minute I hit the SEND button, I said to myself, "My God, man, what have you
done to yourself?"

I gotta' give my fingers a rest after that last long post. Want to take a
first cut at it?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1814. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-25 01:38:04 UTC
From: Larry Klose <lklose@net-link.net>
Message-ID: <3a6f8391$0$29999$44a10c7e@news.net-link.net>
Source record: 2064

"Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
news:3A6F6DC2.C776E7DA@uci.edu...
> Larry Klose wrote:
> > I personally advocate petitioning the United States/FCC to adopt a WRC
2003
> > policy to: (1) suppress ITU rule S25.5, (2) take exception to S25.5 in
the
> > WRC 2003 Final Acts if it is nor suppressed, and (3) delete 47 CFR
97.503(a)
> > after the conclusion of WRC 2003 without any futher proceedings.
>
> You might try meeting the present requirements as a means of first
> demonstrating that it is not for personal gain that you make these
> esteemed and learned recommendations.

Are saying that person petitioning his government to change a regulation
that he believes is not in conformity with law and not in the public
interest has no standing to file that petition?

The matter more or less before the Commission is complaint against the
political, legal and constitutional validity of a the Morse code exam
regulation. An attack against the petitioner is irrelevant.

Would you ask black women to be white before she challenges the a bus
seating law. Would ask a women to be man before she challenges the right to
vote. Must I pass a code test in order challenge the ITU rule S25.5 and FCC
rule 47 CFR 97.503(a)?

Larry

1815. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-25 01:56:20 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <94o144$55j$0@208.207.71.131>
Source record: 2065

Jon Bloom wrote:
>
> Aaron Jones wrote:
> >
> > "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net> wrote:
> > Well let's see...
> > Jon first calls Dick ignorant (among other insults) and then calls
>
> It's not an insult. Dick admitted he was ignorant of the meaning of the
> term "per annum." Hey, I'm ignorant of lots of things. So are you
> (shocking!)
>

Not exactly, Jon. 'Per Annum' is Latin for "Each Year". You didn't exactly specify in clear terms which years you were referring to, so I made the assumtion that *future years* was the subject, since the future is the only time where the increase can apply - you're sure not going to collect arrears from the membership.
Turns out that wasn't what you were talking about, instead you were doing past-years' accounting. Until you made that clear it looked appeared to be a screening of the dues increase as a percentage, the sort of spin that is an everyday matter in society today, lamentable though it is. It's a routine business matter today. So it wasn't exactly my "ignorance" that was wholly to blame for the clash. Once your meaning was clear, my complaint dissipated. Let's just leave it at that.

1816. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-25 02:11:33 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <94o20l$76a$0@208.207.71.131>
Source record: 2066

Cecil wrote:
>
> Aaron Jones wrote:
> > But that's not what I was commenting on.
> > I was comparing the 50's era average ham's technical abilities to the
> > technical abilities of today's average ham. I think the 50's average
> > ham wins hands down...
>
> I don't know about that. I am infinitely more technical now than
> I was in the 50s. How about you?

If there's one thing that we've all seen here on rrap it is that Cecil
is definitely the exception to -any- rule.

1817. Re: ARRL Life Membership - Don't buy one!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-25 02:28:58 UTC
From: Paul McCarron <w1hzy@cybertours.com>
Message-ID: <3A6F8F6A.5E641B8A@cybertours.com>
Source record: 2068
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.swap

I have been a life member since it's inception, some 30+?? years ago. They sure lost money on me!!!
Paul W1IY

"Ed G." wrote:

> >>Can anybody tell me what are the benefits of becoming a Life Member of
> >>the ARRL. Thanks
>
> Please don't pay any attention to the rantings from Vince. He
> apparently has a beef with ARRL. While the ARRL's policies may not be
> agreeable to every ham, they are the only organization with any clout to
> stand between the amateur community and the FCC and a Spectrum hungry
> Congress that would love to sell off our frequencies to business users..
> As for benefits to becoming a life member, kinda depends on your motives
> and your age. If you're young, it's probably fiscally prudent. If you
> wish to support the ARRL and its objectives, that would be good too.
>
> Ed WB6SAT

1818. Re: Top 10 Problems facing Amteur Radio? (was Re: ARRL code test resolution)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-25 02:28:59 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.10.10101250222110.6999-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 2067

Here's two:

1) Apathy. Many amateurs don't care about some other aspect of the service if it doesn't affect them.

2) Anarchy. Everyone simply does their own thing without regard to others. For this, I'm primarily thinking of the breakdown of the packet network (at least regionally), where cooperation is necessary but lacking. We're left with just a few "die-hards" (often called "blow-hards" by those who aren't in the network), who are aware that they're unappreciated and by themselves, cannot sustain an already fractured network. It gets worse with TCP/IP ops. However, with some of the jamming on HF, this could be a factor with voice ops too.

These two certainly lead to alot of corrolary problems such as in-fighting, the insult wars here on the RRA newsgroups, etc....

On 25 Jan 2001, W1RFI wrote:
> >From: Brian Kelly kelly@dvol.com
>
> >At this point certainly. Since you brought it up, what are the top ten more
> >important issues?
>
> The minute I hit the SEND button, I said to myself, "My God, man, what have
> you done to yourself?"
>
> I gotta' give my fingers a rest after that last long post. Want to take a
> first cut at it?

1819. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-25 02:46:05 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <94o41d$c3e$0@208.207.71.131>
Source record: 2069

Brian Kelly wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> > Actually, I don't see where it matters more than trivially anyway,
> > since FCC today pretty well ignores ARRL.
> > Hang around long enough, you'll find out how it works.
>
> >
> If that's fact I think it's far more due to today's dumbed-down FCC than it is
> with anything the ARRL has or hasn't done. I think it's been pretty clearly
> demonstrated that the FCC could care less about ham radio. The whole history of
> the FCC with respect to ham radio over decades has been a litany of disengagement
> maneuvers. When it comes to changing the regs the first thing the FCC seems to do
> is ask itself "First priority, guys: how can we jerk this R&O around to make
> life easier for US?" Once that's decided they pay cerimonial attention to
> commenters like the ARRL.
>

I certainly agree. The League's restructuring proposal was very much
appropriate and would have affected an orderly progression of the ARS.
FCC evidently didn't give it more than a cursory look.
I don;t know exactly when things changed, but it had have something to
do with retirements and massive personnel changes. Both ARRL and FCC are
operating with totally different personnel than in the dasy when they
collaborated closely in planning and making rules for the orderly
administration of the ARS. I doubt we'll ever again see such close
cooperation again. FCC has bigger fish to fry and ARS is a very small
blip on a very large screen.

1820. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-25 02:47:27 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nospam.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.g7oxh80.pminews@ca.news.verio.net>
Source record: 2070

On 24 Jan 2001 23:45:24 GMT, W1RFI wrote:

>Most important, though, is when this comes up as a rulemaking issue, whether as
>a Notice of Inquiry or NPRM, make your views known to the FCC.

Do you mean the FCC that has a chairman who doesn't believe
that the FCC has any business doing what it 'sposed to do
(setting standards and regulating communications providers) and
another commissioner who doesn't have a clue as to what the job
of the FCC is anyway...thanks be that we finally lost the
California moonchild, she was even worse...but who knows
who/what Prez Dubya will select to fill the new vacancy.

These folks will be "in the seats" when WRC-2003 business and
its aftermath has to be dealt with.

Bring Back George Sterling (the last ham and the last engineer
who served as Commissioner).

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

1821. Re: Anthony Hancock

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-25 03:27:15 UTC
From: "G8ASO;;;;;" <not@here.com>
Message-ID: <94o6ep$e9r1t$1@ID-67923.news.dfncis.de>
Source record: 2071
Cross-posted to: aus.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

Brilliant!

"bigpimp" <bigpimp@ntlworld.com> wrote in message
news:NdIb6.1956$vc.57072@news6-win.server.ntlworld.com...
>
> G8ASO;;;;; <not@here.com> wrote in message
>
> >
> > The "lad" himself and arguably the most famous radio ham of them all!
> >
> > Converted to mono and only a 4MB file in zipped MP3 for free download,
the
> > full episode "The Radio Ham"
> >
> already got it.....
> and my local repeater in Nottingham loves it !!!!!
>
> M1ADU/M5ADU.......They dont like it up 'em
>
>
>

1822. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-25 03:32:43 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <94o6oripq0@208.207.71.131>
Source record: 2072

"Ed Hare, W1RFI" wrote:
>
> W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com> wrote:
>
> > Then why all the bull crap math? I have no problem with the increase. I
> have
> > one hell of a problem with the Clintonesque explanation.
>
> The explanation was in response to a statement that the dues increase was
> not justifiable with the present low rate of inflation. I really can't think
> of a better way to have resonded than to express the dues increase in terms
> of a per-annum increase.
>
> Do you have any suggestions as to how Jon could have answered it better?

Now that you've asked, he might have said something like "While the
increase is 14.7% per year, it actually amounts to 3.5 % per annum since
the last increase, which is not out of line with the rate of inflation".

Sometimes economy of words winds up costing many more. (Something I
soon found when attempting to shorten my own posts).

1823. Re: ARRL Life Membership

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-25 04:04:01 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <1m8v6t0kv242tt0skg6fnd747vun6iaht8@4ax.com>
Source record: 2073

w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:

>>From: GAR GARIGUE garigue@home.com
>
>>You don't get bothered 4 months before your subcription is up.
>
>What would bother me is if they didn't ask me to renew until 4 months AFTER my
>subscription was up. :-)
>
>Actually, the other magazines to which I subscribe have about the same time
>frame. If everybody else gave you 4 months to pay a bill, would you call it a
>bother? :-)

ARRL will now notify you by email at renewal time
and allow you to re-up online...

1824. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-25 04:04:03 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <vn8v6to75vcos4bvjsu1quh23m4ba20ht9@4ax.com>
Source record: 2074

w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:
>I believe that a desire to learn is what motivates
>most hams to become hams

I think that a desire to get on the air is what motivates most people
to become hams. Learning is easily done without any license...

1825. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-25 04:04:14 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <8o8v6t8uesu2vu5l82v83s77htnksf9tbl@4ax.com>
Source record: 2075

lagniappe <lagniappe@my-deja.com> wrote:
>My girlfriend knew nothing about radio, and it
>took her 2 weeks with practice exams to earn a perfect
>score.

How can this happen if we have a good ham test? Pass the test without knowing the material?? Hear that Ed... Oops sorry, I forgot that you decided to avoid this embarrassing subject... :-)

1826. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-25 04:04:17 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <789v6to6m2rl699772s4v25ibhl0d0t14b@4ax.com>
Source record: 2076

w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:

>>From: Aaron Jones nomail@nomail.com
>>Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote:
>>>It's not an insult.
>>>Dick admitted he was ignorant...
>>>So are you [ignorent] (shocking!)...

>Aaron likes to twist things, too, it would seem. Did you snip the middle part
>of Jon's paragraph because you thought it irrelevant to the discussion at hand?

Fair question. Lets analyze. Here's Jon's *entire* quote:

>>It's not an insult. Dick admitted he was ignorant of the meaning of the term
>> "per annum." Hey, I'm ignorant of lots of things. So are you (shocking!)

Have you seen Dick post that he admitted that he was ignorant of
anything? Have you seen me post that I was ignorant of anything?
"Ignorant" is not the nicest word you can use when describing someone,
even when using the word on yourself...

Of course Jon was referring to his earlier statement:
>>This is one of the reasons I don't hang around rrap much any more -- too
>>many people like Dick who (willfully? ignorantly?) misinterpret simple,
>>direct statements and then use their misinterpretation as "evidence" of
>>unethical behavior on the part of the other party. Guess my stomach for
>>idiocy like this isn't as strong as Ed's.

Translation: Dick (wilfully? ignorantly?) misinterprets my posts which
is idiocy. Idiocy? Would you like to hear that your posts are idiocy,
meaning of course you write like an idiot...

So Jon has effectively posted: Dick = idiot = ignorant and Cecil =
liar, all over a silly percentage argument... :-)

You may be right in your criticism of my quoting, but all in all, I
think I had Jon's flavor rather well. Question is, why do you take me
to task for my quoting, and yet remain silent on Jon's conduct? You're
not going to pardon your brother (employee) are you Mr. Clinton... :-)

1827. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-25 04:04:19 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <6s8v6totjp2sh94u79s6fs6ts44ouihm47@4ax.com>
Source record: 2077

w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:
>I *would* be happy if they raised the rates on my adjustable rate mortgage this
>year in response to inflation rather than 3 years ago. Real logic.

You're a bit odd Ed. Most people *are not* happy at all when they get
their mortgage rates raised... :-)

And that apparently goes for some ARRL members with dues increases
too. Unless of course they aren't good on figuring percentages... :-)

1828. Re: QCWA TELLS FCC TO END INCENTIVE LICENSING

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-25 04:47:48 UTC
From: Bob Wex w2ilp <w2ilp@juno.com>
Message-ID: <94ob5j$j5u$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2078

In article <20010118051156.05040.00002273@ng-ff1.aol.com>,
w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:
> >From: Bob Wex w2ilp
>
> >I believe it is also because ham radio, even without a Morse code
> >exam, is considered old hat by those who are already using cell-
phones
> >and capable of brousing on the Internet.
>
> Why are there more hams now than there were before cell phones and
internet
> became widespread?

Ed...
I would love to belive that ham radio is continuing to grow...
BUT
common sense tells me it is not capturing the interest of young people
and it is no longer advised as a worthy educational hobby by their
teachers or parents. We can not ignore the facts that show that ham
radio has become an old foggies' hobby, because only old retireees are
interested in using its facilities. Communicating by ham radio in the
way that the majority of hams (but certainly not all hams) are doing it
is not very educational...Nor do hams attribute appreciably to the
state of the communications art when compared to computer guru
hobbyists.
Ham Radio is sick and will get sicker unless its basis and purpose
is clarified and adhered to.
Because some public schools in the USA are not producing educated
students it has become a political objective to improve education in
general. Programs are being prepared that would test students'
achievements and teachers' abilities to teach. Bush warns that schools
which do not succeed will be closed. Programs involving school
vouchers, so that parents may select "better" schools may be impossible
to implement because either the voucher money offered will not be
enough or the good schools will quickly be filled and there will not
be "good" resources for all. The separation of church and state, as
interpreted froim our Constitution, had formerly prohibited federal aid
to parocial schools. IMHO this is a good idea because any inclusing of
religious teaching must be handled separately from all other teaching
to allow for the religious freedom that our founding fathers knew was
best for maintaining peace and dignity within our nation.
Why do I bring up the Educational Dilemmas that are now political
footballs? I bring it up because it has a lot to do with ham radio.
Some present political beliefs include:-

1) All children must be given a good head start early in their
education if a modern educational program is to succeed.
2) Children must be tested in all subjects at all levels to certify
their abilities and to make schools accountable.
3) Americans need more required education in math and science if the
USA is to remain competitive with other industrial nations.

Are we to believe these ideas???

I kind of agree with these needs and I think that our government is
prepared to spend some bucks to achieve them. Why not apply them to
HAM RADIO???
We could...
1) Restore a Novice License that would be at a level to motivate very
young children to become hams.
2) Increase the number of Ham License Classes and corresponding exams
bringing ham radio into the digital information age.
3) Add endorsements on Ham Licenses for those, who through self study
and practical hands on work, can demonstrate on exams that they have
learned applied math, science and technology and are an asset to the
USA.

Nah...
You will not agree with me because you only think that the ARRL will
get dues from affluent old foggies who could care less about the future
reputation of the hobby. They will rarely be able to get their own
grand children interested...but won't see that as a detriment to
working a rare island or rag chewing about their ailments...or
complaining about a few kilohertz that they lost in 1968 because they
couldn't make Amateur Extra Class.

Please keep thinking Ed...I appreciate the fact that you are answering
almost everyone who comments here...Please read what they are saying
with care before you jump to respond. For Ham Radio to survive in the
changing times of new technologies and challenges it must motivate
youth and their teachers...with progressively rarer exception, it is
not doing so!

73,
Bob ex 2ilp (I wonder wher the double-us went!)
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1829. Re: QCWA TELLS FCC TO END INCENTIVE LICENSING

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-25 05:09:19 UTC
From: Bob Wex w2ilp <w2ilp@juno.com>
Message-ID: <94ocds$k46$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2079

In article <945sr5kmn0@208.207.71.177>,
Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>
>
> W1RFI wrote:
> >
> > >From: Bob Wex w2ilp w2ilp@juno.com
> >
> > >While the Novic License
> > >was not producing many new Novices, let us not discount it as an
entry
> > >to youths who prefered to start becoming real HF Hams...Or haven't
you
> > >noticed.
> >
> > The ones who didn't notice, Bob, were the new hams who were not
choosing the
> > Novice as their first license.
>
> Why should they? Another few questions and they had Tech Plus with
all
> Novice privileges plus 2 meters and up. With such a convoluted
> licensing system, no wonder the Novice class faded away.
> There was a time when FCC bothered to find out what they could expect
> from changes to be made in ham radio before they made them. Somewhere
> along the way that went by the way. Right along with retirements, I
> suppose.

Yep...
FCC Chairman Kennard has been replaced by the son of a general. I
dunno if that will mean anything as far as Ham Radio goes. The
political belief among present FCC leaders is that all of the public
must be given as much access to all of the bandwidth that the spectrum
and the information highway can provide. Should everyone have the
right to be a ham??? Without taking any tests??? Should ham radio
become Citizens' Multi-Band (CMB)??? What about content? Should hams
be able to transmit music, talk shows, political debates, antique
auctions, casino gambling, pornography? Why not:- The Internet does.
The Internet dotcoms do these things with the idea of making a profit.
Hams could volunteer to do them for nothing (as true amateurs). Maybe
it would be OK only if the Hams were women, minorities, Native
Americans or folks who can't speak English....because they need the
education???...or a better way to get equally represented???
I dunno. Maybe I've been listening to and watching too many

Congressional hearings.

73,
Bob Wex w2ilp (Internet Lures Politicians?)

Stop the music! Stop the music!
Everybody wants to get into the act!!!
--Jimmy Durante--

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1830. Re: QCWA TELLS FCC TO END INCENTIVE LICENSING

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-25 05:33:37 UTC
From: Bob Wex w2ilp <w2ilp@juno.com>
Message-ID: <94odrhlar1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2081

In article <20010118051000.05040.00002272@ng-ff1.aol.com>,
w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:
> >From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
>
> >> The ones who didn't notice, Bob, were the new hams who were not
choosing
> >>the Novice as their first license.
>
> > Why should they? Another few questions and they had Tech Plus with
all
> >Novice privileges plus 2 meters and up.
>
> And their meeting additional requirements is bad how?
>
> Oh, and the "another few questions" was an additional 30 questions,
from a
> question pool of about 330.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

Kids don't want to hear about any number of Ham exam queations. Why
should they? They are constantly reminded that Radio Shack "...has the
answers"...about cell-phones...at least.

Restore the Novice class with a simple oral exam.
Let Novices work ten meter stateside sideband short skip (SSSS).
Increase the number of license classes and exams for advancing hams.

73,
Bob Wex w2ilp (Indoctrinate Little People)

Familarity breeds children.
--Mark Twain--

Adults are obsolete children.
--Dr. Seuss--

It's a dull child that knows less than his father.
--?--

They said, "Children should be seen and not heard."
I wanted to be a ham when I was a child so that I
could be heard and not seen. If I was born 50 years
later I would have wanted to be a computer hacker.
--w2ilp--

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1831. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-25 05:34:08 UTC
From: "Leland C. Scott" <no-spam@junk-mail.net>
Message-ID: <kVOb6.45073$ft6.1066002@typhoon.mw.mediaone.net>
Source record: 2080

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20010124201518.18765.00001206@ng-da1.aol.com...
> >From: "Leland C. Scott"
>
> > I don't see why retaining a CW test element would expose one to
> > any more CW than what they are likely to experience on the air
operating.
>
> You are probably correct, but I also see no reason to completely eliminate
> testing for one popular mode on the tests. The method I described does
indeed
> test CW, but to the same standard as other modes.

So you would propose that a CW test element be of the same weight as say a selection of questions on Part 97 rules? And a failure to pass the CW element does not automatically disqualifies the applicant from passing the over all exam? That could satisfy many, I would think, on both sides of the issue. If that's your position I can see where it could be a reasonable compromise, at least it's an interesting idea to think about.

--
73's,

Leland C. Scott
KC8LDO

ARRL member
NCI member

"You ask what Morse Code is good for? I'll tell you. Morse
Code is used exclusively by Electronics Based life forms to
communicate amongst themselves using advanced Organic
Digital Signal Processors, running state of the art Artificial
Intelligence Software, to perform the highly complex
transmit encryption, receive decryption and error correction
functions."

1832. Re: The Pope now rules the U.S.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-25 06:03:37 UTC
From: Doh-Bro <mrdna@gate.net>
Message-ID: <94ofm5$1lt0$1@news.gate.net>
Source record: 2082
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.conspiracy

>"o-o-o" <o-o-o@gmx.net> said:
>
>>who do you think then rules over the pope?

The bug people of quadrant 23zeta7.

1833. Re: FCC Proposal for New Novice Class License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-25 07:40:46 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net>
Message-ID: <3A6FD87E.404055D1@ovis.net>
Source record: 2083

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3A6E560F.6F7E7E4A@ovis.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net> writes:
>
> >> You have done more than that, especially when not receiving
> >> any praise over the "clever" use of CW as an order-wire for
> >> a State Department FSK TTY circuit. :-)
> >
> >I don't know whether you are not being forthright or are just forgetful
> >in your old age. I did not seek any praise.
>
> Sure you sought praise. You thought it was a clever idea...of yours.

Now you may be providing some ammunition for Steve's claims regarding truthfulness. I never made the claim that it was my idea nor did I seek praise. I pointed to it to U.S. Government use of morse. You as much as called me a liar over the issue.

> You were indulging in relating a story of your expertise on
> a government radio circuit, knowing full well that few on an
> amateur radio newsgroup would have experience there
> (with exception of a few ex-USN-radio-ops of earlier times).

I made no such claim regarding my expertise. Do you know what a person who tells untruths is called?

> Technically, switching over to CW from FSK TTY should be
> possible but it is a most odd sort of thing to use as an
> order-wire (a command circuit for radio circuit purposes).

We didn't switch back and forth, Len. We used CW on one frequency and ran the TTY circuit on a different pair.

> You claimed the switchover was "necessary to synchronize"
> the TTY circuit. TTYs have always self-synchronized since
> the first Teletype Model 15s, whether on landline or radio
> circuits. A Model 28 is no different in that regard.

I stated that CW was used to arrange QSYs, openings and closings of the TTY circuit. It was also necessary to confirm crypto used if that is the "synchronization" to which you refer.

>
> On a following reply you stated that the "synchronizations"
> were to "set schedules." That was illogical since, if the TTY
> was operating correctly, it could be used as a TTY to send
> schedules, copies printed at each end.

Huh?

>
> > I did not come up with the
> >circuit. I simply used what was already in place. As I recall, you
> >tried telling me that what I stated was untrue.
>
> I said it was a dumb idea if you did it that way. I still think so.

It is obvious that you did not and do not understand what was stated.

> While technically possible if the TTY transmitter also had OOK
> CW capability, there were no technical justifications for this.
> You seemed to be trying to get an "upper hand" in an on-going
> argument in a newsgroup on the necessity to operate OOK CW
> and preserve morse code testing for an amateur license.

Different transmitters were used since one circuit used CW and the other
was the TTY circuit. My statement regarding government use of the CW
circuit was correct. No "upper hand" was needed nor sought.

> You are now welcome to state why that particular switch from
> TTY to CW was technically or opeationally necessary. For
> any reason. It doesn't really matter but it will be interesting to
> see the rationalizations and attempts to close with the last
> newsgroup word. :-)

I'll leave it to you to figure out the necessity for such operation.
You were not a State Department communicator any more than you're a
radio amateur.

> didit

Yep, been there and didit.

Dave K8MN

1834. Re: Will you let them take away your guns?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-25 09:50:02 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010125045002.07593.00003975@nso-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 2088

In article <3A6DD5AA.7C9C6A83@uci.edu>, Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> writes:

>Dick Carroll wrote:
>> I don't have a dog in this scrap but I would point out that a certain
>> rebellion that began in Boston harbor was hardly considered legal,
>> either....
>
>We're discussing a rebellion against the US government, not the one that
>started the US government. Maybe I'm wrong, but one seems at odds with
>the other. Or are we just talking rebellion for rebellion's sake here.
>

Jim:

We're talking about rebellion against government tyranny. And
just so you know, I believe we're about as far away from needing
any such rebellion as we can get -- so there's no need to be
nervous! However, a good way to judge whether or not such a
modern-day rebellion is in order is to see whether the government
starts making serious attacks against Constitutionally-guaranteed
freedoms -- such as the right to freedom of speech, or the
right to keep and bear arms. "Rebellion for rebellion's sake" is
the last thing law-abiding gun owners have in mind, and I, for
one, would be more likely to act to quash any such rebellion as
to be a part of it. When American citizens have the right to keep
and bear arms, that right, by itself, is a powerful check against
any possibility of governmental tyranny -- the same way that
states with liberal CCW licensing have experienced a major
reduction in gun-related violent crime. When "they" start talking
seriously about taking that right away, as they actually did in
England, Australia, and other Third-World countries, then it's
time to start seriously thinking about acting on such a "rebellion."
I'm sure President Bush isn't going to permit that to happen.
For the first time in eight years, I have renewed faith in my
government.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1835. Re: Will you let them take away your guns?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-25 09:50:02 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010125045002.07593.00003974@nso-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 2089

In article <3A6DD753.66F79733@uci.edu>, Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> writes:

>Cecil wrote:
>> I think the people who want high taxes should pay them and the people
>> who don't want high taxes should pay less. In other words, tax the
>> liberals at a higher rate than the conservatives. Then count the
>> number of liberals. :-)
>
>I've often thought exactly the same thing. An excellent idea - and very
>fair. The only problem is that the liberals don't think THEY should pay
>more taxes - it's only the OTHER guy who should pay more taxes.

Jim:

That's just the way liberals think. They must impose a rigidly-
enforced double standard, because they believe themselves to be
intellectually, morally, ethically, and socially superior than those
over whom they rule. They are the true elite -- at least in their
own minds.

So, the next time you see some Environmentalist telling you
where you can't build a nuclear power plant, tell them to get
back in their Volvo and go back to their gated residential
community and play a round of golf -- because unless they
are living in a cave, wearing a buckhide union suit, and have
never pissed into porcelin, they can't tell you a damn thing!

73 de Larry, K3LT

1836. Re: ARRL Life Membership

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-25 09:50:03 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010125045003.07593.00003976@nso-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 2085

In article <3A6E68AD.B49B121@bctv.com>, Keith Wood <kw@bctv.com> writes:

>> Can anybody tell me what are the benefits of becoming a Life Member of the
>> ARRL. Thanks
>
>Well, they can't raise membership rates on you -- the only way to get
>more money per year of your membership is to kill you.

Keith:

Shhhhh! Ixnay on the illkay talk -- or the next thing you know, the
League will be sending out "hit squads" to terminate Life Members
en masse!

I remember giving serious thought to a Life Membership 20 years
ago, shortly after I joined. However, my car insurance premium was
due...and I had to prioritize. Well, I've been thinking about it again,
but guess what came in the mail today? You guessed it -- my
car insurance premium notice!

73 de Larry, K3LT

1837. Re: ARRL Life Membership

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-25 09:50:04 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010125045004.07593.00003977@nso-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 2084

In article <20010123230419.18743.00000881@ng-fg1.aol.com>, rasta567@aol.com (Rasta567) writes:

>
>Can anybody tell me what are the benefits of becoming a Life Member of the
>ARRL. Thanks

Simple. It's a hedge against future membership dues increases,
like the one the ARRL Board of Directors just approved. I wish I'd
invested in a Life Membership 20 years ago!

73 de Larry, K3LT

1838. Re: Black helicopters (WAS:Re: No-code kills)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-25 09:50:04 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010125045004.07593.00003978@nso-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 2086

In article <bPqb6.1159$e5.2823825@news.ntplx.net>, "Ed Hare, W1RFI"
<w1rfi@arrl.net> writes:

>> I don't know, but I've got my resume ready to send in at a
>> moment's notice, complete with a picture of my spit-shined
>> jack boots and Luftwaffe-issue CW key. All they gotta do is
>> send a black helicopter to pick me up and take me to
>> Newington!
>
>I will go you one better, Larry; I will pick you up in my infamous 1978 GMC
>pickup. QST's QRP columnist lovingly dubbed it the Deathmobile. :-)

Ed:

Sounds like my kind of vehicle. But is it black? BTW -- if we pass
any seafood restaurants along the way, remember I owe you a lobster
dinner!

73 de Larry, K3LT

1839. Re: Will you let them take away your guns?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-25 09:50:04 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010125045004.07593.00003979@nso-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 2087

In article <3A6E362F.190C54B2@IEEE.org>, Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>> Uh, don't look now, but I still fit into my old Air Force uniforms quite
>> nicely!
>
>You mean you were that fat way back then? :-)

Cecil:

Only between the ears! The rest of me was always well within
regulation weight and BMI (Body Mass Index) standards, and I
always passed my physical conditioning tests in one of the two
highest categories. I have not changed considerably since then,
although I probably could not run 1.5 miles as fast anymore.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1840. Re: The handle here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-25 09:50:05 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010125045005.07593.00003980@nso-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 2090

In article <94lf3b$k6k$1@iac5.navix.net>, "W4JLE" <Fred@w4jle.com> writes:

>
>If I may disagree Larry, it is difficult to decide not to read, once you
>learn how. It is impossible to drive down the street and not read a
>billboard or two.
>
>This particular guy was never allowed to attend school because his parents
>were uneducated fundamentalists. He was told most of his life he was not
>able to go to school because he was mentally handicapped.
>
>He originally came to the lessons at my house because his buddies did. When
>he was having real problems with the code, I asked him to come over by
>himself a few nights.
>
>The stupid one was me! It took me three nights before I finally realized he
>was illiterate.
>When I finally asked him if he knew how to read he was very embarrassed. I
>asked him if he would like to never be embarrassed again. Then we started to
>work on learning. I learned as much as he did. I did not know how to teach
>someone to read, I have that skill now.
>
>Within a year he was reading at a 10th grade level and we went to the
>Knoxville Hamfest for him to take his test. He came out of the session with
>a ticket and you couldn't have wiped the smile off his face with a shovel. I
>was like a proud father and I must admit to a few tears rolling down my face
>in joy.
>
>I do not know if ham radio was the motivator or the vehicle, neither do I
>care.
>
>--
>Fred W4JLE

Fred:

I'm not going to sit here and say that your helping this fellow learn
how to read through an interest in ham radio is a bad thing. I very
much admire the way you helped ham, and congratulate you both
for the result. I think, in my original reply, I somehow overlooked
the unique nature of this situation. If I therefore stuck my foot in
my mouth, I once again spit it out. Patoooooie!

73 de Larry, K3LT

1841. Re: Black helicopters (WAS:Re: No-code kills)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-25 11:29:51 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010125062951.06242.00001324@ng-ff1.aol.com>
Source record: 2091

>From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

>Sounds like my kind of vehicle. But is it black? BTW -- if we pass
>any seafood restaurants along the way, remember I owe you a lobster
>dinner!

It is not black; it is painted a sort of red-rust brown. That works our really well. :-)

Yes, I do remember the lobster dinner. We can either wait until I am in Delaware, or we can go to Tinker's Seafood in West Hartford, CT. I don't recall, was it "loser drives" like my bet with Carl? I had to go to Allentown. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1842. Re: QCWA TELLS FCC TO END INCENTIVE LICENSING

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-25 11:32:19 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010125063219.06242.00001325@ng-ff1.aol.com>
Source record: 2092

>From: Bob Wex w2ilp w2ilp@juno.com

>The political belief among present FCC leaders is that all of the public
>must be given as much access to all of the bandwidth that the spectrum
>and the information highway can provide.

The public already has access to all amateur frequencies. They can do so at high power, by passing the exams, or a low power, by using devices that meet the requirements of Part 15. All amateur spectrum is shared.

73,
Ed Hare,W1RFI

1843. Re: ARRL Life Membership - Don't buy one!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-25 11:42:37 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010125064237.06242.00001326@ng-ff1.aol.com>
Source record: 2093

>From: Paul McCarron w1hzy@cybertours.com

>I have been a life member since it's inception, some 30+?? years ago. They
>sure lost money on me!!!

Not so, Paul, ARRL maintains an investment folio that is funded, in part, by the Life Membership dues it has taken in over the decades. While I am not at all sure of the exact relationship between the folio and LM dues, it is pretty clear that without those prepaid memberships, the money would not be there. The proceeds for the investments serve both to keep the investments growing to match or exceed inflation and as part of the annual operating costs of the League.

When you shelled out those beans so many years ago, that was a chunk of change, indeed. You could have invested it yourself and used the proceeds to pay your annual dues, just like ARRL is doing. In that sense, you have indeed paid and shouldn't see yourself as a money loser at all.

If the League were to spend LM investments in the year they are received, it would make the budgeting process a bit easier, but they would be building a house of cards that would soon tumble down. They have been fiscally responsible with Life Memberships, IMHO.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1844. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-25 11:58:04 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010125065804.06242.00001327@ng-ff1.aol.com>
Source record: 2094

>From: "Leland C. Scott" no-spam@junk-mail.net

>So you would propose that a CW test element be of the same weight as say a
>selection of questions on Part 97 rules? And a failure to pass the CW
>element does not automatically disqualifies the applicant from passing the
>over all exam?

That idea, to my knowledge, was first proposed by Bill Sohl. He wrote a Correspondence piece for QST that the editor published, perhaps in 1997 or 1998 (Bill?) I agree with it as an excellent way to retain testing for a popular mode, but in a way that balances Morse more fairly against other operating modes and practices.

Right now, one can get all of the questions wrong on any other mode, even get all of the band-edge questions wrong or all of the safety questions wrong, and still be given a license. Learning Morse code to 5 wpm is not all that hard, and some applicants will see it as an easy way to get a few questions right.

>That could satisfy many, I would think, on both sides of the
>issue.

I think so. IMHO, the complete loss of Morse-code testing would be as inappropriate as the complete loss of questions about FM operation. The nature of Morse code is such that it really is not appropriate to ask questions like:

What is the optimum rise and fall times of a properly shaped OOK CW Morse signal at 20 wpm?

I think that many of the no-code-test folks object more to the pass/fail nature of the Morse tests than to the presence of Morse code on the exams. On the other side, I think that many of the pro-code-test folks believe that Morse is needed to address some of the deficiencies in the present exams (real and imagined, IMHO). Looking at it from these perspectives, I think we MAY have some common ground. Compromise exists because it has value to society; maybe we can all decide that reaching a compromise position is more valuable to us than being "right" in the never-ending debate.

If I read the handwriting on the wall (for what that is worth), I think that the no-code-test side could ulitmately prevail if it stands firm. But in doing so, without compromise, the rift between us will be made a bit wider and that would spiritually disenfranchise a significant segment of amateur radio from its bretheren and sisteren. I don't know what the price of that, but the only example I can see is the rift that grew after incentive licensing removed priveleges from people -- the hurt and anger continues to this day. IMHO, any compromise that is reached, both organizationally and in the hearts of those who are willing to set at the "negotiating table," will let us make changes in a way that minimizes any harm to amateur radio.

And don't fool yourself, there is harm to us all in all of this bickering. Fortunately, the harm is not nearly as bad as a shapshot of this highly polarized forum is. Most hams don't feel nearly as strongly as some folks here do.

The real trick will be "organizationally." I am trying in my mind to imagine ARRL, FISTS and NCI setting at the table, burying the hatchet not in each other. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1845. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-25 14:04:21 UTC
From: Larry Klose <lklose@net-link.net>
Message-ID: <3a703273$0$35015$44a10c7e@news.net-link.net>
Source record: 2095

"Leland C. Scott" <no-spam@junk-mail.net> wrote in message news:kVOb6.45073>
> > So you would propose that a CW test element be of the same weight as say
a
> selection of questions on Part 97 rules? And a failure to pass the CW
> element does not automatically disqualifies the applicant from passing the
> over all exam? That could satisfy many, I would think, on both sides of
the
> issue. If that's your position I can see where it could be a reasonable
> compromise, at least it's an interesting idea to think about.

Before April 15, 200 a person could become an Extra and miss
every question on Part 97 rules except two question on the Novice test.

Apparent the rules were not as important a manual Morse code proficiency.

Larry

1846. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-25 14:05:55 UTC
From: "Leland C. Scott" <no-spam@junk-mail.net>
Message-ID: <t70cm6g20aqrdb@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 2096

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20010125065804.06242.00001327@ng-ff1.aol.com...
> I think that many of the no-code-test folks object more to the pass/fail
nature
> of the Morse tests than to the presence of Morse code on the exams. On the
> other side, I think that many of the pro-code-test folks believe that
Morse is
> needed to address some of the deficiencies in the present exams (real and
> imagined, IMHO

I think that sums up the whole debate in a nut shell with that statement!

--
Leland C. Scott
KC8LDO

1847. Re: N8wwm causes a lot of problems on rec.radio.cb

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-25 14:13:03 UTC
From: "Leland C. Scott" <no-spam@junk-mail.net>
Message-ID: <t70d3igvs7bpe4@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 2097

"Aaron Jones" <nomail@nomail.com> wrote in message
news:k3cq5t80g23avg6itv7cv445ono774ijkm@4ax.com...
> "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net> wrote:
>
> >BRAND SPANKIN' NEW <brandnew@hotmail.com> wrote:
> >
> >> I DISAGREE. I THINK N8 IS JUST HAVING FUN AND PULLING CHAINS BUT, ON
> >> THE OTHER HAND I REALLY THINK VOOBNER TRIES TO TAKE THIS MESS
> >> SERIOUSLY, EVEN IF HE IS NOT TAKEN SERIOUSLY BY THE MAJORITY.
> >
> >Voobner?
>
> >Ah, and here I thought that it might be Aaron's real name. :-)
>
> Not me. I'm a CW op. This guy obviously works RTTY... :-)

Believe it or not he stated in that news group that he does not even hold a
Ham license of any type, but is studying to get one.

--
Leland C. Scott
KC8LDO

>

1848. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-25 14:22:00 UTC
From: Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com>
Message-ID: <3A703688.B4F869D1@dvol.com>
Source record: 2098

W1RFI wrote:

> >From: Brian Kelly kelly@dvol.com
>
> >> We are then going to take them to the FCC. IF the FCC will enforce the
> >> no-interference clause, then it can be relied upon. If not, then we cannot
> >> live with the limits.
>
> >If it's well documented, etc. I would expect Riley would move on it.
>
> Actually, it may be better to take it to the Part 15 folks, but your point is
> taken. I am not so confident.

>
Neither am I but Riley is accessible and on the inside, ask the pro. ARRL Counsel sure knows the game. Not a job for a lab manager when push comes to shove.
>

> What will the FCC do with the neighbor of a ham
> who buys a touch lamp at the local K Mart and causes interference.
> I chose that example on purpose because in one very clear cut case, the FCC
> paid a visit on the neighbor after months of the ham begging. The FCC told the
> neighbor that he had to stop using the light, shook everyone's hand and then
> drove away. The van no sooner was out of sight than the noise returned. So
> far, no further action.

>
No surprise. The FCC guy did what he had to do to cover his butt, he filed the report and he ain't gonna go in circles over some citizen's stupid touch lamp.
>

>
> . . . the FCC has been good about writing advisory letters to electric utilities,
> as
> a followup to the letters I write first. (I hear from about 75% or so, with
> generally good cooperation, although 50-50 on the actual resolution.)

>
The electric utility responses to QRN gripes have been as close as we'll probably ever get to ideal ever since I can remember. Going back to when granny bitched about noise screwing up the Arthur Godfrey Breakfast Hour on WPEN 950 AM. on yer dial. The utilites have legal departments which dictate corporate policy as it relates to compliance with all regs in minute detail. Plus of course QRN in a neighbohood is often a useful tipoff to a failing connection or xfmr or whatever which is a big incentive for them to get into it before somebody's lights go out and more damage is done. None of it involves any altruism.

>

>
> But how does a ham and the FCC tell the neighbor of a ham that the device he
> just bought at K Mart is being operated in violation of federal law?

>
You don't, all ya do is piss off the neighbor and get generate a ham-hater. Like we need more of those. The neighbor is just as much a victim as the ham. Rightouseness ain't the solution, keeping the crap off the shelves in the first place is the solution.
>

> > ... the FCC can readily spank an owner of an RFI source but
> >there are two perps involved. One being the owner who refuses to go
> > QRT which the FCC can shut down, the other is the manufacturer of
> > the widget who probably sold a jillion >of the things.
>
> Actually, there is only one perp under the law in most cases.

>
Yeah, the wrong perp.
>

> The manufacturer
> is required to build the devices to the requirements of Part 15. Some devices
> must be Certificated -- the manufacturer or importer has to send test data to
> the FCC and the Commission approves the device for sale in the US. Others are
> "Verified," meaning the rules require the manufacturer to test it and keep test
> data if the FCC ever asks. (Really!)

>
That's letting the fox guard the henhouse. Make 'em run the widget past UL under tighter emissions limits. I can easily see where the things can start interfering with each other.
>

> Once those requirements are met by the manufacturer, the device can be sold. A
> "legal" device on 3.5 MHz can cause S9+15 dB to a dipole located 100 feet away.
> This is, of course, harmful interference if it lands on a frequency an amateur
> is using.

<
. . uuuh . . I think the definition of "harmful interference" is interfernce with emergency services comms, aviation, etc. We suffer plain "interference" which is a much lesser regulatory sin?
>

>
> Even that may not be so clear cut. The definition of harmful interference
> requires that communication be repeatedly disrupted. The FCC has made decisions
> wrt cable leakage that merely hearing the signal (S9 is typically legal for a
> cable leak) break squelch is not harmful interference. 145.25 the usual

> frequency, and if there is no repeater in the area, there is no harmful
> interference.

>
Might be interesting to dredge up the and check the EU technical requirements in this area as an example of tighter limits being just as viable on the market as the stuff we have here. The EU has consistently clamped down harder on the technical requirements in any number of cases than the EPA, NEC and FCC do here.
>

> In my estimation, more instinct than fact, the FCC would not view an S1 or S2
> signal on HF as harmful interference. S6+ almost certainly is. I don't have a
> clue how the FCC would view things in the middle. How about a signal that is a
> 1-second burst every few minutes? Harmful interference? How about the frequency
> agility that is a natural part of the Amateur Radio Service? Would the FCC feel
> we should use the flexibility they have given us to avoid interference that is
> on a single frequency? I don't know, but I could imagine that they would.

>
The rare one on the other end ain't gonna move up. There has to be a middle ground which has to be actually enforced. There is no excuse for allowing all the crap coming out of the desktop computers.
>

> The real issue, however, is that under the rules, the operator of the device,
> ie, your neighbor, that local business, a school, is responsible for resolving
> actual interference. I don't know about you, but I sure would not want to have
> that conversation with my neighbor.

>
Neither would I, he ain't the perp.
>

> He bought an arc welder at Sears and I
> gotta' tell him he is using in violation of federal law? He is a nice enough
> fellow under most circumstances, but don't think he would see things my way.
> Now what? A letter from the FCC? There goes my next tower variance, eh? And
> what do I say if he says, "So, the tables have turned, have they?"

>
He ain't gonna be welding all day all night, it's just part of ham radio going back to coherer detector days. It's the signals which are on the air continuously which prevent the operation of a ham station which matter.
>

> > Gets very complex but it's absolutely gotta be done.
>
> Complex, indeed. That is why Mark Wilson tolerates me in the Lab. :-)
>
> > I vote for getting the limits for Class B devices 'way down, kill it
> > before it shows up on the shelves and be done with it.
>
> The ARRL fought that fight, and lost. I guess the big boys had more expensive

> lawyers.

>
They always do. When was that? That's the whole ballgame.
>

> Realistically, unless we can show serious and repeated harm to the
> Amateur Radio Service, I don't think we have a prayer, and even then, I think
> we would lose. And, what the manufacturers say is that the rules offer
> complete protection against harmful interference; how much more protection do
> we want than absolute?

>
No such thing as "absolute", we have to accept some interference, it's a matter of
how much.
>

> I can live with this,IF the FCC is willing to enforce the rules. I can live
> with ARRL having to take a lot of the first steps, in preparing information and
> in trying to resolve some of these problems with the device operators, IF the
> FCC is willing to take the last steps and deal with those cases where a
> reasonable cooperative effort is not enough. How that works remains to be
> seen, but if the FCC won't do it, I think ARRL's comemnts to the FCC may be
> very different the next time a high-level of radiated emissions is proposed as
> being okay because of the non-interference rules.

>
That's a big part of what the ARRL is all about. I can see this landing in the
courts given the way the FCC has backed away from ham radio. Nothin' like a lawsuit
to get a bureaucrat's attention.
>

> In the meantime, what can be done? Even with what it has for staff resources
> (me,part time on RFI), quite a lot. It all started with the old Phonex PX-421
> wireles modem jacks on 3.53 MHz. Man, I can hardly tell you how much time I
> have into that one. It took over two years, but it is actually starting to pay
> off. Phonex did the right thing immediately, learning of widespread harmful
> interference and literally stopping production and making engineering changes
> in a few weeks. About a month later, a new model was in production, operating
> outside the ham bands.

>
That was well done and can be used for a model.
>

> TCI, now AT&T, bought them by the thousands. That was
> the hard part. They were very cooperative on the national level, but had a lot
> of local problems getting the job done. After a long while, they switched over
> to a 100%-recall mode, and are, in MOST sytems, 90% done. (The areas that are
> still behind the curve are San Francisco/San Jose and the Dallas area, but
> Dallas is coming up to speed pretty fast.) Whew!
>
> Unfortunately, and fortunately, that isn't it. Other technologies such as

> VDSL, HPNA, and HomePlug threaten HF. Fortunately, that isn't it. I somehow
> managed to put togehter the web pages at
> http://www.arrl.org/tis/info/rfiteljx.html. This is, of course, seen by a lot
> of hams (not all of which are members... :-)

>
Pages like that should remain open-access.
>

>). Many hams work in industry,
> so this info got the attention of those organizations. In many cases, work to
> protect amateur radio was already underway, I might add. The bottom line is
> that these organization are willing to address RFI from the getgo, and are
> doing so, to one degree or another. All 3 product specs contain at least 20 dB
> more protection for amateur radio than the rules require, with the very
> specific intent of preventing inteference to large numbers of hams.
>
> Will there be cases anyway? Yes, there will, just like there are cases of TVI
> involving ham radio. But these manufacturers are voluntarily including
> protection, and they are going to radiate about 60 dB less energy in our ham
> bands than the rules permit us to radiate in our neighbors' TV bands.

>
Just a tad hypocritical on the surface but the Part 15 devices aren't gonna work if
they have to deal with the weak signals we deal with routinely.
>

> Now, the real problem is probabliy 2.4 and 5.6 GHz. Can you say Bluetooth and
> wireless digital? There can be no protection added because these devices are
> using the shared ISM bands that we also share. The manufacturers know, too,
> that our use of the 2.4 GHz bands is a lot less than our use of HF, so the
> likelihood of *actual* harmful interference is pretty small. The ARRL's ad hoc
> Spectrum Strategy Committee is discussing just what CAN be done to help protect
> these bands. Asking for Part 15 rules changes may be one of the end results.
> The committee has been in place about 4 months or so, and just reported to the
> ARRL Board in January. As a "spectrum-strategy," the full report may not be
> made public -- no sense telling the opposition how we intend to defend the
> bands, but I will sed what I can shake loose for a public report.

>
The microwave bands are gonna be a real battleground and they don't look good.
There just aren't enough hams up there to stake an effective claim. But we'll see I
guess. I don't have clue one about that end of the spectrum.
>

> Even it only appeared on the web, it would be a start. Once I get my new
> staffer hired, and up to speed, I am going to have to get things documented.
> (Man, I hope I can find the right RFI guru in a tight employee market and a
> salary range that is not at IEEE standards.

>
. . . Lucent is about to lay off 13,000 employees . . Squiggy? Hee!

>

> The saving grace is that this is a
> once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to work with ARRL, industry and the FCC to make
> a BIG difference in something really important. I will either get the
> semi-retired EMC engineer or the new grad who wants something REALLY impressive
> on his or her resume.)

>
Gotta be somebody like you who is into ham radio to the extent that it's worth
taking paycheck hits.
>

> ALL amateur spectrum is shared, most of it with Part 15. That sharing can
> protect us as well as hurt us; even the Part 15 folks are afraid of congestion
> on 2.4 GHz. Time will tell what can be done, but I, for one, am going to give
> it a go.

>
If you quit trying they'll eat us alive.
>

> Anyway, I probably gave you (all) more of an answer than you wanted. To find
> out how many read this far, send me an email to W1RFI@arrl.org or
> W1RFI@aol.com. I will do a drawing of all those that do to award the 2000
> "bent-cover" Handbook, now that I offered it to Aaron but he didn't accept the
> terms. I will add that you have to look REAL close to see the bent cover. But
> I did want to give a snapshot of what I have been up to over the past few
> months. The details are, well, a bit more detailed. :-)

>
. . . my head hurts. What's this "bent cover handbook thing? I missed it.
>

>I figure that it is

> the least I can do after disagreeing with you so often on code testing. :-)

>
I AIN'T EVEN STARTED!!
>

>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

>
w3rv

1849. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-25 14:25:07 UTC
From: Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com>
Message-ID: <3A703743.FF0CF160@dvol.com>
Source record: 2099

Len Over 21 wrote:

> In article <3A6E29A5.99589F63@dvol.com>, Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com> writes:
>
> >An article on "How to Build the Black Box" which feeds the Firewire port in
> >the back of Le Machine should work even better with a bunch less hardware. .
>
> One doesn't NEED a computer interface, doesn't need any UHF
> TV tuner for a front end, doesn't need a computer-specific
> interface unless fancy display lettering on the display that will
> print to any computer printer.

>
Simply a matter of a making use of a much larger display.
>

> I've seen two, used one such
> PC Card type spectrum analyzer and both versions suffer from
> inaccurate and limited logarithmic range.

>
High accuracy isn't a critical need in most ham applications particularly when
used as panadapters. Sorta like fish finders are lousy fathometers.
>

> The Log-Amp-Detector from Analog Devices solves the log
> range and accuracy problems. What was once a large PCB
> full of certain semiconductors and precision resistors is now
> collapsed into one package. The VCOs for the first LO
> sweeper are off-the-shelf from Mini-Circuits. Front end filters
> can be almost kluged together out of what parts are in the
> junk box. This isn't rocket science gee-whizzery.

>
No doubt, but I'm not able to design one myself so I'd have to settle for some
kit or construction article or another. Which is definitely not one of my
priorities.
>

> Then you haven't used anything with more than 20 db dynamic
> range. I agree that the old-style 1940s Panadaptor wasn't much
> good with its semi-linear (not logarithmic) vertical display.

>
The utility in using a spectrum analyzer for ham receiving purposes is usually to
detect the existence of a signal, not to accurately measure it's amplitude or
frequency. Junk analyzers work fine in this kind of service, some being better

than others. When I need to get serious about spectrum analyzers for machine vibration work I wheel out a $5-6k calibrated spectrum analyzer. Bruel & Kjar makes one which cost $25,000 a few years ago. There are spectrum analyzers and there are spectrum analyzers.
>

> the signals within sweepwidth settings are visible. 50 or 100
> KHz sweep width no problem to see CW or any other kind of
> modulation on those incoming signals. Everything is on the
> display at once.

>
Understood, I've seen good spectrum analyzers (vs. HO-10s) used to present band displays. On HF they're close to useless because of the junk and noise on any open band for one. In a contest all you see is one monster 50-75Khz wide spike. Spectrum analyzers simply are not a useful enough operating aid to bother with. One of the high-end Icom xcvrs has a pretty decent built-in analyzer but nobody uses it on an ongoing basis. The proof of the pudding is that if spectrum analyzers had any particular value as a receiving aid the things would be on every operating desk. I don't know of a single big-gun HF weak signal wonk who uses a spectrum analyzer and I kow a bunch of those. Using one to scan low-population VHF and UHF bands might be another story.
>

> A 1960s consumer-electronics item this
> ain't...none of those had as much as 60 db of accurate
> dynamic range. With some extra work, 100 db of dynamic
> range is possible (but one has to start thinking of using
> a display larger than 5" diameter to ease the eyes). Analog
> Devices has a stock Log package that can handle 100 db.
>
> Sound interesting? :-)

>
Write the article.
>

>
> didit

>
w3rv

1850. Why N8 causes problems in NG

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-25 14:35:11 UTC
From: "www.kp82.com" <kp82@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <94pdivdoi1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2100

Because ILLEGAL FAGGOT KEYCLOWNS DONT LIKE THE TRUTH!

Does a drug dealer like the DEA?

In article <t70d3igvs7bpe4@corp.supernews.com>,
"Leland C. Scott" <no-spam@junk-mail.net> wrote:
>
> "Aaron Jones" <nomail@nomail.com> wrote in message
> news:k3cq5t80g23avg6itv7cv445ono774ijkm@4ax.com...
> > "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net> wrote:
> >
> > >BRAND SPANKIN' NEW <brandnew@hotmail.com> wrote:
> > >
> > >> I DISAGREE. I THINK N8 IS JUST HAVING FUN AND PULLING CHAINS
BUT, ON
> > >> THE OTHER HAND I REALLY THINK VOOBNER TRIES TO TAKE THIS MESS
> > >> SERIOUSLY, EVEN IF HE IS NOT TAKEN SERIOUSLY BY THE MAJORITY.
> > >
> > >Voobner?
> >
> > >Ah, and here I thought that it might be Aaron's real name. :-)
> >
> > Not me. I'm a CW op. This guy obviously works RTTY... :-)
>
> Believe it or not he stated in that news group that he does not even
hold a
> Ham license of any type, but is studying to get one.
>
> --
> Leland C. Scott
> KC8LDO
>
> >
>
>

--
http://members.theglobe.com/keyclownzsuk/EXP_SITE_PERSONAL_2/
http://www.geocities.com/antikeyclown/1mangayboy_and_NeboDweeb.html
http://www.geocities.com/aunteekeyklown/Keyclown_wedding.html
http://humor.easynews.com/
http://www.geocities.com/keyclownslappa/dweebrain.jpg

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1851. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-25 16:09:49 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A704FCD.C1122AA9@IEEE.org>
Source record: 2101

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> Cecil wrote:
> > I don't know about that. I am infinitely more technical now than
> > I was in the 50s. How about you?
>
> If there's one thing that we've all seen here on rrap it is that Cecil
> is definitely the exception to -any- rule.

Why, thanks for the compliment, Dick. I do try to be exceptional. And
I'm sorry that you are no more technical now than when you took your
first ham exam. :-)
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

1852. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-25 17:05:10 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <94pmc6hhk0@208.206.142.106>
Source record: 2103

Brian Kelly wrote:
>
> W1RFI wrote:
>
how does a ham and the FCC tell the neighbor of a ham that the device
he
> > just bought at K Mart is being operated in violation of federal law?
>
> >
> You don't, all ya do is piss off the neighbor and get generate a ham-hater. Like we
> need more of those. The neighbor is just as much a victim as the ham. Righteouseness
> ain't the solution, keeping the crap off the shelves in the first place is the
> solution.

Exactly,and precisely why the problem will NOT be solved at that
level, since FCC refused to require manufacturers of Part 15 devices to
spend the few extra pennies on filtering.
When the Pt 15 NPRM was in process I wrote both the FCC and my
congressperson to insist that more be done to reduce the RFI that was
sure to come as result of the way it was written. FCC ignored me and
quickly convinced my congressman that there really was "no problem" with
it. That was a done deal long ago and won't addressed again. Ed's work
is probably the only effective force in place at all, and it is largely
educational, as we can see from here. And much of that education is
pointed at manufacturing engineers who have no clue about ham radio, it
seems.
Whatta scheme.

Dick

> >
>
> > > ... the FCC can readily spank an owner of an RFI source but
> > >there are two perps involved. One being the owner who refuses to go
> > > QRT which the FCC can shut down, the other is the manufacturer of
> > > the widget who probably sold a jillion >of the things.
> >
> > Actually, there is only one perp under the law in most cases.
>
> >
> Yeah, the wrong perp.
> >
>
> > The manufacturer
> > is required to build the devices to the requirements of Part 15. Some devices

> > must be Certificated -- the manufacturer or importer has to send test data to
> > the FCC and the Commission approves the device for sale in the US. Others are
> > "Verified," meaning the rules require the manufacturer to test it and keep test
> > data if the FCC ever asks. (Really!)
>
> >
> That's letting the fox guard the henhouse. Make 'em run the widget past UL under
> tighter emissions limits. I can easily see where the things can start interfering
> with each other.
> >
>
> > Once those requirements are met by the manufacturer, the device can be sold. A
> > "legal" device on 3.5 MHz can cause S9+15 dB to a dipole located 100 feet away.
> > This is, of course, harmful interference if it lands on a frequency an amateur
> > is using.
>
> <
> . . uuuh . . I think the definition of "harmful interference" is interfernce with
> emergency services comms, aviation, etc. We suffer plain "interference" which is a
> much lesser regulatory sin?
> >
>
> >
> > Even that may not be so clear cut. The definition of harmful interference
> > requires that communication be repeatedly disrupted. The FCC has made decisions
> > wrt cable leakage that merely hearing the signal (S9 is typically legal for a
> > cable leak) break squelch is not harmful interference. 145.25 the usual
> > frequency, and if there is no repeater in the area, there is no harmful
> > interference.
>
> >
> Might be interesting to dredge up the and check the EU technical requirements in
> this area as an example of tighter limits being just as viable on the market as the
> stuff we have here. The EU has consistently clamped down harder on the technical
> requirements in any number of cases than the EPA, NEC and FCC do here.
> >
>
> > In my estimation, more instinct than fact, the FCC would not view an S1 or S2
> > signal on HF as harmful interference. S6+ almost certainly is. I don't have a
> > clue how the FCC would view things in the middle. How about a signal that is a
> > 1-second burst every few minutes? Harmful interference? How about the frequency
> > agility that is a natural part of the Amateur Radio Service? Would the FCC feel
> > we should use the flexibility they have given us to avoid interference that is
> > on a single frequency? I don't know, but I could imagine that they would.
>
> >
> The rare one on the other end ain't gonna move up. There has to be a middle ground
> which has to be actually enforced. There is no excuse for allowing all the crap
> coming out of the desktop computers.
> >

>
> > The real issue, however, is that under the rules, the operator of the device,
> > ie, your neighbor, that local business, a school, is responsible for resolving
> > actual interference. I don't know about you, but I sure would not want to have
> > that conversation with my neighbor.
>
> >
> Neither would I, he ain't the perp.
> >
>
> > He bought an arc welder at Sears and I
> > gotta' tell him he is using in violation of federal law? He is a nice enough
> > fellow under most circumstances, but don't think he would see things my way.
> > Now what? A letter from the FCC? There goes my next tower variance, eh? And
> > what do I say if he says, "So, the tables have turned, have they?"
>
> >
> He ain't gonna be welding all day all night, it's just part of ham radio going back
> to coherer detector days. It's the signals which are on the air continuously which
> prevent the operation of a ham station which matter.
> >
>
> > > Gets very complex but it's absolutely gotta be done.
> >
> > Complex, indeed. That is why Mark Wilson tolerates me in the Lab. :-)
> >
> > > I vote for getting the limits for Class B devices 'way down, kill it
> > > before it shows up on the shelves and be done with it.
> >
> > The ARRL fought that fight, and lost. I guess the big boys had more expensive
> > lawyers.
>
> >
> They always do. When was that? That's the whole ballgame.
> >
>
> > Realistically, unless we can show serious and repeated harm to the
> > Amateur Radio Service, I don't think we have a prayer, and even then, I think
> > we would lose. And, what the manufacturers say is that the rules offer
> > complete protection against harmful interference; how much more protection do
> > we want than absolute?
>
> >
> No such thing as "absolute", we have to accept some interference, it's a matter of
> how much.
> >
>
> > I can live with this,IF the FCC is willing to enforce the rules. I can live
> > with ARRL having to take a lot of the first steps, in preparing information and
> > in trying to resolve some of these problems with the device operators, IF the

> > FCC is willing to take the last steps and deal with those cases where a
> > reasonable cooperative effort is not enough. How that works remains to be
> > seen, but if the FCC won't do it, I think ARRL's comemnts to the FCC may be
> > very different the next time a high-level of radiated emissions is proposed as
> > being okay because of the non-interference rules.
>
> >
> That's a big part of what the ARRL is all about. I can see this landing in the
> courts given the way the FCC has backed away from ham radio. Nothin' like a lawsuit
> to get a bureaucrat's attention.
> >
>
> > In the meantime, what can be done? Even with what it has for staff resources
> > (me,part time on RFI), quite a lot. It all started with the old Phonex PX-421
> > wireles modem jacks on 3.53 MHz. Man, I can hardly tell you how much time I
> > have into that one. It took over two years, but it is actually starting to pay
> > off. Phonex did the right thing immediately, learning of widespread harmful
> > interference and literally stopping production and making engineering changes
> > in a few weeks. About a month later, a new model was in production, operating
> > outside the ham bands.
>
> >
> That was well done and can be used for a model.
> >
>
> > TCI, now AT&T, bought them by the thousands. That was
> > the hard part. They were very cooperative on the national level, but had a lot
> > of local problems getting the job done. After a long while, they switched over
> > to a 100%-recall mode, and are, in MOST sytems, 90% done. (The areas that are
> > still behind the curve are San Francisco/San Jose and the Dallas area, but
> > Dallas is coming up to speed pretty fast.) Whew!
> >
> > Unfortunately, and fortunately, that isn't it. Other technologies such as
> > VDSL, HPNA, and HomePlug threaten HF. Fortunately, that isn't it. I somehow
> > managed to put togehter the web pages at
> > http://www.arrl.org/tis/info/rfiteljx.html. This is, of course, seen by a lot
> > of hams (not all of which are members... :-)
>
> >
> Pages like that should remain open-access.
> >
>
> >). Many hams work in industry,
> > so this info got the attention of those organizations. In many cases, work to
> > protect amateur radio was already underway, I might add. The bottom line is
> > that these organization are willing to address RFI from the getgo, and are
> > doing so, to one degree or another. All 3 product specs contain at least 20 dB
> > more protection for amateur radio than the rules require, with the very
> > specific intent of preventing inteference to large numbers of hams.
> >

> > Will there be cases anyway? Yes, there will, just like there are cases of TVI
> > involving ham radio. But these manufacturers are voluntarily including
> > protection, and they are going to radiate about 60 dB less energy in our ham
> > bands than the rules permit us to radiate in our neighbors' TV bands.
>
> >
> Just a tad hypocritical on the surface but the Part 15 devices aren't gonna work if
> they have to deal with the weak signals we deal with routinely.
> >
>
> > Now, the real problem is probabliy 2.4 and 5.6 GHz. Can you say Bluetooth and
> > wireless digital? There can be no protection added because these devices are
> > using the shared ISM bands that we also share. The manufacturers know, too,
> > that our use of the 2.4 GHz bands is a lot less than our use of HF, so the
> > likelihood of *actual* harmful interference is pretty small. The ARRL's ad hoc
> > Spectrum Strategy Committee is discussing just what CAN be done to help protect
> > these bands. Asking for Part 15 rules changes may be one of the end results.
> > The committee has been in place about 4 months or so, and just reported to the
> > ARRL Board in January. As a "spectrum-strategy," the full report may not be
> > made public -- no sense telling the opposition how we intend to defend the
> > bands, but I will sed what I can shake loose for a public report.
>
> >
> The microwave bands are gonna be a real battleground and they don't look good.
> There just aren't enough hams up there to stake an effective claim. But we'll see I
> guess. I don't have clue one about that end of the spectrum.
> >
>
> > Even it only appeared on the web, it would be a start. Once I get my new
> > staffer hired, and up to speed, I am going to have to get things documented.
> > (Man, I hope I can find the right RFI guru in a tight employee market and a
> > salary range that is not at IEEE standards.
>
> >
> . . . Lucent is about to lay off 13,000 employees . . Squiggy? Hee!
> >
>
> > The saving grace is that this is a
> > once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to work with ARRL, industry and the FCC to make
> > a BIG difference in something really important. I will either get the
> > semi-retired EMC engineer or the new grad who wants something REALLY impressive
> > on his or her resume.)
>
> >
> Gotta be somebody like you who is into ham radio to the extent that it's worth
> taking paycheck hits.
> >
>
> > ALL amateur spectrum is shared, most of it with Part 15. That sharing can
> > protect us as well as hurt us; even the Part 15 folks are afraid of congestion

> > on 2.4 GHz. Time will tell what can be done, but I, for one, am going to give
> > it a go.
>
> >
> If you quit trying they'll eat us alive.
> >
>
> > Anyway, I probably gave you (all) more of an answer than you wanted. To find
> > out how many read this far, send me an email to W1RFI@arrl.org or
> > W1RFI@aol.com. I will do a drawing of all those that do to award the 2000
> > "bent-cover" Handbook, now that I offered it to Aaron but he didn't accept the
> > terms. I will add that you have to look REAL close to see the bent cover. But
> > I did want to give a snapshot of what I have been up to over the past few
> > months. The details are, well, a bit more detailed. :-)
>
> >
> . . . my head hurts. What's this "bent cover handbook thing? I missed it.
> >
>
> >I figure that it is
>
> > the least I can do after disagreeing with you so often on code testing. :-)
>
> >
> I AIN'T EVEN STARTED!!
> >
>
> >
> > 73,
> > Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
> >
> w3rv

1853. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-25 17:09:31 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <94pmk1$n0q$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2104

In article <3A6E3311.C7B96D42@IEEE.org>,
Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> n2ey@aol.com wrote:
> > Much of what you have written about me is simply not true, Cecil. I
> > have pointed out your mistakes above. You will not admit them, of
> > course.
>
> A simple statement is all that it would take for me to change my mind
> and you have refused to provide it.

I have refused to be manipulated by your mind-fornication and word-
weaseling.

>What am I to infer from that?

That I won't play your games.
>
> > I'm sorry you are so bored that you have
> > to spend time trying to "get other people's goats".
>
> And I'm sorry you won't condemn code-tested hams who use Morse code
> equipment for jamming.

For about the tenth time:

I have repeatedly condemned all jammers on the ham bands. Regardless of
mode, frequency, test or license status.

The ones you keep obsessively focusing on are obviously a subset of
those I have condemned.

What is it about "all" and "subset" that you don't understand?

Maybe there's no word for "logic" in Texan.

73 de Jim, N2EY
FISTS #4360
BIT #0001

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1854. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-25 17:13:36 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A705EC0.D897C447@uci.edu>
Source record: 2105

Larry Klose wrote:
> > You might try meeting the present requirements as a means of first
> > demonstrating that it is not for personal gain that you make these
> > esteemed and learned recommendations.

> Are saying that person petitioning his government to change a regulation
> that he believes is not in conformity with law and not in the public
> interest has no standing to file that petition?

Not really. It's perhaps more of a credibility issue.

> Would you ask black women to be white before she challenges the a bus
> seating law.

No, I wouldn't. So are you claiming that you are being discriminated
against because of your race, color, creed, gender, or disability,
Larry?

> Must I pass a code test in order challenge the ITU rule S25.5 and FCC
> rule 47 CFR 97.503(a)?

I never said anything of the kind. I was just pointing out that you
might increase your credibility by doing so.

73, Jim AC6XG

1855. Re: ARRL Life Membership - Don't buy one!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-25 17:32:15 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <hao07tsaasll1909c5u96ac3su17nlkjcf@4ax.com>
Source record: 2106

w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:
>ARRL maintains an investment folio that is funded, in part, by
>the Life Membership dues it has taken in over the decades.

Also, Life Membership is a great marketing tool. The League has a nice captive audience in life members for advertising. Those lifetime eyeballs are worth $$$ ... :-)

1856. Re: N8wwm causes a lot of problems on rec.radio.cb

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-25 17:32:20 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <3go07tsqvruamde468cai5adg4mclu184r@4ax.com>
Source record: 2107

"Leland C. Scott" <no-spam@junk-mail.net> wrote:

>>"Aaron Jones" <nomail@nomail.com> wrote in message

>>>BRAND SPANKIN' NEW <brandnew@hotmail.com> wrote:
>>> I DISAGREE. I THINK N8 IS JUST HAVING FUN AND PULLING CHAINS BUT, ON
>>> THE OTHER HAND I REALLY THINK VOOBNER TRIES TO TAKE THIS MESS
>>> SERIOUSLY, EVEN IF HE IS NOT TAKEN SERIOUSLY BY THE MAJORITY.

>>... This guy obviously works RTTY... :-)

>Believe it or not he stated in that news group that he does not even hold a
>Ham license of any type, but is studying to get one.

When I first got online, I typed my messages in all capital letters. I
guess I thought it was like being on RTTY. I was quickly told that I
was being impolite (by shouting in net language). I'm glad that
someone finally took the time to point out this social gaff to me. I
don't remember his 'first personal' though... :-)

1857. Re: ARRL Life Membership - Don't buy one!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-25 17:35:20 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <94po4okvk0@208.206.142.106>
Source record: 2108
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.swap

"Vince Fiscus, KB7ADL" wrote:
>
> rasta567@aol.com (Rasta567) wrote in
> <20010123230419.18743.00000881@ng-fg1.aol.com>:
>
> >Can anybody tell me what are the benefits of becoming a Life Member of
> >the ARRL. Thanks
> >
>
> Don't buy any form of League membership if you care about the integrity
> of your license or ham radio. The ARRL will screw you when your head is
> turned. Buy a membership only if you believe that the natural progression
> of amateur radio should be to become more like CB, for this is what the
> ARRL board of directors believe.

Vince,that's what the current FCC believes. Why would the ARRL
deliberately -again- go against the wishes of the FCC? It never worked
before.

Dick

1858. I will no longer tolerate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-25 17:38:12 UTC
From: N8WWM@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <94poa2$or2$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2110
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Illegal keyclowns. Amateurs or cbers you sell illegal stuff I turn you in.
End of story.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1859. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-25 17:38:23 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010125123823.14777.00001042@nso-bd.aol.com>
Source record: 2109

In article <3A6F6DC2.C776E7DA@uci.edu>, Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> writes:

>Larry Klose wrote:
>> I personally advocate thpetition the United States/FCC to adopt a WRC 2003
>> policy to: (1) suppress ITU rule S25.5, (2) take exception to S25.5 in the
>> WRC 2003 Final Acts if it is nor suppressed, and (3) delete 47 CFR
>97.503(a)
>> after the conclusion of WRC 2003 without any futher proceedings.
>
>You might try meeting the present requirements as a means of first
>demonstrating that it is not for personal gain that you make these
>esteemed and learned recommendations.
>
>73, Jim AC6XG

How do you arrive at that "recommendation," Jim?

Are you saying that everyone must go through the same
test ritual as you did just because you had to?

didit

1860. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-25 18:03:44 UTC
From: K0HB@USWEST.NET
Message-ID: <94ppq0$a1n$1@news.netmar.com>
Source record: 2102

In article <3A703743.FF0CF160@dvol.com>, Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com>
writes:

> Sorta like fish finders are lousy fathometers.

Really? (I didn't know that.) Why?

I would have thought they'd be great fathometers, since they not only show the
depth but also give hints of bottom "hardness", etc.

73, Hans, K0HB

----- Posted via NewsOne.Net: Free (anonymous) Usenet News via the Web -----
http://newsone.net/ -- Free reading and anonymous posting to 60,000+ groups
NewsOne.Net prohibits users from posting spam. If this or other posts
made through NewsOne.Net violate posting guidelines, email abuse@newsone.net

1861. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-25 18:05:14 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <XWZb6.1206$e5.2947234@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 2111

Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote:

> > Are saying that person petitioning his government to change a regulation
> > that he believes is not in conformity with law and not in the public
> > interest has no standing to file that petition?

> Not really. It's perhaps more of a credibility issue.

I don't believe that Larry is going through all of the work of serving on the NCI Board because he feels that doing so is easier than learning the code.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1862. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-25 18:11:52 UTC
From: Lamar Owen <lamar.owen@wgcr.org>
Message-ID: <3A706C68.691289AD@wgcr.org>
Source record: 2112
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.policy

N2EY wrote:
> In article <3A6F533D.9B230C15@wgcr.org>, Lamar Owen <lamar.owen@wgcr.org>
> writes:

> >> > When the great majority of radio services
> >> > drop a mode, that is the defining characteristic of being outdated.
> >> Nonsense. If that's true, then SSB, RTTY, AM and a host of other modes
> >> are "outdated" too.
> >They are still used.
> Yep - ALL of them.

CW is not used for anything other than an ID on the majority of radio
services. Hey, that's a _good_ use of CW, though.

> >But, you miss the point -- you're not tested on
> >being able to _copy_ SSB, AM, or RTTY as you are with CW

> Because no special skill is required to "copy" 'phone modes, there's no test.
> "Copying" RTTY requires that you be able to read - that's tested by the written
> exam. Can an illiterate person get a ham license? I don't think so.

Automatic CW 'modems' are also available -- you can then copy CW by
simply reading. It just remains to make them more reliable due to
poorly sent code. But, then again, poorly sent ASCII or Baudot would be
the same.

> >(knowledge of
> >how the mode works, of which we are tested for the others, and knowing
> >how to copy the mode are two different things) -- you're tested on how
> >the mode works.

> AND on ability to "copy" it.

No one is tested on how to recognize RTTY by ear, now are they? Is
difficult SSB copy presented (phase shifting and other ionospheric
artifiacts can make copy difficult)? Nope.

In fact, someone who is deaf is able to get a license -- the capability
of copying SSB is definitely not tested then. Whether they are able to
transmit SSB (and, using computerized voice recognition software,
perhaps, they can receive it) is not limited, even if they can't copy
it.

> >CW is outdated.

> Why do you say that? Have you ever actually LISTENED to the HF ham bands?

The Amateur HF bands are a small minority of 'the great majority of
radio services' listed above. Sure, hams use CW -- but hams also use
outdated FM equipment on 2 meters, too, that no one else can use. The
reason for amateurs' existence is spelled out in the rules -- which
paragraph does CW Morse meet these days?

Yes, I have listened to the amateur HF bands. Do you take me for a
newbie?

> > Almost as outdated as spark.

> Not at all. Do you know when spark disappeared from the ham bands, and why?

The why is due to occupied bandwidth. The when was a very long time ago
(around 1924). The then new 'CW' method of sending code was much more
efficient, both in power and in occupied spectrum.

But you did know that I placed that clause in there as a troll, right?
:-)

If persued on technical merits alone, CW would be dead now, due to modes
such as PSK31 and MFSK16, which are more efficient and more capable than
CW Morse (or Vail, if you want to go there) code.

But ham radio has never been only about technical merit.

> > -- protected subbands are good, though.

> Agreed! In fact, how about this: Divide each HF band into 3 subbands, by mode:
> Morse only, digital, analog voice/image. 35/15/50% is about right. To use the
> Morse-only subbands, you have to pass a Morse test and a written test. All else
> requires only a written test.

I would go a little larger on the digital -- reference the recent PSK31
interest. And with automatic CW 'modems' (such as the contest keyers
many use), a test would really be superfluous -- but I wouldn't make it
a sticky point. 30-20-50, maybe? Or 33-33-34, even?

> Something for everybody.

Right -- something for everybody. No one forced to learn a mode they
won't use. Exactly my point.
--
Lamar Owen
WGCR Internet Radio
1 Peter 4:11

1863. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-25 18:13:03 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A706CAF.4544FCB8@IEEE.org>
Source record: 2113

n2ey@aol.com wrote:
> What is it about "all" and "subset" that you don't understand?

When you condemn "all" and absolutely refuse to condemn a
particular subset, it's easy to read between the lines.
It reminds me of my cousin who says, "I'm not a racist, I
just don't like black people."
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

1864. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-25 18:28:35 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A707053.E3FA3E70@IEEE.org>
Source record: 2115

Drew Northup wrote:
> I think that it is too bad that they may not be
> willing to take the time to learn it (those whom are not able to for some good
> reason can get a dispensation), ...

Since there is no code waiver anymore, what kind of "dispensation"
are you talking about?
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

1865. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-25 18:28:48 UTC
From: Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com>
Message-ID: <3A707060.F652308@dvol.com>
Source record: 2114

K0HB@USWEST.NET wrote:

>
> > Sorta like fish finders are lousy fathometers.
>
> Really? (I didn't know that.) Why?
>
> I would have thought they'd be great fathometers, since they not only show the
> depth but also give hints of bottom "hardness", etc.

>
Some of them might, not the one I used. About ten years ago I was recruited to skipper a rented 37' sloop to take a four day tour of the northern Chesapeake at the behest of a couple mahout type gents in my biz who are another generation up and didn't want to go it on their own (Actually, one of their wives told Hisself that there was no way he was gonna do any such stunt unless I was aboard. Pain in the ass. Lucky me.). The boat had a fish finder and a fathometer in the cockpit, they consistently disagreed about the depth by a bunch. To make a long story short, I got curious and actually dipsticked the bottom several times, the digital fathometer was always right on the money, the fish finder was out to lunch every time. In ten feet of plumbed water dockside at Annapolis the fish finder told me we had 16 feet and the fathometer told me the bottom was ten point something below it's transducer. Mud time if ya navigate with a fish finder as far as I'm concerned.
>
I'm normally a stinkboater, I don't fish and that was my only experience with the things but it was enough.
>

> 73, Hans, K0HB

>
w3rv

1866. Re: I will no longer tolerate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-25 18:36:28 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A70722C.F8A5F0A2@IEEE.org>
Source record: 2116
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

N8WWM@yahoo.com wrote:
>
> Illegal keyclowns. Amateurs or cbers you sell illegal stuff I turn you in.
> End of story.

My SG-500 amp covers 24-30MHz. Would it be illegal for me to sell it?
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

1867. Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-25 18:44:27 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <94ps69$sn6$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2117
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Dean Craft" <w4ihk@mindspring.com> wrote:

> There is no longer a place for pride in individualism; no longer a
> place for pride in personal achievement;

I take a great deal of pride in my abilities at Morse code.

That pride is not diminished if some other fellow can't beep as fast as I can. I'll bet he has something different to be proud of, like maybe the size of that bass he caught last summer, or how well his daughter did in her soccer game last night, or how well he sang in the church choir last Sunday.

73, de Hans, K0HB
--
"We are fellow travelers on a journey between two eternities, and it's a trip far too brief for me to be concerned about your speed at the Code of Morse."

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1868. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-25 18:45:37 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A707451.5F994DC2@IEEE.org>
Source record: 2118

Drew Northup wrote:
> The Constitution of the US guarantees very little (including the Amendments).
> That is the point. Access to public property is not part of these guarantees.

I do believe that The Constitution guarantees equal treatment under the law.
That's why we don't have segregated rest rooms any more. If tested in court,
I do not believe the Morse code requirement would stand. I believe "ramps"
would be required for Morsely handicapped citizens just as they are required
for wheelchairs.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

1869. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-25 18:49:58 UTC
From: xjim@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <94psgi$t4o$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2120

> The same battery you will use to power the HW-7, or a different battery?

The HW-7 could be operated a long time on any typical laptop battery. Typical laptop has a 2-4 hr operating time for the first year or two, but only if you keep it charged every other day (they normally draw some current even when turned off). The HW-7 and a great many other simpler QRP rigs are far less picky about their power supply. The VHF marine radio in the life-boat is a good idea, but you will need special batteries for these radios for a long shelf life, and they probably won't be useful until shortly before someone can hear or see the helicopter, and untrained people could have wasted the batteries long before someone was in range.

Which brings me back to the training aspect. Much equipment will be misused by untrained people, and there is no guarantee that any one would pay any heed to a trained person even if they survived the incident, but the idea behind Amateur Radio was to provide for a great number of trained people, so there would be a greater probability of trained people available in the event of emergency. There is no excuse for disregarding this issue in order to sell gadgets that purport to be useful to those who have no experience in their use.

You can have it both ways if you like, and you don't mind deliberately utilizing people with lesser qualifications in order to avoid Morse code. You stated that you would prefer SSB because it's faster. True It can be faster. I prefer to use any of the Digital modes for passing text traffic that I can maintain in my logs without extra handling. Voice modes are too slow because they require significantly more handling and must be transcribed anyway unless rumor and misinformation is your goal. It is typically required to slow down the traffic sent by voice to allow reliable transcription. This is inherent in CW operation.

SSB usually allows more fluid net operations and is requires less power consumption so it is best to have that capability, and since CW is fully compatible with SSB operation, it behooves one to be prepared to resort to or more fully use it rather than close the station early under adverse conditions.

> > If that is the case wouldn't you want someone with a whole bunch of tricks in
> >his arsenal, including ham radio and CW capability?
>
> Sure, and if I go camping, and something goes wrong, I would want someone

> around trained in wilderness rescue.
>

When camping in wilderness areas, EVERYONE should be trained in
wilderness survival, otherwise they are usually a liability.

Jim, ac6tk, AAR9BS

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1870. Re: I will no longer tolerate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-25 18:53:01 UTC
From: 'Doc <w5lz@oio.net>
Message-ID: <3A70760D.CAC740F8@oio.net>
Source record: 2119
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

N8WWM@yahoo.com wrote:
>
> Illegal keyclowns. Amateurs or cbers you sell illegal stuff I turn you in.
> End of story.
>
> Sent via Deja.com
> http://www.deja.com/

And I will no longer tolerate your new address. Bye bye...
'Doc

1871. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-25 18:56:52 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A7076F4.8469FDB2@IEEE.org>
Source record: 2123

n2ey@aol.com wrote:
> The standard way plainlanguage Morse speed is judged is by seeing how
> many times you can send the word "PARIS" in a given time. If a dit is
> one time unit long (that's just the keydown time, not the keydown plus
> following keyup time) then the word "PARIS" in Morse takes 50 time
> units to send.

> In 5 level Baudot, "PARIS" takes 42 time units to send IF the start and
> stop bits are the same length. 16% faster than Morse. If the stop bits
> are longer, the improvement is decreased or vanishes entirely.
>
> In 7 level asynchronous ASCII, "PARIS" takes 54 time units to send.
>
> Where's the inefficiency?

The inefficiency of CW is in the baud rate, e.g. ~10 baud, compared to
300 baud for Baudot and ASCII. The effective baud rate of PACTOR II
with its PSK modulation is hundreds of times the effective baud rate
of CW.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

1872. Re: Will you let them take away your guns?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-25 18:59:45 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A7077A1.82B5FA5D@uci.edu>
Source record: 2122

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> "Rebellion for rebellion's sake" is
> the last thing law-abiding gun owners have in mind, and I, for
> one, would be more likely to act to quash any such rebellion as
> to be a part of it.

Then I think we're more or less on the same page in that regard.

> When American citizens have the right to keep
> and bear arms, that right, by itself, is a powerful check against
> any possibility of governmental tyranny -- the same way that
> states with liberal CCW licensing have experienced a major
> reduction in gun-related violent crime.

I think gun related crime and government tyranny are two disparate things. But my point has been all along that arms in the possession of citizens is no longer a check on government tyranny. The balance of power is too lop sided. That argument is the weakest of all the NRA arguments. Don't get me wrong, Larry. I support the right to keep and bear arms. It's just with the present atmosphere of pressure to increase gun control laws, the NRA needs to put forward it's strongest arguments. There's not going to be another revolution, and it sounds really lame to talk about needing to be prepared in case of one.

> When "they" start talking
> seriously about taking that right away, as they actually did in
> England, Australia, and other Third-World countries, then it's
> time to start seriously thinking about acting on such a "rebellion."

It would take a Constitutional Ammendment to eliminate the 2nd Ammendment. And if enough people were to vote to get rid of it, which is extremely unlikely in any foreseeable future, then you're going to be seriously outnumbered by the majority. The outcome would have been arrived at in a democratic process - not by government tyrrany - and you would be in violation of the law to start shooting at people over it.

> I'm sure President Bush isn't going to permit that to happen.

Heck, even Clinton didn't suggest that it should happen.

> For the first time in eight years, I have renewed faith in my
> government.

Hey man, the government is just the same as it was. Some of the names on the roster have changed.

73, Jim AC6XG

1873. Re: Top 10 Problems facing Amteur Radio? (was Re: ARRL code test resolution)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-25 18:59:59 UTC
From: Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com>
Message-ID: <3A7077AF.D5A0E69@dvol.com>
Source record: 2121

W1RFI wrote:

> >From: Brian Kelly kelly@dvol.com
>
> >At this point certainly. Since you brought it up, what are the top ten more
> >important issues?
>
> The minute I hit the SEND button, I said to myself, "My God, man, what have you
> done to yourself?"

>
Heeeee! Of course, ask me how many times I've shipped a post into this endless swamp and wished I could live my life over.
>

> I gotta' give my fingers a rest after that last long post. Want to take a
> first cut at it?

>
Yeah, could be interesting but later. I have six days to get all my crap outta the rental slum I've been living in for years and move it to new digs so I'm going quiet. Want an AT-1 cabinet for really cheap?
>
Have any idea when you might be in Philly? N2EY and self will pop for the lobster at Bookbinders.
>

> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

>
w3rv

1874. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-25 19:00:59 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A7077EB.165D5268@IEEE.org>
Source record: 2125

Drew Northup wrote:
> We live in a Republican [representative] Democracy. The last
> truly deomcratic society was that of ancient Greece. Therefore,
> it only matters whom convinces our represenatives (and
> senators...). Let us start working on something more
> productive--a solution. Any takers?

The solution is obviously 7-figure soft money contributions. :-)
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

1875. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-25 19:03:31 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <94pt9r$ts1$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2124

In article <3A707060.F652308@dvol.com>,
Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com> wrote:
>
> K0HB@USWEST.NET wrote:
>
> >
> > > Sorta like fish finders are lousy fathometers.
> >
> > Really? (I didn't know that.) Why?
> >
> > I would have thought they'd be great fathometers, since
> >they not only show the depth but also give hints of
> >bottom "hardness", etc.
>
> >
> Some of them might, not the one I used.

I think you must have gotten hold of a clunker there, or the transducer
was cocked.

I have two on my boat, one at the helm and one at the forward fishing
station, and they are always dead-nuts on.

73, Hans, K0HB
--
"We are fellow travelers on a journey between two
eternities, and it's a trip far too brief for me
to be concerned about your speed at the Code of
Morse."

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1876. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-25 19:14:34 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <XX_b6.1208$e5.2952265@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 2126

K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org> wrote:

> That pride is not diminished if some other fellow can't beep as fast as
> I can.

Amen.

> I'll bet he has something different to be proud of, like maybe
> the size of that bass he caught last summer, or how well his daughter
> did in her soccer game last night, or how well he sang in the church
> choir last Sunday.

Don't leave the non-Morse-code Amateur accomplishments out it, Hans. I was far prouder of my first QST article than I was of passing my 20 wpm Extra. Those who operate the phone traffic net, or net control the SSB or CW county hunters net can be proud, too. To be more in line with the accomplishment of doing CW proficiently, the phone operator who uses proper operating techniques can be just as proud as you.

And none who have obtained amateur licenses as required by Part 97 and who conduct themselves on the air in compliance with its rules need make any apologies to anyone. In Amateur Radio, there is plenty of pride to go around and many, many ways to find it.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1877. Re: Will you let them take away your guns?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-25 19:36:38 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A708046.9978C11B@uci.edu>
Source record: 2127

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

> In article <3A6DD753.66F79733@uci.edu>, Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> writes:

> >Cecil wrote:
> >> I think the people who want high taxes should pay them and the people
> >> who don't want high taxes should pay less. In other words, tax the
> >> liberals at a higher rate than the conservatives. Then count the
> >> number of liberals. :-)

> >I've often thought exactly the same thing. An excellent idea - and very
> >fair. The only problem is that the liberals don't think THEY should pay
> >more taxes - it's only the OTHER guy who should pay more taxes.

> That's just the way liberals think.

I know.

> So, the next time you see some Environmentalist telling you
> where you can't build a nuclear power plant, tell them to get
> back in their Volvo and go back to their gated residential
> community and play a round of golf -- because unless they
> are living in a cave, wearing a buckhide union suit, and have
> never pissed into porcelin, they can't tell you a damn thing!

Did you hear about the proposed new Southgate, Ca. power plant? Very clean burning gas plant with all the state-of-the-art scrubbers; replaces a huge diesel truck facility currently on the site; reduces the annual tonnage of pollution emmission by a substantial margin; and the people turned out en masse - in the middle of an electrical energy crisis - to shout it down.

I think the reason in this case is the people feel as though their neighborhood, which is economically depressed, is being used as a dumping ground. They just use environmentalism as their excuse not to have the plant in their backyard. The little picture takes on greater importance than the big picture.

73, Jim AC6XG

1878. Re: I will no longer tolerate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-25 19:45:34 UTC
From: "www.kp82.com" <kp82@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <94pvor$c5$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2129
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <94poa2$or2$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
N8WWM@yahoo.com wrote:POSTED TO MAKE YOU THINK IT WAS N8, BUT it
aint...
> Illegal keyclowns. Amateurs or cbers you sell illegal stuff I turn
you in.
> End of story.
>
> Sent via Deja.com
> http://www.deja.com/
>

--
http://members.theglobe.com/keyclownzsuk/EXP_SITE_PERSONAL_2/
http://www.geocities.com/antikeyclown/1mangayboy_and_NeboDweeb.html
http://www.geocities.com/aunteekeyklown/Keyclown_wedding.html
http://humor.easynews.com/
http://www.geocities.com/keyclownslappa/dweebrain.jpg

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1879. Re: I will no longer tolerate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-25 19:54:17 UTC
From: "J.Mayner" <not@this.net>
Message-ID: <Dv%b6.161$7j2.41383@open-news.pacbell.net>
Source record: 2128
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

LOL

Jeff

<N8WWM@yahoo.com> wrote in message news:94poa2$or2$1@nnrp1.deja.com...
> Illegal keyclowns. Amateurs or cbers you sell illegal stuff I turn you in.
> End of story.
>
>
> Sent via Deja.com
> http://www.deja.com/

1880. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-25 20:09:44 UTC
From: Vincent Biancomano <103520.355@CompuServe.COM>
Message-ID: <94q168$2in$1@sshuraac-i-1.production.compuserve.com>
Source record: 2130

>If tested in court, I do not believe the Morse code requirement
>would stand.

Neither would the theory requirements. Unfortunately, that's not
the issue.

Regards,
Vince, WB2EZG

1881. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-25 20:26:07 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A708BDF.7EFE007E@uci.edu>
Source record: 2131

W1RFI wrote:
>
> >From: Jim Kelley jwkelley@uci.edu

> >You might try meeting the present requirements as a means of first
> >demonstrating that it is not for personal gain that you make these
> >esteemed and learned recommendations.

> Most of the comments made to the FCC are by people seeking personal gain
> from the result.

I'm not so sure about that. But, I appreciate your support of my
suspiscion about Larry's motivations here. ;-)

> The FCC accepts that.

The FCC gives equal credence, presumably, to all comments because they
are more or less taking an opinion poll. But personally, I prefer to
have experienced people making policy decisions for the Amateur Radio
Service. Most hams probably feel the same way or even stronger about
that. Also, it is my perception that most people don't like being
lectured by newbies in any profession or avocation. Just an
observation, Ed.

73, Jim AC6XG

1882. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-25 20:31:05 UTC
From: billsohl@mindspring.com
Message-ID: <3a708c22.1159033@news.mindspring.com>
Source record: 2132

On Tue, 23 Jan 2001 19:00:57 GMT, xjim@my-deja.com wrote:

>
>> I have not read much in the press about the failure of emergency
>devices in
>> emergencies. Do we need a media coverup to make this all plausible?
>
>
>Well... My take on the press, is that they don't even know that the
>water is cold until they run into an iceburg, and even then they get
>the color wrong. But that's another story.
>
>The problem with gadgets and emergencies, is that you need a real
>emergency in order to test their efficiency. I have been involved both
>professionaly (LMR) and in RACES (off and on depending on political
>currents) since the Civil Defense days, and currently support US Army
>MARS. The simple gadgets that are highly adaptable, like an 8' Crecent
>wrench, are the most useful when compared to highly technical gadgets
>like uP controlled radios and data terminals. Multi-channel radios and
>programmable radios often present a problem for people who only bring
>them out of the back room twice a year. Even Fire/Police/Rescue people
>may find it difficult to talk to one another even if they have a common
>frequency because they might not be able to find it in their 100
>channel radios.

And morse code using simple equipment makes that a non-issue
because?

>I'm not talking about things that are broken or worthless from the
>start (there are those) Rather I'm talking about things that don't get
>used in real emergencies either because they are not adaptable to the
>emergency at hand, or because the available personnel isn't familiar or
>the equipment isn't intuitive enough.

If the available people aren't familiar with their
gear, then shame on those that had responsibility
for building the preparedness before hand.

>Ham radio operators are supposed to bridge the communications gap in
>emergencies for those who are trained in other areas, by being
>resourceful with both operating and technical skills. One of the most
>common failures I have seen is when the equipment or propagation aren't
>up to the task, or the operator is unprepared to handle signed written
>traffic. We are valuable because we can make use of what survives the
>disaster, not by how well we can raid ham store shelves.

Yet the histroy of contemporary communications by hams in an emergency is filled with use of modern equipment as opposed to "what survives". That is because the equipment that survives is more robust to begin with (IMHO).

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1883. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-25 20:41:15 UTC
From: billsohl@mindspring.com
Message-ID: <3a708e1b.1664507@news.mindspring.com>
Source record: 2133

On 24 Jan 2001 23:26:13 GMT, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:

>>From: xjim@my-deja.com
....
>>If I could only take one radio with me on the
>>road, It would be an HF mobile and it would have CW capability because
>>I know what it is worth. If I could take two, I would add a cell phone.
>
>Depending where I was going, I would choose either a cell phone, an HT or an
>all mode rig. If I felt using the all-mode rig, I would use SSB as my first
>choice; it conserves battery power and in plain language, I can communicate a
>lot of information in a small amount of time.

Well my cellphone fits in my pocket and my HT (Icom T8A) isn't much
bigger. In my vehicle I have a 2m mobile that can hit at least one
repeater almost anywhere I might be able to drive my car.
I see no real value to having an HF rig in the car for emergency
comms. Perhaps I am missing something that isn't being stated?

>If all that failed, I would be glad I know Morse code.
>
>I will add that, as a CW op, if I ran across the 1 wpm SOS from someone using a
>lookup chart, I would stick it out.

The problem is, as you note, "if I ran across the...".
The reality is that there isn't any common HF assigned
emergency frequency that people (hams) might be able
to monitor for that unexpected emergency.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1884. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-25 20:47:11 UTC
From: billsohl@mindspring.com
Message-ID: <3a708f8a.2031547@news.mindspring.com>
Source record: 2134

On Thu, 25 Jan 2001 18:49:58 GMT, xjim@my-deja.com wrote:

>> The same battery you will use to power the HW-7, or a
>> different battery?
>
>The HW-7 could be operated a long time on any typical laptop battery.
>Typical laptop has a 2-4 hr operating time for the first year or two,
>but only if you keep it charged every other day (they normally draw
>some current even when turned off). The HW-7 and a great many other
>simpler QRP rigs are far less picky about their power supply.

What the HW-7 lacks, however, is any specific frequency
stability/readout. In using the HW-7 you must hope
someone happens to just be tuning across the frequency
you are transmitting.

>The VHF
>marine radio in the life-boat is a good idea, but you will need special
>batteries for these radios for a long shelf life, and they probably
>won't be useful until shortly before someone can hear or see the
>helicopter, and untrained people could have wasted the batteries long
>before someone was in range.

Actually, you could include a solar panel and/or a hand generator
to power it.

>Which brings me back to the training aspect. Much equipment will be
>misused by untrained people, and there is no guarantee that any one
>would pay any heed to a trained person even if they survived the
>incident, but the idea behind Amateur Radio was to provide for a great
>number of trained people, so there would be a greater probability of
>trained people available in the event of emergency.

Agreed.

>There is no excuse
>for disregarding this issue in order to sell gadgets that purport to be
>useful to those who have no experience in their use.

The gadgets can and should be "simple" to use if the intended
user is someone without experience.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1885. Re: N8wwm rules the newsgroups and knocks hell out of keyclowns

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-25 20:52:35 UTC
From: N8WWM@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <94q3me$4bd$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2135

In article <3go07tsqvruamde468cai5adg4mclu184r@4ax.com>,
Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com> wrote:
> "Leland C. Scott" <no-spam@junk-mail.net> wrote:
>
> >>"Aaron Jones" <nomail@nomail.com> wrote in message
>
> >>>BRAND SPANKIN' NEW <brandnew@hotmail.com> wrote:
> >>> I DISAGREE. I THINK N8 IS JUST HAVING FUN AND PULLING CHAINS BUT, ON
> >>> THE OTHER HAND I REALLY THINK VOOBNER TRIES TO TAKE THIS MESS
> >>> SERIOUSLY, EVEN IF HE IS NOT TAKEN SERIOUSLY BY THE MAJORITY.
>
> >>... This guy obviously works RTTY... :-)
>
> >Believe it or not he stated in that news group that he does not even hold a
> >Ham license of any type, but is studying to get one.
>
> When I first got online, I typed my messages in all capital letters. I
> guess I thought it was like being on RTTY. I was quickly told that I
> was being impolite (by shouting in net language). I'm glad that
> someone finally took the time to point out this social gaff to me. I
> don't remember his 'first personal' though... :-)
>

You're all wrong and half of you are FAGGOT ILLEGAL KEYCLOWNS! I NEVER SAID I
WAS STUDYING for anything.

Making illegal keyclowns cry is Fun!

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1886. Person posting as N8WWM is not him.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-25 21:01:08 UTC
From: "www.kp82.com" <kp82@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <94q46d$4tb$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2137
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

N8WWM does post to newsgroups, but is not identified by his name or
callsign in his email address.
The individual posting to newsgroups as N8WWM is not him.

Just so you know.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1887. Person posting as N8WWM is not him.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-25 21:01:47 UTC
From: "www.kp82.com" <kp82@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <94q47k$4tt$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2136

N8WWM does post to newsgroups, but is not identified by his name or
callsign in his email address.
The individual posting to newsgroups as N8WWM is not him.

Just so you know.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1888. Re: all the wrong places

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-25 22:01:40 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A70A244.867D0186@uci.edu>
Source record: 2138

N8WWM@yahoo.com wrote:
>
> I think I was looking for love in all the wrong places. Illegal keyclowns
> said for me to get me elmer in here. I elmered more than they can ever dream.
> Any suggestions fellers? Whats the best way to get back at these illegal
> keyclowns for harming my good name?

Please define this term 'keyclown' that you seem to be so fond of
typing.

thanks,

ac6xg

1889. Re: The REAL DEAL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-25 22:02:10 UTC
From: N8WWM@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <94q7os$8e0$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2139
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

In article <94q46d$4tb$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
www.kp82.com <kp82@my-deja.com> wrote:
> N8WWM does post to newsgroups, but is not identified by his name or
> callsign in his email address.
> The individual posting to newsgroups as N8WWM is not him.
>
> Just so you know.
>
> Sent via Deja.com
> http://www.deja.com/
>

www.kp82.com does not know enough about N8WWM to make this claim. He just began posting to newsgroups and is not identified by a email address or name. He has mistakenly been identified several times as me. While we share some views, I have always posted under my call because I have nothing to hide, unlike you ILLEGAL FAGGOT KEYCLOWNS! Insist on the original.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1890. Re: I will no longer tolerate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-25 22:17:00 UTC
From: igotdapower <igotdapowa@hone.con>
Message-ID: <wB1c6.6624$49.607705@news1.rdc2.pa.home.com>
Source record: 2140
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

go get a real computer you web-tv geek, trying to hide behind Yahoo..

<N8WWM@yahoo.com> wrote in message news:94poa2$or2$1@nnrp1.deja.com...
> Illegal keyclowns. Amateurs or cbers you sell illegal stuff I turn you in.
> End of story.
>
>
> Sent via Deja.com
> http://www.deja.com/

1891. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-25 22:18:56 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A70A650.D656BFD8@uci.edu>
Source record: 2141

"Ed Hare, W1RFI" wrote:

> I don't believe that Larry is going through all of the work of serving on
> the NCI Board because he feels that doing so is easier than learning the
> code.

I'll bet for him it's the easier of the two things. For some people,
complaining comes naturally. But I'm not really this cynical, Ed. Are
you Leroy's little brother, or just his apologist?

73, Jim AC6XG

1892. FAKE POSTING BY SOMEONE CLAIMING TO BE N8WWM

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-25 22:20:15 UTC
From: "www.kp82.com" <kp82@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <94q8qm$9fh$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2143
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

This is not true. N8WWM the poster is NOT N8WWM the person.
To prove this, I propose a test. At QRZ.com there is a page for every
member that you can put personal information on. The REAL N8WWM will
change the page by putting a new first sentence in. Go there now to see
the original page. I challenge the fake n8wwm@my-deja.com or
N8WWM@yahoo.com to do that. Of course it will be impossible. If you
email n8wwm@arrl.net, within 24 hours of 2200Zulu on 1-25-01, the REAL
N8WWM will send you the exact wording of what that first sentence will
be. AFTER 2200Z on 1-26-01 the this address right here will post the
sentence change in the profile on QRZ.
The ONLY valid address for N8WWM that has his callsign in it is
N8WWM@arrl.net. The FAKE N8WWM can't change that.

In article <94q7os$8e0$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
N8WWM@yahoo.com wrote:
> In article <94q46d$4tb$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
> www.kp82.com <kp82@my-deja.com> wrote:
> > N8WWM does post to newsgroups, but is not identified by his name or
> > callsign in his email address.
> > The individual posting to newsgroups as N8WWM is not him.
> >
> > Just so you know.
> >
> > Sent via Deja.com
> > http://www.deja.com/
> >
>
> www.kp82.com does not know enough about N8WWM to make this claim. He
just
> began posting to newsgroups and is not identified by a email address
or name.
> He has mistakenly been identified several times as me. While we share
some
> views, I have always posted under my call because I have nothing to
hide,
> unlike you ILLEGAL FAGGOT KEYCLOWNS! Insist on the original.
>
> Sent via Deja.com
> http://www.deja.com/
>

--
http://members.theglobe.com/keyclownzsuk/EXP_SITE_PERSONAL_2/
http://www.geocities.com/antikeyclown/1mangayboy_and_NeboDweeb.html

http://www.geocities.com/aunteekeyklown/Keyclown_wedding.html
http://humor.easynews.com/
http://www.geocities.com/keyclownslappa/dweebrain.jpg

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1893. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-25 22:22:34 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A70A72A.DBD5FFEA@uci.edu>
Source record: 2142

Len Over 21 wrote:
> Are you saying that everyone must go through the same
> test ritual as you did just because you had to?

If you find that I said that, then you'll know that I said that.
If you don't find it, well, maybe you can figure it out for yourself.

I would make an exception for you, however.

ac6xg

1894. FAKE N8WWM POSTS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-25 22:32:17 UTC
From: "www.kp82.com" <kp82@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <94q9hi$a39$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2144

The real N8WWM will change the first sentence in his personal information at QRZ.com 24 hours from now. The FAKE n8wwm@yahoo.com and the FAKE n8wwm@my-deja.com of course cannot know what that change will be.
Email N8WWM@arrl.net to get the exact words that will be inserted into the qrz.com profile. N8WWM will email the exact words to anyone who asks for it within 24 hours of 2200Zulu on 1-25-01. The change will be made on QRZ after that time on 1-26-01. Immediately before the change you will get your email with the text of the new sentence from the address cbersarelosers@my-deja.com.
For some reason, N8WWM's call has been fraudulently "bootlegged" on the internet. Why didn't the moron bootleg an extra class call?

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1895. Re: REAL POSTING AND THE FINAL WORD

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-25 22:36:02 UTC
From: fatandgayn8wwm@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <94q9oi$a7n$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2146
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

In article <94q8qm$9fh$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
www.kp82.com <kp82@my-deja.com> wrote:
> This is not true. N8WWM the poster is NOT N8WWM the person.
> To prove this, I propose a test. At QRZ.com there is a page for every
> member that you can put personal information on. The REAL N8WWM will
> change the page by putting a new first sentence in. Go there now to see
> the original page. I challenge the fake n8wwm@my-deja.com or
> N8WWM@yahoo.com to do that. Of course it will be impossible. If you
> email n8wwm@arrl.net, within 24 hours of 2200Zulu on 1-25-01, the REAL
> N8WWM will send you the exact wording of what that first sentence will
> be. AFTER 2200Z on 1-26-01 the this address right here will post the
> sentence change in the profile on QRZ.
> The ONLY valid address for N8WWM that has his callsign in it is
> N8WWM@arrl.net. The FAKE N8WWM can't change that.
>
> In article <94q7os$8e0$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
> N8WWM@yahoo.com wrote:
> > In article <94q46d$4tb$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
> > www.kp82.com <kp82@my-deja.com> wrote:
> > > N8WWM does post to newsgroups, but is not identified by his name or
> > > callsign in his email address.
> > > The individual posting to newsgroups as N8WWM is not him.
> > >
> > > Just so you know.
> > >
> > > Sent via Deja.com
> > > http://www.deja.com/
> > >
> >
> > www.kp82.com does not know enough about N8WWM to make this claim. He
> just
> > began posting to newsgroups and is not identified by a email address
> or name.
> > He has mistakenly been identified several times as me. While we share
> some
> > views, I have always posted under my call because I have nothing to
> hide,
> > unlike you ILLEGAL FAGGOT KEYCLOWNS! Insist on the original.
> >
> > Sent via Deja.com
> > http://www.deja.com/
> >
>

> --
> http://members.theglobe.com/keyclownzsuk/EXP_SITE_PERSONAL_2/
> http://www.geocities.com/antikeyclown/1mangayboy_and_NeboDweeb.html
> http://www.geocities.com/aunteekeyklown/Keyclown_wedding.html
> http://humor.easynews.com/
> http://www.geocities.com/keyclownslappa/dweebrain.jpg
>
> Sent via Deja.com
> http://www.deja.com/
>

No longer neccessary doug. I concede. I made my point. Just had to show someone in here that doubted who you were. Had to prove it. I'm gone!

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1896. Timmy, go play with Lassie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-25 22:45:21 UTC
From: "www.kp82.com" <kp82@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <94qa9t$aq9$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2147
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Who said anything about what who N8WWM is or is not?
You should KNOW who you are talking to before you accuse.
Face it sissy, You cannot do anything to the anti-keyclown faction
without getting busted!
There's grown men here, sonny...go play with your puppies!
> > http://members.theglobe.com/keyclownzsuk/EXP_SITE_PERSONAL_2/
> > http://www.geocities.com/antikeyclown/1mangayboy_and_NeboDweeb.html
> > http://www.geocities.com/aunteekeyklown/Keyclown_wedding.html
> > http://humor.easynews.com/
> > http://www.geocities.com/keyclownslappa/dweebrain.jpg
> >
> > Sent via Deja.com
> > http://www.deja.com/
> >
>
> No longer neccessary doug. I concede. I made my point. Just had to
show
> someone in here that doubted who you were. Had to prove it. I'm gone!
>
> Sent via Deja.com
> http://www.deja.com/
>

--
http://members.theglobe.com/keyclownzsuk/EXP_SITE_PERSONAL_2/
http://www.geocities.com/antikeyclown/1mangayboy_and_NeboDweeb.html
http://www.geocities.com/aunteekeyklown/Keyclown_wedding.html
http://humor.easynews.com/
http://www.geocities.com/keyclownslappa/dweebrain.jpg

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1897. Timmy, go play with Lassie

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-25 22:45:58 UTC
From: "www.kp82.com" <kp82@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <94qab3$ar1$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2148

Who said anything about what who N8WWM is or is not?
You should KNOW who you are talking to before you accuse.
Face it sissy, You cannot do anything to the anti-keyclown faction
without getting busted!
There's grown men here, sonny...go play with your puppies!
> > http://members.theglobe.com/keyclownzsuk/EXP_SITE_PERSONAL_2/
> > http://www.geocities.com/antikeyclown/1mangayboy_and_NeboDweeb.html
> > http://www.geocities.com/aunteekeyklown/Keyclown_wedding.html
> > http://humor.easynews.com/
> > http://www.geocities.com/keyclownslappa/dweebrain.jpg
> >
> > Sent via Deja.com
> > http://www.deja.com/
> >
>
> No longer neccessary doug. I concede. I made my point. Just had to
show
> someone in here that doubted who you were. Had to prove it. I'm gone!
>
> Sent via Deja.com
> http://www.deja.com/
>

--
http://members.theglobe.com/keyclownzsuk/EXP_SITE_PERSONAL_2/
http://www.geocities.com/antikeyclown/1mangayboy_and_NeboDweeb.html
http://www.geocities.com/aunteekeyklown/Keyclown_wedding.html
http://humor.easynews.com/
http://www.geocities.com/keyclownslappa/dweebrain.jpg

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1898. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-25 22:47:16 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <m32c6.1210$e5.2964922@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 2145

Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

> > You don't, all ya do is piss off the neighbor and get generate a ham-hater. Like we
> > need more of those. The neighbor is just as much a victim as the ham. Rightouseness
> > ain't the solution, keeping the crap off the shelves in the first place is the
> > solution.

> Exactly,and precisely why the problem will NOT be solved at that
> level, since FCC refused to require manufacturers of Part 15 devices to
> spend the few extra pennies on filtering.

I think you are mixing metaphors here, so to speak, but the point is well made. The FCC does not require consumer equipment manufacturers to include filtering.

Part 15 is another story; the Part 15 rules cover devices that are either intended, or likely, to radiate. The levels that the FCC permits Part 15 devices to radiate are strong enough to cause Amateur Radio problems.

First, incidental emitters, such as power lines, electric motors, etc, have NO *specific* radiated or conducted emissions limits. They are subject only to the provision that they not cause harmful interference.

Unintentional radiators (computers, etc) do not deliberately generate RF energy, but they deliberately create RF signals for "internal" use. They are subject to conducted emissions limits (ie, how much signal they can put on the power line) on HF, and radiated emissions limits on VHF. The premise is that on HF, the case and intercabling on a computer is not a good antenna, so the energy conducted on the power lines is the determining factor. In practice, cases radiate, and by my calculations, if the residential electrical wiring has about -30 dBi gain, the legal conducted limits are about S5 at a nearby HF dipole 30 meters away on 3.5 MHz. Generally, the manufacturers have to include some filtering. To put it into perspective, the legal limit of 250 microvolts conducted energy is 0.00125 microvolts, generally conducted into a pretty poor antenna -- residential electrical wiring. Compare that to the 50 milliwatts you are permitted to radiate for harmonic or other spurious energy, into a good antenna. The computer system in your neighbors house needs to be be about 76 dB better than your station, before we even consider how much better your antenna works as an antenna than his electrical wiring. Food for thought before we get too critical of the industry.

Intentional radiator are a bigger issue. The concept of filtering doesn't apply there at all -- they are designed to radiate. About S9+15 dB on 80 meters, by my calculation. On 2.4 GHz, things are actually better due to increased path loss, but nowhere near perfect. There have been some NTIA spectral studies that show a distinct rise on the "Part 15" portion of the 2.4 GHz band in urban areas. At this stage, I don't know if it from the legal wireless devices, or if people have added big antennas and amplifiers, raising the noise more than the rules intend. ARRL has a couple of cases of actual interference, both of which are before the FCC.

> When the Pt 15 NPRM was in process I wrote both the FCC and my
> congressperson to insist that more be done to reduce the RFI that was
> sure to come as result of the way it was written. FCC ignored me and
> quickly convinced my congressman that there really was "no problem" with
> it. That was a done deal long ago and won't addressed again.

ARRL did too, with the same effect. And, in one sense, the FCC is right. 99 percent of the Part 15 devices do not cause harmful interference. Unfortunately, 1% of millions of devices is still a lot.

> Ed's work is probably the only effective force in place at all, and it is
largely
> educational, as we can see from here. And much of that education is
> pointed at manufacturing engineers who have no clue about ham radio, it
> seems.

Yes, but, as amazing as it is, that education is having an effect. As I said in my lenghty post, the Home Phone Networkiung, VDSL and HomePlug specs all have notches to protect ham radio. It was NOT me alone that did it, but I have no doubt that had ARRL not been involved, it would not have happened that way. There are concerned hams who played pivotal roles on the VDSL committees, HPNA and HomePlug, and it would not have happened without them, either. It is a process of teamwork and cooperation, because under the present rules, that is about the best tool we have available. All good things do NOT come from Newington, CT, and in this area, I will continue to do what I did when I put the RFI Book together, draw on the best of the best of amateur radio to ensure that the end result is what is best for Amateur Radio. Fortunately, among those best are people who are willing to give, helped by others willing to support it. I tell, you, Dick; if you had told me three years ago that if ARRL asked the industry to do the right thing, and they would do so willingly, I would not have believed you. Even I have heard the whirl of the 'copter blades from time to time.

Will it always work out that way. I don't think so, but, IMHO, it was critical to get some successes under our belt, to demonstrate to the FCC that cooperation to avoid harmful interference works, and that it is not the exception. The first industry group that asserts that cooperation is not possible is going to have some powerful examples tossed at them. And, btw, the industries involved here are giants -- Lucent, Microsoft and the like are the key players on all these committees. The ARRL RFI Task Group meeting was hosted at Lucent, by Steve Strauss, a Lucent engineer and a member of the ARRL RFI Task Group.

> Whatta scheme.

I'm not sure how much of a scheme. In some cases, the right Part 15 sharing partner can be an asset. Remote control and similar devices often operate legally on 433.92 MHz. They typically transmit a few milliseconds every few minutes. That part of the band is already "occupied" by devices with a range of a few hundred feet at best, with signals that will sound like a fast dit to us. Harmful interference? The FCC probably would not think so. Will other, more harmful, Part 15 devices be likely to occupy this part of the band? Probably not. How about 2.4 GHz and the Bluetooth threat? Those devices, short range, will be around in the millions in a few years. Can we justify not allowing them there based on occupancy of 2.4 GHz? Probably not. Can hams adopt these spread-spectrum devices and fight fire with fire, using broadband technology to make use of that part of the band occupied by broadband technology? Sounds like it; maybe that is where some of our future is.

I don't have all the answers, Dick, but I am taking the support of people like you and me (I pay dues, too, just like you) and using it to keep at it. Each committee meeting I attend costs about $1,000 or so. Factoring in the expense of producing QST, I estimate that about 50 people are members to send me to one. Man, I hope that it is MY membership that pays for the ext -- sounds a lot more glamorous than helping to pay the heating bill. You and I both disagree with ARRL on issues like Morse code testing, in opposite directions, I am sure. But THIS sort of thing is what is really important. Little LEO threats and ground-imaging radar threats on 70 and a host of similar ones to come down the pike are going to make us or break us. I gotta' say, Dick, that as far as I am concerned, any one of these justified my dues dollars for 2001, increase and all. And I get QST, the Web and such besides.

So when you do what I do; re-up in spite of some differences of opinion, let me know. I will personally thank a League member for helping to make it happen.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1899. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-25 23:16:22 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <Eu2c6.1214$e5.2967081@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 2149

Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote:

> I'll bet for him it's the easier of the two things. For some people,
> complaining comes naturally. But I'm not really this cynical, Ed. Are
> you Leroy's little brother, or just his apologist?

Who is Leroy?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1900. Re: Top 10 Problems facing Amteur Radio? (was Re: ARRL code testresolution)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-25 23:25:36 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <iD2c6.1215$e5.2967591@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 2150

D. Stussy <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote:

> 1) Apathy
> 2) Anarchy.

Let's add to it:

3. Spectrum threats
4. Spectrum sharing - (Part 15)
5. CC&Rs
6. Zoning restrictions
7. RFI to consumer electronics
8. Declining numbers (possible after the NC Tech's start expiring)
9. Insufficient Elmering of newcomers
10. Unresolved repeater coordination issues
11. Amateurs losing ground relative to changes in technology
12. Rising noise levels
13. Inadequacies in the content of written examinations

Somehow, I still wouldn't put "Lack of sufficient Morse code testing" anywhere except the bottom of this list. Others' mileage may vary, but I would strongly disagree with anyone who put "Lack of sufficient Morse code testing" near the top.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1901. Re: I will no longer tolerate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-25 23:28:22 UTC
From: n4jzh@knology.net
Message-ID: <3a70b680.42107526@news.knology.net>
Source record: 2151
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Thu, 25 Jan 2001 17:38:12 GMT, N8WWM@yahoo.com wrote:

>Illegal keyclowns. Amateurs or cbers you sell illegal stuff I turn you in.
>End of story.
>
>
>Sent via Deja.com
>http://www.deja.com/
Shmuck! PERIOD.....

1902. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-25 23:40:54 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A70B986.E6CA291D@uci.edu>
Source record: 2152

"Ed Hare, W1RFI" wrote:

> Who is Leroy?

He's the guy with the same callsign as Larry.

73, ac6xg

1903. Re: The knuckle head here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-26 00:16:25 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <94qfkifma1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2153

In article <94kbfemhj1@208.207.71.163>,
Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>
>
> Brian wrote:
>
> > Hopefully I won't
> > suffer the kind of brain damage you did as a beginner.
>
> I should've remembered that all that bashing your head against walls
> and knashing your teeth over a simple code test did it to you long,
> long ago.

Are you calling me a long time ham?

Dick, abused hams grow up to abuse the ham family. Go get some
counseling. Seriously.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1904. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-26 00:53:15 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <1hi17tcc2uaa2hsqdh38odr83agat86p8c@4ax.com>
Source record: 2154

billsohl@mindspring.com (Bill Sohl) wrote:
>In my vehicle I have a 2m mobile that can hit at least one
>repeater almost anywhere I might be able to drive my car.

If you want to remove "almost anywhere" from your sentence, you will need an HF mobile. Murphy might strike when you're "almost anywhere"...

>I see no real value to having an HF rig in the car for emergency
>comms. Perhaps I am missing something that isn't being stated?

It depends on where you plan to go. Stay on the interstates and in the cities and a cell phone should do it. However when I'm heading across the Navajo Nation on my way to Colorado, the HF mobile is comforting...

>The reality is that there isn't any common HF assigned
>emergency frequency that people (hams) might be able
>to monitor for that unexpected emergency.

That's what the tuning knob is for. Just find a QSO and break in. Most hams will be happy to make that emergency call for you...

1905. Re: I will no longer tolerate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-26 00:59:44 UTC
From: BigPoppaPump <igotdapowa@hone.con>
Message-ID: <4_3c6.6940$49.675451@news1.rdc2.pa.home.com>
Source record: 2155
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

eat shit and die i can reboot and viola Linux , your not the only one who uses it.

"igotdapower" <igotdapowa@hone.con> wrote in message news:wB1c6.6624$49.607705@news1.rdc2.pa.home.com...
> go get a real computer you web-tv geek, trying to hide behind Yahoo..
>
>
> <N8WWM@yahoo.com> wrote in message news:94poa2$or2$1@nnrp1.deja.com...
> > Illegal keyclowns. Amateurs or cbers you sell illegal stuff I turn you in.
> > End of story.
> >
> >
> > Sent via Deja.com
> > http://www.deja.com/
>
>

1906. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-26 01:20:04 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <94qjbtiod1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2156

In article <3A70B986.E6CA291D@uci.edu>,
Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote:
> "Ed Hare, W1RFI" wrote:
>
> > Who is Leroy?
>
> He's the guy with the same callsign as Larry.
>

Leroy is K3LT?

73, Hans, K0HB
--
"We are fellow travelers on a journey between two
eternities, and it's a trip far too brief for me
to be concerned about your speed at the Code of
Morse."

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1907. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-26 01:43:54 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A70D65A.87BF046A@uci.edu>
Source record: 2157

K0HB wrote:
>
> In article <3A70B986.E6CA291D@uci.edu>,
> Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote:
> > "Ed Hare, W1RFI" wrote:

> > > Who is Leroy?

> > He's the guy with the same callsign as Larry.

> Leroy is K3LT?

:-)

Klose, but no cigar.

ac6xg

1908. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-26 02:06:38 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <94qm3a$l3j$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2160

In article <1hi17tcc2uaa2hsqdh38odr83agat86p8c@4ax.com>,
Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com> wrote:
> billsohl@mindspring.com (Bill Sohl) wrote:
> >In my vehicle I have a 2m mobile that can hit at least one
> >repeater almost anywhere I might be able to drive my car.
>
> If you want to remove "almost anywhere" from your sentence, you will
> need an HF mobile. Murphy might strike when you're "almost
> anywhere"...

Is this the K3LT "broken leg and the wife is screaming" scenario? HF always gets through? Or is it CW always gets through?

Weren't you on the other side of this argument last time?

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1909. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-26 02:09:38 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010125210938.22779.00000962@nso-fa.aol.com>
Source record: 2159

In article <3A703743.FF0CF160@dvol.com>, Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com> writes:

>> Then you haven't used anything with more than 20 db dynamic
>> range. I agree that the old-style 1940s Panadaptor wasn't much
>> good with its semi-linear (not logarithmic) vertical display.
>
>The utility in using a spectrum analyzer for ham receiving purposes is
>usually to
>detect the existence of a signal, not to accurately measure it's amplitude or
>frequency. Junk analyzers work fine in this kind of service, some being
>better than others.

If all you have is junk equipment, then all you do is junk operation.

Junk spectrum analyzers existed as ready-made equipment for a
long time. Their dynamic range never got beyond 40 db and the
accuracy, to be kind, was seldom better than +/- 5 db on a log
scale, if you were able to get one with a log scale.

>When I need to get serious about spectrum analyzers for machine
>vibration work I wheel out a $5-6k calibrated spectrum analyzer. Bruel &
>Kjar makes one which cost $25,000 a few years ago. There are spectrum
>analyzers and there are spectrum analyzers.

Back 20 years ago one of the semiconductor makers had a kit
containing a many-bit A/D and a pre-programmed microprocessor.
It was an audio range spectrum analyzer whose output could be
displayed on any oscilloscope. Was better than 30 db in
dynamic range and covered DC to about 20 KHz. Rocketdyne
Instrumentation Lab got one and it worked very well. While
considered a curiosity back then...it used FFT techniques to
do the transform from amplitude-time to amplitude-frequency...it
was a precursor to what now exists in consumer electronics
music systems selling for less than $200 for the whole music
system.

Navies of the world that use sonar have a form of such a spectrum
analyzer (FFT for analysis of the sonar signals) for over 30 years.
The same goes for some Electronic Warfare systems for good
discrimination among several signals. Those are also spectrum
analyzers.

I'm not talking about an all-purpose instrument with laboratory
quality and accuracy. That's not needed in this discussion.

>> the signals within sweepwidth settings are visible. 50 or 100
>> KHz sweep width no problem to see CW or any other kind of

>> modulation on those incoming signals. Everything is on the
>> display at once.
>
>Understood, I've seen good spectrum analyzers (vs. HO-10s) used to present
>band
>displays. On HF they're close to useless because of the junk and noise on any
>open band for one. In a contest all you see is one monster 50-75Khz wide
>spike.

Then the analyzer's bandwidth is way too wide. In all spectral
analysis there is an optimum bandwidth, sweep rate, and
band span of sweep tuning. That's been established decades
ago. In "modern" (less than 2 decades old) lab spectrum
analyzers, the selection has be hard-wired into the panel
controls.

A spectrum analyzer is simply a receiver with automatic sweep
tuning and display on a 'scope instead of aural output. The
bandwidth can be as narrow as 10 Hz to show just about
everything or as wide as 10 KHz to show "everything in a 50
to 70 KHz" span as one large spike. Attention to skirt
selectivity is a must, more critical than with an aural output
receiver...and related to the dynamic range.

>Spectrum analyzers simply are not a useful enough operating aid to bother
>with.
>One of the high-end Icom xcvrs has a pretty decent built-in analyzer but
>nobody uses it on an ongoing basis.

Now, now, Icom has been selling high-end models with built-in
spectrum analyzers for several years. The IC-756PRO is $3600
and the IC-R9000L (receiver only) is $9500. Someone is buying
them...

One reason spectrum analyzers are "simply not useful enough" is
the lack of dynamic range. If it has only 20 db range, it might as
well be a linear display. That range is useless. A range of 40 db
is better but still inadequate for practicality. 60 db is much
better but analyzer internal bandwidth filters start needing brick-
wall selectivity. 80 db is an optimum dynamic range in trading off
internal filter selectivity, logarithmic IF and detector range, and
everything else. You can relate the dynamic range to S units if
you like...80 db is practically the entire range of an S meter.

>The proof of the pudding is that if spectrum
>analyzers had any particular value as a receiving aid the things would be on
>every operating desk.

Heh, heh, heh...if morse keys had any particular value, every
radio amateur would have one on their operating desk... :-)

>I don't know of a single big-gun HF weak signal wonk who
>uses a spectrum analyzer and I kow a bunch of those.

...Hmmm...I guess that is supposed to settle that? :-)

>> Sound interesting? :-)
>
>Write the article.

I'm not. I know of two such projects already in the works, both for amateur radio use. One is upstate California, the other one is local to me. I'm in an advisory capacity in the group down here. It simply wouldn't do to have some non-ham be in the byline of such an article, would it? :-)

didit

1910. Re: FCC Proposal for New Novice Class License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-26 02:09:40 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010125210940.22779.00000963@nso-fa.aol.com>
Source record: 2158

In article <3A6FD87E.404055D1@ovis.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net> writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <3A6E560F.6F7E7E4A@ovis.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net> writes:
>>
>> >> You have done more than that, especially when not receiving
>> >> any praise over the "clever" use of CW as an order-wire for
>> >> a State Department FSK TTY circuit. :-)
>> >
>> >I don't know whether you are not being forthright or are just forgetful
>> >in your old age. I did not seek any praise.
>>
>> Sure you sought praise. You thought it was a clever idea...of yours.
>
>Now you may be providing some ammunition for Steve's claims regarding
>truthfulness. I never made the claim that it was my idea nor did I seek
>praise. I pointed to it to U.S. Government use of morse. You as much
>as called me a liar over the issue.

Ahem...you pointed a finger back at yourself and then at the
State Department for "cleverness."

To switch over to CW for an order-wire or command context
from FSK is a *dumb* idea. Dumb technically, dumb
operationally.

>I made no such claim regarding my expertise. Do you know what a person
>who tells untruths is called?

Now, now, you are starting to sound like your buddy, the
USMC reject.

Dave, I called the procedure DUMB. Other folks in
communications have already established the methods
decades before you. You are free to call their methods
"wrong" but it is up to you to show why in order to verify
your claims.

>> Technically, switching over to CW from FSK TTY should be
>> possible but it is a most odd sort of thing to use as an
>> order-wire (a command circuit for radio circuit purposes).
>
>We didn't switch back and forth, Len. We used CW on one frequency and
>ran the TTY circuit on a different pair.

Ah, so the story CHANGES! Now, looking at it all in operation
and considering the methods, why does this CW-on-a-different-
frequency for an order-wire have more advantages than having
the circuit commands sent over the TTY circuit?

>I stated that CW was used to arrange QSYs, openings and closings of the
>TTY circuit. It was also necessary to confirm crypto used if that is
>the "synchronization" to which you refer.

I have to admit you might have me there, Dave. I've only been
involved with three different crypto methods of TTY, all over
military circuits, between 1953 and 1989. Without revealing
anything like a state secret or violating national defense, it is
safe to reveal that all of those military circuits self-synchronized.

No doubt State had another crypto system.

I might mention that secure Army field communications using
crypto digital voice do synchronization in real-time. There is
no need for any auxilliary "second channel" to "confirm" any
crypto settings. Such has been operational as the SINCGARS
family since 1988. It's also capable of frequency hopping.

>> I said it was a dumb idea if you did it that way. I still think so.
>
>It is obvious that you did not and do not understand what was stated.

Given a lot of text it is possible to "read between the lines" of
what a person writes. In the above case there seems to have
been some omissions of details. It's very hard to fill in details
by trying to read between lines there...

>I'll leave it to you to figure out the necessity for such operation.
>You were not a State Department communicator any more than you're a
>radio amateur.

Sorry, Dave, you will either have to explain your activity or just
drop the subject. While my only contact with State was a
quick time on RCA's RACES machine (State had two of them
for message storage-retrieval), you ignore that I've had some
thorough experience with HF communications and did it with
operating methods well worked out by others. Also on VLF,
LF, MF, VHF, UHF, and a few microwave bands.

I make no claims of expertise in communications methods,
technically or operationally. I can analyze and reason the
why and wherefore of how things are done and observe that
methodology of operation in communications done by others
before me.

There are few US radio amateurs who have any direct
experience with either State Department methods or crypto
communications. While I can understand your mentioning
such items in close proximity in the same message, they

are bogus for trying to make your case. [US radio amateurs are forbidden to use systems which obscure their communications...it's in the regulations]

The FCC issues US amateur radio licenses, Dave, not the US Department of State. You let me know if that changes, okay? Oh, and the FCC does not require any Commissioners or staff to hold amateur radio licenses in order to regulate US amateur radio or issue amateur licenses. Let me know if that changes, too, please?

didit

1911. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-26 02:11:07 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <94qmbm$l7r$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2161

In article <94qm3a$l3j$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com> wrote:
>
> Weren't you on the other side of this argument last time?
>

Boy, and he calls *ME* a jerk!

73, Hans, K0HB

--
"We are fellow travelers on a journey between two
eternities, and it's a trip far too brief for me
to be concerned about your speed at the Code of
Morse."

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1912. Re: VHF history (long) (was: any ideas on HOw to learn Morse

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-26 02:33:14 UTC
From: 20kw <20kw@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <94qnlamgf1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2162

In article <Owjb6.1124$e5.2796228@news.ntplx.net>,
"Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net> wrote:
> <Steven J Robeson>; K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com> wrote
>
> > Of course, I am not the only one who challenges
Lennies "facts",
> > and I know that it requires no further re-posts of that already
> > stated. But if you insist.....
>
> Do you think that Len believes that what he says is untrue?
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
>

what a bunch of shit from a spinless wimp. this fool agrees with
everything. dont ya ever get a thout of your oqn eddie?

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1913. Re: I will no longer tolerate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-26 02:46:11 UTC
From: Toll Free <tollfree@bigradios.com>
Message-ID: <Sx5c6.278771$IP1.9148329@news1.giganews.com>
Source record: 2163
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

And what would you call a "real OS"?

Toll Free

"Stagger Lee" <SLee@houston.net> wrote in message
news:94qb2p$8ql$0@dosa.alt.net...
>
> On Thu, 25 Jan 2001 22:17:00 GMT, igotdapower <igotdapowa@hone.con> wrote:
> : X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
> : X-Newsreader: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.50.4133.2400
> : X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.50.4133.2400
> :
> : go get a real computer you web-tv geek, trying to hide behind Yahoo..
>
> Go get a real OS before daring to criticize others, you mindless minion
> of Microsoft mediocrity.

1914. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-26 03:04:39 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <e9q17tcdqvh852p8pkg5gajgtmqst2pfa7@4ax.com>
Source record: 2164

Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com> wrote:
>Is this the K3LT "broken leg and the wife is screaming" scenario?

No scenario, just a statement of fact/opinion... :-)

>HF always gets through?

HF SSB is the best *all around/all location* mobile rig for personal emergencies while traveling in a vehicle. There are few places that you can go where you cannot find a contact for any possible emergency communications. The same cannot be said for VHF/UHF...

>Or is it CW always gets through?

While I normally work 100% CW when I'm HF mobile, I always carry a mike in case of a personal emergency. IMO CW is the least effective tool for any emergency...

>Weren't you on the other side of this argument last time?

I think you will find this consistent with what
I have said in the past...

1915. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-26 03:04:41 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <94qpg9lks0@208.206.142.92>
Source record: 2165

"Ed Hare, W1RFI" wrote:
>
> Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote:
>
> > > Are saying that person petitioning his government to change a regulation
> > > that he believes is not in conformity with law and not in the public
> > > interest has no standing to file that petition?
>
> > Not really. It's perhaps more of a credibility issue.
>
> I don't believe that Larry is going through all of the work of serving on
> the NCI Board because he feels that doing so is easier than learning the
> code.

No, it's an inflated sense of selfpity.

1916. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-26 03:12:58 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <94qpvqnbk0@208.206.142.92>
Source record: 2166
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.policy

K0HB wrote:
>

> "We are fellow travelers on a journey between two
> eternities, and it's a trip far too brief for me
> to be concerned about your speed at the Code of
> Morse."
>

Me too - so long as you have a code speed.

1917. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-26 03:34:03 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <94qr7bqdl0@208.206.142.92>
Source record: 2167

Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> The problem is, as you note, "if I ran across the...".
> The reality is that there isn't any common HF assigned
> emergency frequency that people (hams) might be able
> to monitor for that unexpected emergency.

OF COURSE there is! Every state has at least one emergency frequency.
As always, you naturally assume that no one on a SSB frequency would
ever have any reason to use CW instead of SSB.

1918. Re: The Real Bill Clinton Legacy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-26 04:02:34 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3A70F6B0.107511F7@sccoast.net>
Source record: 2168
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Dan/W4NTI wrote:
>
> Very well put and accurate. I just heard
> the former President tell everyone how much
> good they had done. And that just because
> they were no longer in political power, that
> was not a reason to stop doing what they did
> for the last 8 years. Hmmmmmm, where's Monica?

Forget Monica. Did you see Bill's eyes light up, and the grin on his face, when he saw those cheerleaders during his farewell ceremony? Heck, I thought he was going to get up and start chasing them right there.

Look, I'm all for enjoying the view of a nice looking woman (and, even more, the pleasure of a nice woman), but that man really needs to learn that there is a place and a time for all this (the oval office is not that place and a farewell ceremony is not the time).

> I am holding out hope that after the American
> public saw the demoncrats in action in Florida,
> they will put an end to this feel good crap once
> and for all.

I guess we all have impossible hopes and dreams. ;-)

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net

1919. Re: The knuckle head here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-26 04:03:43 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <94qsuv$t7v$0@208.206.142.92>
Source record: 2169

```
Brian wrote:
>
> In article <94kbfe$mhj$1@208.207.71.163>,
> Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
> >
> >
> > Brian wrote:
> >
> > > Hopefully I won't
> > > suffer the kind of brain damage you did as a beginner.
> >
> > I should've remembered that all that bashing your head against walls
> > and knashing your teeth over a simple code test did it to you long,
> > long ago.
>
> Are you calling me a long time ham?
>
> Dick, abused hams grow up to abuse the ham family. Go get some
> counseling. Seriously.

Suture self, Doc.
```

1920. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-26 04:16:27 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A70FA1B.EE10EE27@IEEE.org>
Source record: 2170

Vincent Biancomano wrote:
>
> >If tested in court, I do not believe the Morse code requirement
> >would stand.
>
> Neither would the theory requirements. Unfortunately, that's not
> the issue.

Someone reported that the Morse code requirement was actually tested
in court and fell to the ADA. I think a rules/regulations requirement
would stand up in court.

Hope this is not a double posting. My newsreader screwed up.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

1921. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-26 04:59:33 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <94r07l$9gq$0@208.206.142.92>
Source record: 2171

"Ed Hare, W1RFI" wrote:
>
> I think you are mixing metaphors here, so to speak, but the point is well
> made. The FCC does not require consumer equipment manufacturers to include
> filtering.

Indeed I did miz intentional and unintentional radiators. It's the
unintentionals that need the missing although cheap filters.

> Part 15 is another story;

>snip good info<

> > When the Pt 15 NPRM was in process I wrote both the FCC and my
> > congressperson to insist that more be done to reduce the RFI that was
> > sure to come as result of the way it was written. FCC ignored me and
> > quickly convinced my congressman that there really was "no problem" with
> > it. That was a done deal long ago and won't addressed again.
>
> ARRL did too, with the same effect. And, in one sense, the FCC is right.
> 99 percent of the Part 15 devices do not cause harmful interference.
> Unfortunately, 1% of millions of devices is still a lot.

Problem is that no one knows who may do what to whom or how. The
potential is ubiquitous. Not until interference shows up and detective
work tracks it down and ID's it can the beginnings of a solution take
place. Lame plan. The stuff is likely to be any and anywhere.

>
> > Ed's work is probably the only effective force in place at all, and it is
> largely
> > educational, as we can see from here. And much of that education is
> > pointed at manufacturing engineers who have no clue about ham radio, it
> > seems.
>
> Yes, but, as amazing as it is, that education is having an effect. As I
> said in my lenghty post, the Home Phone Networkiung, VDSL and HomePlug specs
> all have notches to protect ham radio. It was NOT me alone that did it, but
> I have no doubt that had ARRL not been involved, it would not have happened
> that way. There are concerned hams who played pivotal roles on the VDSL
> committees, HPNA and HomePlug, and it would not have happened without them,
> either. It is a process of teamwork and cooperation, because under the
> present rules, that is about the best tool we have available.

Yeah I know, but you weren't tagged the "point man" without reason.

All good
> things do NOT come from Newington, CT, and in this area, I will continue to
> do what I did when I put the RFI Book together, draw on the best of the best
> of amateur radio to ensure that the end result is what is best for Amateur
> Radio. Fortunately, among those best are people who are willing to give,
> helped by others willing to support it. I tell, you, Dick; if you had told
> me three years ago that if ARRL asked the industry to do the right thing,
> and they would do so willingly, I would not have believed you. Even I have
> heard the whirl of the 'copter blades from time to time.
>

See, those loud choppy noises do some good after all!

> Will it always work out that way. I don't think so, but, IMHO, it was
> critical to get some successes under our belt, to demonstrate to the FCC
> that cooperation to avoid harmful interference works, and that it is not the
> exception. The first industry group that asserts that cooperation is not
> possible is going to have some powerful examples tossed at them. And, btw,
> the industries involved here are giants -- Lucent, Microsoft and the like
> are the key players on all these committees. The ARRL RFI Task Group
> meeting was hosted at Lucent, by Steve Strauss, a Lucent engineer and a
> member of the ARRL RFI Task Group.
>

IMO this sort of activity is one of the most critical functions of
ARRL. If they don't do it it most likely won't get done. I'm sure there
are other similar but less sensational, such as CCCR's. When you gonna
go to work with the same effectiveness on that one?

> In some cases, the right Part 15 sharing
> partner can be an asset. Remote control and similar devices often operate
> legally on 433.92 MHz. They typically transmit a few milliseconds every few
> minutes. That part of the band is already "occupied" by devices with a
> range of a few hundred feet at best, with signals that will sound like a
> fast dit to us. Harmful interference? The FCC probably would not think so.
> Will other, more harmful, Part 15 devices be likely to occupy this part of
> the band? Probably not. How about 2.4 GHz and the Bluetooth threat? Those
> devices, short range, will be around in the millions in a few years. Can we
> justify not allowing them there based on occupancy of 2.4 GHz? Probably not.
> Can hams adopt these spread-spectrum devices and fight fire with fire, using
> broadband technology to make use of that part of the band occupied by
> broadband technology? Sounds like it; maybe that is where some of our future
> is.

Goood analysis, should be read by every ham.

> I don't have all the answers, Dick

But you have a very good grip on the demensions of the problem ,from
which the answers derive. Most important.

but I am taking the support of people
> like you and me (I pay dues, too, just like you) and using it to keep at it.
> Each committee meeting I attend costs about $1,000 or so. Factoring in the

> expense of producing QST, I estimate that about 50 people are members to
> send me to one. Man, I hope that it is MY membership that pays for the
> ext -- sounds a lot more glamorous than helping to pay the heating bill.
> You and I both disagree with ARRL on issues like Morse code testing, in
> opposite directions, I am sure.

My disappointment is not so much with either the ARRL nor FCC, but with hams who won't recognize the obvious - that there is a communications advantage in every ham being able to communicate via radiotelegraphy.

But THIS sort of thing is what is really
> important. Little LEO threats and ground-imaging radar threats on 70 and a
> host of similar ones to come down the pike are going to make us or break us.
> I gotta' say, Dick, that as far as I am concerned, any one of these
> justified my dues dollars for 2001, increase and all. And I get QST, the Web
> and such besides.
>
> So when you do what I do; re-up in spite of some differences of opinion, let
> me know. I will personally thank a League member for helping to make it
> happen.

When I re-up it'll be due to the likes of you doing the work you do so well. A pat on the back is well deserved. And noted, as a definite valuable plus to continued membership. Right now I'm leaning in that direction. I got a renewal notice in the mail today. The three year membership looks to be a bargain what with the increase.

Now for a small proposal. Send me one of your "scratch and dent" Handbooks and I'll use it to formulate at least 10 new questions, following the format of those you posted the other day, to submit for consideration by the QPC. Also, I will send to you, by return mail, a copy of Robert L. Shrader's book
"Electronic Communication", fourth edition, for disposal as you see fit. It's not new but is in very good condition, suitable for a library most anywhere, I think. I ran across and bought a nice copy that I couldn't allow to remain derelict and I already had one.

If I find it not too time consuming I just might do more than ten questions.

1922. Re: I will no longer tolerate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-26 05:39:16 UTC
From: curious_dan@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <94r2i4$v3q$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2172
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <4_3c6.6940$49.675451@news1.rdc2.pa.home.com>,
"BigPoppaPump" <igotdapowa@hone.con> wrote:
> eat shit and die i can reboot and viola Linux , your not the only
one who
> uses it.
>
> "igotdapower" <igotdapowa@hone.con> wrote in message
> news:wB1c6.6624$49.607705@news1.rdc2.pa.home.com...
> > go get a real computer you web-tv geek, trying to hide behind
Yahoo..
> >
> >
> > <N8WWM@yahoo.com> wrote in message news:94poa2$or2
$1@nnrp1.deja.com...
> > > Illegal keyclowns. Amateurs or cbers you sell illegal stuff I
turn you
> in.
> > > End of story.
> > >
> > >
> > > Sent via Deja.com
> > > http://www.deja.com/
> >
> >
>
>

i make it or i break it, hell come in,....cd is out....

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1923. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-26 07:13:01 UTC
From: Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com>
Message-ID: <3A71237D.44AA0EF0@dvol.com>
Source record: 2173

Dick Carroll wrote:

> > "First priority, guys: how can we jerk this R&O around to make
> > life easier for US?" Once that's decided they pay cerimonial attention to
> > commenters like the ARRL.
> >
>
> I certainly agree. The League's restructuring proposal was very much
> appropriate and would have affected an orderly progression of the ARS.
> FCC evidently didn't give it more than a cursory look.

>
The NPRM was a joke. Read like it was written in 20 minutes by the 10th grade English class idiot then they made it an R&O. Wham, bam, outta here.
>

> I don;t know exactly when things changed, but it had have something to
> do with retirements and massive personnel changes.

>
Phil Kane has expounded on just that several times. He's about as digusted with the whole operation as it can get and he was one of 'em.
>

> Both ARRL and FCC are
> operating with totally different personnel than in the dasy when they
> collaborated closely in planning and making rules for the orderly
> administration of the ARS. I doubt we'll ever again see such close
> cooperation again. FCC has bigger fish to fry and ARS is a very small
> blip on a very large screen.

>
Sure, the telecomms biz has exploded since the good 'ole days, the population has grown, etc. Plus there is a much more pronounced tendency to do business in an adversarial arm's length mode. Stinks.
>
w3rv

1924. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-26 10:44:23 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010126054423.12054.00001691@ng-fl1.aol.com>
Source record: 2174

>From: Brian Kelly kelly@dvol.com

>FCC has bigger fish to fry and ARS is a very small
>> blip on a very large screen.

>Sure, the telecomms biz has exploded since the good 'ole days, the population
>has grown, etc. Plus there is a much more pronounced tendency
>to do business in an adversarial arm's length mode. Stinks.

I have to wonder how much all of the complaints about the disability-code-waiver system and the abuses played in the FCC's decision. I am sure they saw the ARS as an administrative pain in the butt at at that point. Even our friend Riley Hollingsworth is trying to give us a message about the effect of what he terms "petty squabbles."

IMHO, we should concentrate on the important issues. In my personal experience, the FCC is willing to devote considerable time and thought to what it believes to be legitimate and important issues. The unimportant ones can be round filed or swept away with one sweep of the rulemaking broom.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI
>>
>w3rv
>
>
>
>
>
>
>

1925. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-26 10:46:11 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010126054611.12054.00001692@ng-fl1.aol.com>
Source record: 2175

>From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

>> I don't believe that Larry is going through all of the work of serving on
>> the NCI Board because he feels that doing so is easier than learning the
>> code.

>No, it's an inflated sense of selfpity.

And why do you feel that Bill Sohl and Carl Stevenson are serving on the NCI
Board?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
>
>
>
>
>

1926. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-26 10:50:54 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010126055054.12054.00001693@ng-fl1.aol.com>
Source record: 2176

>From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

>> "We are fellow travelers on a journey between two
>> eternities, and it's a trip far too brief for me
>> to be concerned about your speed at the Code of
>> Morse."

>Me too - so long as you have a code speed.

Then you are concerned about his code speed. 0 is as real a number as 5.

If you ARE concerned about people having a code speed, you would be concerned about the large number of hams who pass their code tests and never use the code. Those who do not operate are also at 0 wpm.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

>
>
>
>

1927. Re: Top 10 Problems facing Amteur Radio? (was Re: ARRL code test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-26 10:54:08 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010126055408.12054.00001694@ng-fl1.aol.com>
Source record: 2177

>From: Brian Kelly kelly@dvol.com

>Have any idea when you might be in Philly? N2EY and self will
>pop for the lobster at Bookbinders.

No, but I will try to keep you posted. My next trip is to Miami next weekend.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1928. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-26 11:09:53 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <94rltu$e0g$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2178

In article <94qmbm$l7r$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org> wrote:
> In article <94qm3a$l3j$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
> Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com> wrote:
> >
> > Weren't you on the other side of this argument last time?
> >
>
> Boy, and he calls *ME* a jerk!

It was only a question, and if I called you a jerk, I apologize. You
have jerk-like tendencies only occasionally. :)

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1929. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-26 11:17:01 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <94rmb9edc1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2180

In article <e9q17tcdqvh852p8pkg5gajgtmqst2pfa7@4ax.com>,
Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com> wrote:
> Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com> wrote:
> >Is this the K3LT "broken leg and the wife is screaming" scenario?
>
> No scenario, just a statement of fact/opinion... :-)
>
> >HF always gets through?
>
> HF SSB is the best *all around/all location* mobile rig for personal
> emergencies while traveling in a vehicle. There are few places that
> you can go where you cannot find a contact for any possible emergency
> communications. The same cannot be said for VHF/UHF...

Perhaps. Mobiles usually use vertical whip antennas. How do you solve
the NVIS issue in that situation?
>
> >Or is it CW always gets through?
>
> While I normally work 100% CW when I'm HF mobile, I always carry a
> mike in case of a personal emergency. IMO CW is the least effective
> tool for any emergency...

Even on the FISTS frequencies?

> >Weren't you on the other side of this argument last time?
>
> I think you will find this consistent with what
> I have said in the past...

Probably so. Well, I've got to get ready for werk, so enough of me
being a jerk (according to Hans).

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1930. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-26 11:19:50 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010126061950.12054.00001698@ng-fl1.aol.com>
Source record: 2179

>From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

>Problem is that no one knows who may do what to whom or how. The
>potential is ubiquitous. Not until interference shows up and detective
>work tracks it down and ID's it can the beginnings of a solution take
>place. Lame plan. The stuff is likely to be any and anywhere.

When I went to Phoenix a few months ago for a convention, I also did some field testing on VDSL. I brought a small 80 M loop antenna with me, to do some DFing. While there, I also heard a few of the PX-421 wireless modem jacks. They were literally audible in my /M setup for a couple of miles on the mobile whip. I tracked down one source in about 30 minutes of driving around, holding the loopstick out the window. It was really dramatic being able to drive past the house where it was installed and see the null. Phoenix was ideal for that, however, with underground wiring. If the overhead wires were radiating, I never would have gotten a null.

That is all bad enough. What about the aggregate of many, many devices being heard at once. One alone is not harmful interference, but put 'em all together. Those NTIA studies show just that on 2.4 GHz. A couple of hams on the west coast have done the same.

>>It is a process of teamwork and cooperation, because under the
>> present rules, that is about the best tool we have available.

> Yeah I know, but you weren't tagged the "point man" without reason.

Actually, my RFI work at HQ has just sorta' grown up on its own. I do what is right for ham radio in a number of areas and they let me. It beats letting my boss think up things for me to do. :-)

>>Even I have heard the whirl of the 'copter blades from time to time.

> See, those loud choppy noises do some good after all!

No, had I acted on my suspicion that the BBEI (Big Bux of Evil Industry) would never do the right thing, the outcome would not have been so good. There are times to be adversarial, but trying the cooperative approach first is much faster, and if you have to get adversarial, being able to demonstrate that you tried to be cooperative first is a plus.

>>I'm sure there are other similar but less sensational, such as CCCR's.
>>When you gonna go to work with the same effectiveness on that one?

I personally won't be doing that. I have quite enough bit off already, and as I all too well know, if one takes on more than one can handle, the end result suffers.

>> In some cases, the right Part 15 sharing
>> partner can be an asset.

> Goood analysis, should be read by every ham.

One of the things I hope to have more time for is to develop more info packages for the ARRL Web page and maybe a few articles. Hams need to understand better what it took me a long time to understand -- in today's world, spectrum is shared. It is NOT our 420-MHz band, we are one of several sharing partners, including the military and radar (primary to use) and Part 15, (secondary to us). On 2.4 GHz, we are primary to Part 15 and secondary to Industrial, Scientific and Medical. The trick is finding compatibile sharing partners and choosing compatibile operating modes with the other signals on the band.

> My disappointment is not so much with either the ARRL nor FCC, but with
>hams who won't recognize the obvious - that there is a communications
>advantage in every ham being able to communicate via radiotelegraphy.

Yes, there is some ignorance about OOK CW, Dick, in both directions. Some hams do believe that it is the most effective mode in the Universe. It is not; some of the digital modes will blow it away. Others pooh pooh the mode and don't see that, of the modes commonly available to hams, it is the most effective under most noisy conditions.

Sure, there is a communications advantage of having every ham able to communicate with Morse code. But it ain't gonna' happen, and it has not been so since I was first licensed. If the regulatory goal was to have every ham able to communicate with Morse, then the FCC rules would require that every ham maintain Morse code transmitting and receiving equipment. You filed extensive comments with the FCC, did you not? Did those comments ask that every ham maintain Morse code equipment? Probably not.

The reason that I believe to behind most desire to maintain the code test is that some hams who do not believe in the usefulness of the mode as much as I do feel that without forcing people to learn the code, the mode will fade away. I disagree.

The bottom line, Dick, is, IMHO, Morse code testing will almost certainly be removed from the Amateur Radio Service, as a minimum in its present form. That means that the ONLY tools you and I will have to promote its use will be to educate hams about its merits and to encourage them to try it. That job will have been seriously undermined later by the way Morse code is being presented now, as a soul-hardening task to be undertaken to keep the evil one out of ham radio.

> When I re-up it'll be due to the likes of you doing the work you do so
>well. A pat on the back is well deserved.
No pat necessary, Dick; it was my job. I am proud to do it, and I try to do it well, but the only reason it is happening is because 165,000 people chipped in.

> The three year membership looks to be a bargain what with the increase.

$31 a year for the non-senior dues, vs $39 a year after they go up. I figure I will hang with ARRL at least 3 years, so I ponied up the $93.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1931. Re: Top 10 Problems facing Amteur Radio? (was Re: ARRL code test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-26 12:39:22 UTC
From: Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com>
Message-ID: <3A716FF9.13995DB4@dvol.com>
Source record: 2181

W1RFI wrote:

> My next trip is to Miami next weekend.

>
Pore thing, dress warmly . . .
>

> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

>
w3rv

1932. Re: ARRL Life Membership - Don't buy one!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-26 14:36:06 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nospam.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.g7qodv3.pminews@ca.news.verio.net>
Source record: 2183

On 25 Jan 2001 11:42:37 GMT, W1RFI wrote:

>Not so, Paul, ARRL maintains an investment folio that is funded, in part, by
>the Life Membership dues it has taken in over the decades. While I am not at
>all sure of the exact relationship between the folio and LM dues, it is pretty
>clear that without those prepaid memberships, the money would not be there.
>The proceeds for the investments serve both to keep the investments growing to
>match or exceed inflation and as part of the annual operating costs of the
>League.

>When you shelled out those beans so many years ago, that was a chunk of change,
>indeed. You could have invested it yourself and used the proceeds to pay your
>annual dues, just like ARRL is doing. In that sense, you have indeed paid and
>shouldn't see yourself as a money loser at all.

IIRC the Life Membership fee was 20 times the annual membership
when I signed up. That's self-maintaing if the investment
earns 5% annual interest. Some years it can, other years it's
more difficult.

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

1933. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-26 14:36:07 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nospam.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.g7qny42.pminews@ca.news.verio.net>
Source record: 2182

On Wed, 24 Jan 2001 20:38:04 -0500, Larry Klose wrote:

>Are saying that person petitioning his government to change a regulation
>that he believes is not in conformity with law and not in the public
>interest has no standing to file that petition?

Well-known provision of law in the US - One has no standing to
file unless and until one is injured somehow by that law.
Federal law requires an actual "case or controversy". "Bystander
gotchas" don't count.

>The matter more or less before the Commission is complaint against the
>political, legal and constitutional validity of a the Morse code exam
>regulation. An attack against the petitioner is irrelevant.

Attacking the standing of the petitioner is _de rigeur_ in such
cat fights.

One more example of being a wannabe and missing the gut-level
recognition of the above principles of litigation.

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

1934. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-26 15:03:12 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <94s3jg$4l6$0@208.206.142.91>
Source record: 2184

W1RFI wrote:
>
> >From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
>
> >> I don't believe that Larry is going through all of the work of serving on
> >> the NCI Board because he feels that doing so is easier than learning the
> >> code.
>
> >No, it's an inflated sense of selfpity.
>
> And why do you feel that Bill Sohl and Carl Stevenson are serving on the NCI
> Board?

Probably because they don't see any value in knowing how to use CW on
the air, I'd imagine. But so far they don't keep insisting it's a
Federal civil rights case, at least on rrap.

1935. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-26 15:37:59 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <94s5kn$9jq$0@208.206.142.91>
Source record: 2185

W1RFI wrote:
>
> >From: Brian Kelly kelly@dvol.com
>
> >FCC has bigger fish to fry and ARS is a very small
> >> blip on a very large screen.
>
> >Sure, the telecomms biz has exploded since the good 'ole days, the population
> >has grown, etc. Plus there is a much more pronounced tendency
> >to do business in an adversarial arm's length mode. Stinks.
>
> I have to wonder how much all of the complaints about the
> disability-code-waiver system and the abuses played in the FCC's decision.

No doubt, FCC got saddled with that one and there wasn't a whole lot
they could do with it that was effective but also fair and not
vulnerable to abuse.

I am
> sure they saw the ARS as an administrative pain in the butt at at that point.

If there were no applicants taking advantage of it there would be no
problem. But we know that won't work all time.

> Even our friend Riley Hollingsworth is trying to give us a message about the
> effect of what he terms "petty squabbles."

Yeah, but he's concerned with the nonsense frequencies on SSB. As N2EY
points out, you don't hear that stuff on CW.

> IMHO, we should concentrate on the important issues. In my personal experience,
> the FCC is willing to devote considerable time and thought to what it believes
> to be legitimate and important issues. The unimportant ones can be round filed
> or swept away with one sweep of the rulemaking broom.

Which really means it is vital that FCC and ARRL be in direct constant
communication so that there is no doubt about what is important and what
is not. I'm not sure that has been happening effectively and reliably in
the past few years.

1936. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-26 15:53:42 UTC
From: vlfiscus@mcn.net
Message-ID: <t737c6iuj25v1d@news.supernews.com>
Source record: 2186

w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote in
<20010124184216.18775.00001118@ng-da1.aol.com>:

>>From: Cecil Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>
>>The next board may be made up of completely different people.
>
>If memory serves, the ARRL Board has as members 9 people who were not
>Directors the last time the Board set ARRL policy.
>
>>If you believe your opinion to be the majority opinion, it shouldn't
>>take too much work to load the next board with pro-code-test people.
>
>Or vice versa. Member input is important. I do know that the member
>input in some Divisions was quite different from the member input in
>others. At least one Director immediately recognized the
>"organization-based" input, with a group of pro-code folks all writing
>at the same time, then a group of no-code-test folks writing a bit
>later, as FISTS and NCI asked its members to contact ARRL. :-) The
>hard part, IMHO, is figuring out how important this issue is to the
>folks in the middle.

It's not hard ED, the league knew how its members felt long before the
issue came up from results of member surveys, but the board of directors
choose to stick their heads up their rectums and ignored us.

1937. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-26 16:01:27 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A719F57.C2DD7FE0@IEEE.org>
Source record: 2187

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> W1RFI wrote:
> > And why do you feel that Bill Sohl and Carl Stevenson are serving on the NCI
> > Board?
>
> Probably because they don't see any value in knowing how to use CW on
> the air, I'd imagine.

The value in knowing how to use CW on the air is obvious to everyone.
The value of the Morse code requirement is not obvious to everyone.
We don't need laws designed to protect us from ourselves.

The value in wearing a motorcycle helmet is obvious to everyone.
The value of a helmet requirement is so non-obvious that many
states, including Texas and Arizona, have dropped the requirement.
We don't need laws designed to protect us from ourselves.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

1938. Re: ARRL Life Membership - Don't buy one!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-26 17:17:18 UTC
From: vlfiscus@mcn.net
Message-ID: <t73c8uqvij1a3a@news.supernews.com>
Source record: 2188
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.swap

Spurious@StarBand.net (Ed G.) wrote in
<Xns9033A308FF9AFFrog207Junocom@127.0.0.1>:

>While the ARRL's policies may not be
>agreeable to every ham, they are the only organization with any clout
>to stand between the amateur community and the FCC and a Spectrum
>hungry Congress that would love to sell off our frequencies to business
>users..
> Ed WB6SAT
>

The ARRL says they're trying to protect spectrum, true, but their own dumbed-down licensing & limp-wristed policy proposals will make it more and more difficult for them to do so, because how can they successfully defend amateur spectrum when its users are increasingly becoming as dumb as a post and as useless as CB'ers? Soon, there won't be anything good left to defend. What words can the ARRL use to convince the FCC or Congress that the spectrum is best left to poor operators with bad operating habits? The scenario is akin to a FLY defending a Dung-Heap (ARRL being the fly), they're trying to defend a service that progressively gets stinkier with every new policy they propose. If the ARRL wants to defend amateur radio, let them propose improving licensing standards. The high merits, integrity, and abilities of spectrum users is what will protect the spectrum best and will provide a pool of quality radio operators for service to the country when needed. Real Value!
I'd still be a league member today, maybe even a life member, but the ARRL screwed up when it went against it's long held principles and the founding purposes amateur radio was built on.

1939. Re: This Just In . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-26 17:19:48 UTC
From: vlfiscus@mcn.net
Message-ID: <t73cdk31kc2a7f@news.supernews.com>
Source record: 2189
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org (Cecil) wrote in <3A6F7B97.A6BE2105@IEEE.org>:

>"Vince Fiscus, KB7ADL" wrote:
>> Can you say: "CQ Breaker, CQ Breaker, this here's Good-Buddy-Ham on
>> twenty meters, anyone got their ears on? c'mon back. Ten-four
>> Ten-four good- buddy, I got ya and yer gettin out..."
>
>Wow, words from an obvious expert.

I don't know what it means, I was hoping you could translate it for me
Cecil.

KB7ADL

1940. Re: ARRL Life Membership - Don't buy one!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-26 17:58:51 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <94sdsl$3k6$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2191
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.swap

In article <t73c8uqvij1a3a@news.supernews.com>,
vlfiscus@mcn.net (Vince Fiscus, KB7ADL) wrote:

> ..... long held principles and the
> founding purposes amateur radio was built on.

Mostly the early amateurs that "amateur radio was built on" were a
bunch of unruly rascals who roamed the spectrum at will, interfering
with commercial and military stations alike, and had to be rounded up
and corralled at "200 meters and below". Far worse than today's CB
crowd by a long shot!

73, de Hans, K0HB
--
"We are fellow travelers on a journey between two
eternities, and it's a trip far too brief for me
to be concerned about your speed at the Code of
Morse."

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1941. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-26 18:04:57 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010126130457.01651.00000481@nso-fp.aol.com>
Source record: 2190

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.g7qny42.pminews@ca.news.verio.net>, "Phil Kane"
<Phil.Kane@nospam.spam> writes:

>On Wed, 24 Jan 2001 20:38:04 -0500, Larry Klose wrote:
>
>>Are saying that person petitioning his government to change a regulation
>>that he believes is not in conformity with law and not in the public
>>interest has no standing to file that petition?
>
> Well-known provision of law in the US - One has no standing to
> file unless and until one is injured somehow by that law.
> Federal law requires an actual "case or controversy". "Bystander
> gotchas" don't count.

So...what are you actually saying there? Seems to me it is a nice
bit of wording that says "shut the hell up because you don't count
unless you've done the same thing as I did." Or are you saying
that it is somehow "improper" to petition our government unless
one is "injured?"

Seems to me that there is a rather actual CONTROVERSY going
on in regards to one small regulation by a government agency.
Are you saying that there is "no controversy" just because you
don't believe there is one?!? Or are you just saying the above
to try and make some kind of case for a demand to shut up?

>>The matter more or less before the Commission is complaint against the
>>political, legal and constitutional validity of a the Morse code exam
>>regulation. An attack against the petitioner is irrelevant.
>
> Attacking the standing of the petitioner is _de rigeur_ in such
> cat fights.

Interesting resort to a French phrase which means something
like "SOP." :-)

I suppose such pseudo-sophisticated statements are necessary
when some cats get scratched...and the result is a carefully
worded version of "#$%&!!!, do it like I had to do it...!"

> One more example of being a wannabe and missing the gut-level
> recognition of the above principles of litigation.

Oh, my, what next? Quotations of Case Law in the USA? :-)

What is your take on the FCC's own statements (in 1990 and in
1999 Reports and Orders) that it does not feel that a separate

morse code test does not meet their requirements in determining whether or not an examinee can be considered suitable for an amateur radio license?

Would you stuff the FCC's own statements into the "wannabe" and "gut-level recognition" pile? Or will you acknowledge that the FCC is currently the regulator of US civil radio regardless of the current administration and your views of the political leanings of the about-to-be new Commission Chief?

...the reply has all the bunting and flags of "when I was younger we did things the 'right' way" attitude. :-)

didit

1942. Re: Will you let them take away your guns?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-26 19:15:08 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <94sibk$7pu$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2192

In article <3A708046.9978C11B@uci.edu>,
Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote:
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> > In article <3A6DD753.66F79733@uci.edu>, Jim Kelley
<jwkelley@uci.edu> writes:
>
> > >Cecil wrote:
> > >> I think the people who want high taxes should pay them and the
people
> > >> who don't want high taxes should pay less. In other words, tax
the
> > >> liberals at a higher rate than the conservatives. Then count the
> > >> number of liberals. :-)
>
> > >I've often thought exactly the same thing. An excellent idea - and
very
> > >fair. The only problem is that the liberals don't think THEY
should pay
> > >more taxes - it's only the OTHER guy who should pay more taxes.
>
> > That's just the way liberals think.
>
> I know.
>
> > So, the next time you see some Environmentalist telling you
> > where you can't build a nuclear power plant, tell them to get
> > back in their Volvo and go back to their gated residential
> > community and play a round of golf -- because unless they
> > are living in a cave, wearing a buckhide union suit, and have
> > never pissed into porcelin, they can't tell you a damn thing!
>
> Did you hear about the proposed new Southgate, Ca. power plant? Very
> clean burning gas plant with all the state-of-the-art scrubbers;
> replaces a huge diesel truck facility currently on the site; reduces
the
> annual tonnage of pollution emmission by a substantial margin; and the
> people turned out en masse - in the middle of an electrical energy
> crisis - to shout it down.
>
> I think the reason in this case is the people feel as though their
> neighborhood, which is economically depressed, is being used as a
> dumping ground. They just use environmentalism as their excuse not to
> have the plant in their backyard. The little picture takes on greater

> importance than the big picture.
>
> 73, Jim AC6XG

Well, maybe if they can get their girlfriend to fill out a job application for them, and go drug-free long enough to pass a urinalysis, they might get a janitorial or security job at the new power plant. Then they can go to night school and get a GED, so they can apply for better positions, such as pipefitter, instrument tech, etc. Then they can move to Monterrey and commute 2 hours in an SUV...

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1943. Re: Will you let them take away your guns?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-26 19:25:15 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <94siug$8d8$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2193

In article <20010125045002.07593.00003975@nso-ch.aol.com>,
yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote:

> For the first time in eight years, I have renewed faith in my
> government.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

If he rolls back Brady and the GCA68, we'll be back on the right track.
I also want him to open military artillery ranges the third weekend of
every month for civilian cannon practice.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1944. Re: This Just In . . .

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-26 19:31:29 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A71D091.BB59C661@IEEE.org>
Source record: 2194
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Vince Fiscus, KB7ADL" wrote:
>
> Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org (Cecil) wrote in <3A6F7B97.A6BE2105@IEEE.org>:
>
> >"Vince Fiscus, KB7ADL" wrote:
> >> Can you say: "CQ Breaker, CQ Breaker, this here's Good-Buddy-Ham on
> >> twenty meters, anyone got their ears on? c'mon back. Ten-four
> >> Ten-four good- buddy, I got ya and yer gettin out..."
> > >
> > >Wow, words from an obvious expert.
>
> I don't know what it means, I was hoping you could translate it for me
> Cecil.

Of course you know what it means because your CB syntax is perfect. And
it doesn't appear to violate a single FCC regulation while getting the
meaning across perfectly. It's the kind of stuff I do on the air just
to aggravate the Radio Policeï¿½.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

1945. Re: ARRL Life Membership - Don't buy one!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-26 19:33:16 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A71D0FC.F7219BE7@IEEE.org>
Source record: 2195
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.swap

"Vince Fiscus, KB7ADL" wrote:
> The ARRL says they're trying to protect spectrum, true, but their own
> dumbed-down licensing & limp-wristed policy proposals will make it more
> and more difficult for them to do so, because how can they successfully
> defend amateur spectrum when its users are increasingly becoming as dumb
> as a post and as useless as CB'ers?

That's certainly easier to defend than the 'no users' scenario.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

1946. Re: Will you let them take away your guns?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-26 19:41:00 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <94sjs9$9ep$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2196

In article <3A7077A1.82B5FA5D@uci.edu>,
Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote:
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > "Rebellion for rebellion's sake" is
> > the last thing law-abiding gun owners have in mind, and I, for
> > one, would be more likely to act to quash any such rebellion as
> > to be a part of it.
>
> Then I think we're more or less on the same page in that regard.
>
> > When American citizens have the right to keep
> > and bear arms, that right, by itself, is a powerful check against
> > any possibility of governmental tyranny -- the same way that
> > states with liberal CCW licensing have experienced a major
> > reduction in gun-related violent crime.
>
> I think gun related crime and government tyranny are two disparate
> things.

Does government related crime fall in there anywhere?

> But my point has been all along that arms in the possession
of
> citizens is no longer a check on government tyranny. The balance of
> power is too lop sided. That argument is the weakest of all the NRA
> arguments. Don't get me wrong, Larry. I support the right to keep
and
> bear arms. It's just with the present atmosphere of pressure to
> increase gun control laws, the NRA needs to put forward it's strongest
> arguments.

The Constitutional argument is lame?

Which are the strong arguments?

> There's not going to be another revolution, and it sounds
> really lame to talk about needing to be prepared in case of one.

We've lived a generation not being allowed to own offensive weapons.
Within this generation, we will not be allowed defensive weapons. By
the third generation, even "sporting" weapons will be gone.

The liberals will round up all the mounted deer antlers and send them to
China to make afro-deesiacs under some favored nation treaty.

> > When "they" start talking
> > seriously about taking that right away, as they actually did in

> > England, Australia, and other Third-World countries, then it's
> > time to start seriously thinking about acting on such a "rebellion."
>
> It would take a Constitutional Ammendment to eliminate the 2nd
> Ammendment. And if enough people were to vote to get rid of it, which
> is extremely unlikely in any foreseeable future, then you're going to
be
> seriously outnumbered by the majority. The outcome would have been
> arrived at in a democratic process - not by government tyrrany - and
you
> would be in violation of the law to start shooting at people over it.

Then it would be time to move to Texas, go back to being an independant
nation.

> > I'm sure President Bush isn't going to permit that to happen.
>
> Heck, even Clinton didn't suggest that it should happen.

He didn't speak out against those voices that do advocate it.

> > For the first time in eight years, I have renewed faith in my
> > government.
>
> Hey man, the government is just the same as it was. Some of the names
> on the roster have changed.
>
> 73, Jim AC6XG

Do you really believe that?

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1947. Re: ARRL Life Membership - Don't buy one!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-26 20:36:12 UTC
From: "Rev. John Ryding" <zionluth@southwind.net>
Message-ID: <3A71DFBC.1721CBB7@southwind.net>
Source record: 2197
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.swap

Seem's like the ARRL can't win, doesn't it. When folks were screaming to have the code requirement reduced or removed, the League was seen as a bunch of old fogies who wanted nothing better than to keep out anyone unable to copy code. Now that the licensing structure appears to have favored the no-code crowd, the opposition thinks the League is at fault.

If you want to change the League, join and vote. If you are not a member, quit complaining. The only reason I'm not a life member is the cost. I should have become a life member as soon as I was licensed in 1977. It would have paid for itself several times now.

Join the League or not. But the issue of licensing and code requirements are not decisions they make. The ARRL is the most vocal representation we, as amateurs and others, have with respect to hobby radio. If not for the League, only commercial interests would be heard by the FCC.

My opinion. I apologize to the newsgroup for wasting space where I would rather read posts swapping gear.

John Ryding
WW0H - ww0h@arrl.net

Cecil wrote:

> "Vince Fiscus, KB7ADL" wrote:
> > The ARRL says they're trying to protect spectrum, true, but their own
> > dumbed-down licensing & limp-wristed policy proposals will make it more
> > and more difficult for them to do so, because how can they successfully
> > defend amateur spectrum when its users are increasingly becoming as dumb
> > as a post and as useless as CB'ers?
>
> That's certainly easier to defend than the 'no users' scenario.
> --
> http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

1948. Re: Will you let them take away your guns?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-26 20:41:36 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A71E100.9E291819@uci.edu>
Source record: 2198

Brian wrote:

> Then they can move to Monterrey and commute 2 hours in an SUV...

What kind of an SUV averages 180 miles an hour on the interstate?

ac6xg

1949. Re: Will you let them take away your guns?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-26 20:45:48 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A71E1FC.4EFFC38B@uci.edu>
Source record: 2199

Brian wrote:
> Jim wrote
> > Hey man, the government is just the same as it was. Some of the names
> > on the roster have changed.

> Do you really believe that?

yeah. It was in all the papers.

1950. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-26 21:38:58 UTC
From: xjim@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <94sqph$g29$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2200

> What the HW-7 lacks, however, is any specific frequency
> stability/readout. In using the HW-7 you must hope
> someone happens to just be tuning across the frequency
> you are transmitting.

You raise several good points. Frequency agility has the advantage of being able to break into a QSO in progress. The Hw-7 used to be worthwhile for ragchew if you had a xtal in the Novice band, because it was so full of signals all the time, and lots of people would tune around after making a call. It's not happening much anymore because there are fewer Novices, and there are fewer people who have had the inclination to learn efficient operating techniques anymore. These are some of the things "not stated". Your questions reveal that (like many today) you weren't required to develop certain skills that are better developed with HF CW QRP operations. So sadly, you don't know what I'm talking about. I can only blame this on the licensing structure, because even though 97.1 is well stated, the license structure just isn't supporting it anymore.
http://www.arrl.org/FandES/field/regulations/news/part97/

Another idea (probably stated more fully in the 87.400's) is that there are no specific assigned emergency frequencies in ham radio, because they are ALL Emergency frequencies. The idea, was that ALL hams be able to support emergency communications and that ANYONE be able to perform them. The 2-meter mobile is a great asset, but on longer trips, you may find large stretches of no coverage, or repeaters where all the regulars are either on the road themselves or just busy elsewhere. In addition to developing an emergency comm's monitoring system on a local wide area machine, you should also look into ARRL operating aids and publications (even older ones devoted to Novice training) and get involved with CW NTS nets and MARS (you don't have to do it all at once, but each are good experiences).

>
> Actually, you could include a solar panel and/or a hand generator
> to power it.

The solar panel would be far too fragile, but the hand generator idea has promise. There is a Short-Wave receiver on the market, that has a clock spring generator, that can power the radio for 30 minutes after being wound up. Neat!

Jim, ac6tk

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1951. Re: Will you let them take away your guns?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-26 21:40:48 UTC
From: Carl Zager <kb9rvb@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <94sqsv$g69$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2201

In article <3A71E100.9E291819@uci.edu>,
Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote:
> Brian wrote:
>
> > Then they can move to Monterrey and commute 2 hours in an SUV...
>
> What kind of an SUV averages 180 miles an hour on the interstate?
>
> ac6xg
>
White Ford Broncos -- oh, wait, that was 20mph and there was a handgun
in it.

--
Carl Zager
http://www.mccsc.edu/~czager
kb9rvb@my-deja.com

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1952. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-26 21:49:07 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A71F0D3.683B2DF8@uci.edu>
Source record: 2202

Larry Klose wrote:
> Before April 15, 200 a person could become an Extra and miss
> every question on Part 97 rules except two question on the Novice test.

> Apparent the rules were not as important a manual Morse code proficiency.

They were less concerned with testing back then, because the Hammurabi
code was pretty much the rule of the day. ;-)

1953. Re: I will no longer tolerate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-26 22:04:20 UTC
From: BigPoppaPump <igotdapowa@hone.con>
Message-ID: <Evmc6.8010$49.1024218@news1.rdc2.pa.home.com>
Source record: 2203
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

HELLO CD, YOUR TAG IN THE GARDEN IS GONE....

<curious_dan@my-deja.com> wrote in message
news:94r2i4$v3q$1@nnrp1.deja.com...
> In article <4_3c6.6940$49.675451@news1.rdc2.pa.home.com>,
> "BigPoppaPump" <igotdapowa@hone.con> wrote:
> > eat shit and die i can reboot and viola Linux , your not the only
> one who
> > uses it.
> >
> > "igotdapower" <igotdapowa@hone.con> wrote in message
> > news:wB1c6.6624$49.607705@news1.rdc2.pa.home.com...
> > > go get a real computer you web-tv geek, trying to hide behind
> Yahoo..
> > >
> > >
> > > <N8WWM@yahoo.com> wrote in message news:94poa2$or2
> $1@nnrp1.deja.com...
> > > > Illegal keyclowns. Amateurs or cbers you sell illegal stuff I
> turn you
> > in.
> > > > End of story.
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > Sent via Deja.com
> > > > http://www.deja.com/
> > >
> > >
> > >
> >
> >
>
> i make it or i break it, hell come in,....cd is out....
>
>
> Sent via Deja.com
> http://www.deja.com/

1954. Re: ARRL Life Membership - Don't buy one!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-26 22:12:09 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <xEmc6.1229$e5.3045170@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 2204
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Vince Fiscus, KB7ADL <vlfiscus@mcn.net> wrote:

> If the ARRL wants to defend amateur radio, let them propose improving licensing
> standards.

In its comments to the FCC wrt restructuring, the ARRL you espouse so strongly asked the FCC to increase the technical content of the written exams to offset any changes in Morse-code testing.

> The high merits, integrity, and abilities of spectrum users is
> what will protect the spectrum best and will provide a pool of quality
> radio operators for service to the country when needed. Real Value!

The ARRL has been steadily improving its Tech Info pages on the Web, has changed QST to offer material to help the newcomer learn the ropes, has started an Educational and Certification program, all intended to help hams be better hams and better fulfill the goals of the Service.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1955. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-26 22:12:39 UTC
From: xjim@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <94ssofhtr1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2205

> And morse code using simple equipment makes that a non-issue
> because?

Nothing about ham radio makes this a non-issue.

> If the available people aren't familiar with their
> gear, then shame on those that had responsibility
> for building the preparedness before hand.

http://x58.deja.com/threadmsg_ct.xp?
AN=720652289.1&mhitnum=51&CONTEXT=980546585.1715470374

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1956. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-26 23:07:30 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nospam.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.g7sbjh0.pminews@ca.news.verio.net>
Source record: 2206

On 26 Jan 2001 18:04:57 GMT, Len Over 21 wrote:

>> Well-known provision of law in the US - One has no standing to
>> file unless and until one is injured somehow by that law.
>> Federal law requires an actual "case or controversy". "Bystander
>> gotchas" don't count.
>
>So...what are you actually saying there? Seems to me it is a nice
>bit of wording that says "shut the hell up because you don't count
>unless you've done the same thing as I did." Or are you saying
>that it is somehow "improper" to petition our government unless
>one is "injured?"

One has standing to file suit in Federal proceedings when
one is affected somehow by the statute or reg or action of the
agency. To use your inaccurate phrasing, when one is injured
or can be injured.

If passing the test is the only barrier to getting the
license, you have standing to protest things about the test -
you are "affected". If you are not eligible to get the
license even if you pass the test, (a representative of a
foreign country, for instance) you do not have standing
to protest the test but do have standing to protest the bar
that affects you.

>Seems to me that there is a rather actual CONTROVERSY going
>on in regards to one small regulation by a government agency.
>Are you saying that there is "no controversy" just because you
>don't believe there is one?!? Or are you just saying the above
>to try and make some kind of case for a demand to shut up?

The trial court judge determines if there is a true "case or
controversy". Smart lawyers make sure that one exists before
filing Federal proceedings.

>>>The matter more or less before the Commission is complaint against the
>>>political, legal and constitutional validity of a the Morse code exam
>>>regulation. An attack against the petitioner is irrelevant.
>>
>> Attacking the standing of the petitioner is _de rigeur_ in such
>> cat fights.
>
>Interesting resort to a French phrase which means something
>like "SOP." :-)

Right on, brother. I once was the recipient of such an attack
by an opposing attorney because I disclosed in a petition
against his client that I was a former FCC employee, even
though the law required me to make such a disclosure in that
proceeding. SOP indeed.

"If the facts are against you, pound on the law. If the law is
against you, pound on the facts. If both are against you,
pound on the opponent. If everything is against you, pound on
the table."

>What is your take on the FCC's own statements (in 1990 and in
>1999 Reports and Orders) that it does not feel that a separate
>morse code test does not meet their requirements in determining
>whether or not an examinee can be considered suitable for an
>amateur radio license?

IOW - they feel that a separate Morse test meets their
reuirements ... they're the ones who set the rules...whether
they are accurate or not.

My personal feelings - do away with the Morse TEST. I've been
public with that for years.

>Would you stuff the FCC's own statements into the "wannabe"
>and "gut-level recognition" pile? Or will you acknowledge that
>the FCC is currently the regulator of US civil radio regardless of
>the current administration and your views of the political leanings
>of the about-to-be new Commission Chief?

What planet did you just arrive from, Len?

Ever since the reign of Madman Mark (Fowler) I've had no
problem separating the agency and its function (which I
respect) from the Five Tubeless Tyres who sit on the Eighth
Floor and flail around in their attempts to steer the agency
(whom I may not respect).

To quote my erstwhile teacher, Mr. Justice Marshall:
"What do you mean that folks may not like you? President
Eisenhower is President of the United States and half the
people in the country don't like HIM..." <ggg>

R.I.P. Brother Thurgood.....

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

1957. Re: QCWA TELLS FCC TO END INCENTIVE LICENSING

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-26 23:14:46 UTC
From: Bob Wex w2ilp <w2ilp@juno.com>
Message-ID: <94t0cu$l79$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2207

In article <20010125063219.06242.00001325@ng-ff1.aol.com>,
w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:
> >From: Bob Wex w2ilp w2ilp@juno.com
>
> >The political belief among present FCC leaders is that all of the
public
> >must be given as much access to all of the bandwidth that the
spectrum
> >and the information highway can provide.
>
> The public already has access to all amateur frequencies. They can
do so at
> high power, by passing the exams, or a low power, by using devices
that meet
> the requirements of Part 15. All amateur spectrum is shared.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare,W1RFI
>
I agree that the public is being given more access to masws
communication...
BUT
the large telecommunicators have again stopped the low power FM
community stations from operating legally and we are seeing the mergers
of media giants including newspapers, radio and TV that were once
deemed monopolistic...
as for HAM RADIO: -- Hams are but a minor subclass of the public.
They are those hobbiests who have followed FCC regulations and applied
to take ham exams...They are not "the public" at large. IMHO they
should remain protected...That is - the frequency allocations should
remaion protected...
BUT
Politically if they want to remain protected they must prove their
worth to the USA, over and above the public. An amateur Radio Operator
is no longer an apprentice commercial radio operator. Modern
technology has made the commercial FCC Radio Operator obsolete and thus
the Ham who is a commercial radio operator in waiting is also obsolete.
The only way to bridge that obsolecence is to bring up the Hams and
their licensing exams to the standards of modern communication
technology. The ARRL could be a driving force to do so...but
apparently it is not at the present time interested in strengthining
the basis and purpose of the hobby....The ARRL at present is expecting
a future decrease in membership and is thus trying to increase its
revenue by raising its dues...

Ed...I have news for you...You can't sell stale bananas by raising
their price. Enuf sed.

73,
Bob Wex w2ilp (Increase Logical Progress)

WYMI -- The all philosophy radio station.
--Mike Dugan--

Open your mouth only to change feet.
--Stanley Ralph Ross--

Gravity isn't easy but its the law.
--?--

A man's feet have to be long enough to
reach the ground.
--Abraham Lincoln--

The public need not know Ohm's law or
any other laws but my philosophy is,
that Hams should be well grounded.
--w2ilp--

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1958. Re: Amateur license renewals lost by FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-26 23:28:18 UTC
From: "J. Duffy Beischel" <duffyb01@fuse.net>
Message-ID: <t741vf4huv0n25@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 2208
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

This sounds like a bunch of crap. Even if the files were corrupted there
are multiple copies of files backed up onto tape or CD-ROM. I know the
outgoing democrats were a mean spirited bunch of losers, but this is going
down as another ham lengend.

Regards,

Duffy - WB8NUT

"Bill Hammack" <k9akr@my-deja.com> wrote in message
news:94sqet$3en$0@dosa.alt.net...
>
> The following notice just arrived in my email:
>
> The change of administration has been anything but smooth. You have
> heard about the problems at the White House, well the staffers under
> William Kennard may have done the same. After Michael Powell was
> appointed as the FCC Chairman, staffers found that some of the computer
> files had become corrupted. One of the corrupted files contained all of
> the Amateur License renewals for the last four years. Anyone that has
> renewed their license in the last four years will need to submit FCC
> Form 605 Schedule D with a copy of their original FCC Form 610.
>
> "The FCC has implemented a 180 day grace period to refile before licenses
> will be considered expired. After the grace period, Amateur license
> holders will have to reapply for their call as a "Vanity" call and pass
> all the required examinations.
>
> Sincerely Yours,
> Rob Hgien

1959. Re: ARRL Life Membership

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-26 23:31:35 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <94t1cn$m7m$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2209

In article <20010125045003.07593.00003976@nso-ch.aol.com>,
yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote:
> In article <3A6E68AD.B49B121@bctv.com>, Keith Wood <kw@bctv.com>
writes:
>
> >> Can anybody tell me what are the benefits of becoming a Life
Member of the
> >> ARRL. Thanks
> >
> >Well, they can't raise membership rates on you -- the only way to get
> >more money per year of your membership is to kill you.
>
> Keith:
>
> Shhhhh! Ixnay on the illkay talk -- or the next thing you know, the
> League will be sending out "hit squads" to terminate Life Members
> en masse!

Larry, shhhhh! Ixnay on the "ithay quadsey" talk! Thats why radio
commando MD dropped out of sight. He's on a mission.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1960. Re: ARRL Life Membership - Don't buy one!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-26 23:42:02 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <94t209$mp2$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2210
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.swap

In article <94po4okvk0@208.206.142.106>,
Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>
>
> "Vince Fiscus, KB7ADL" wrote:
> >
> > rasta567@aol.com (Rasta567) wrote in
> > <20010123230419.18743.00000881@ng-fg1.aol.com>:
> >
> > > >Can anybody tell me what are the benefits of becoming a Life
Member of
> > > >the ARRL. Thanks
> > > >
> >
> > > Don't buy any form of League membership if you care about the
integrity
> > > of your license or ham radio. The ARRL will screw you when your head
is
> > > turned. Buy a membership only if you believe that the natural
progression
> > > of amateur radio should be to become more like CB, for this is what
the
> > > ARRL board of directors believe.
>
> Vince,that's what the current FCC believes. Why would the ARRL
> deliberately -again- go against the wishes of the FCC? It never worked
> before.
>
> Dick

That's why Dick has his lifetime membership in the QCCB (Quarter Century
CB) Club.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1961. Re: Will you let them take away your guns?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-26 23:48:05 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <94t2bj$mu3$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2211

In article <3A71E100.9E291819@uci.edu>,
Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote:
> Brian wrote:
>
> > Then they can move to Monterrey and commute 2 hours in an SUV...
>
> What kind of an SUV averages 180 miles an hour on the interstate?
>
> ac6xg

The ones that pass me. My metro will only do 90.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1962. Re: Will you let them take away your guns?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-26 23:49:45 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <94t2emmvh1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2212

In article <94sqsv$g69$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
Carl Zager <kb9rvb@my-deja.com> wrote:
> In article <3A71E100.9E291819@uci.edu>,
> Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote:
> > Brian wrote:
> >
> > > Then they can move to Monterrey and commute 2 hours in an SUV...
> >
> > What kind of an SUV averages 180 miles an hour on the interstate?
> >
> > ac6xg
> >
> White Ford Broncos -- oh, wait, that was 20mph and there was a handgun
> in it.

And a blood sample.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1963. Re: Will you let them take away your guns?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-26 23:51:13 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <94t2he$n92$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2213

In article <3A71E1FC.4EFFC38B@uci.edu>,
Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote:
> Brian wrote:
> > Jim wrote
> > > Hey man, the government is just the same as it was. Some of the
names
> > > on the roster have changed.
>
> > Do you really believe that?
>
> yeah. It was in all the papers.

If there were no difference, then why all the hoopla over the election?

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1964. Re: Will you let them take away your guns?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-27 00:15:06 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A72130A.D014719C@uci.edu>
Source record: 2214

Brian wrote:
> My metro will only do 90.

A Nash metro will do 90? In second gear to boot, no doubt.

1965. Re: Will you let them take away your guns?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-27 00:16:03 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A721343.7D9CB2D7@uci.edu>
Source record: 2215

Brian wrote:
> > > Do you really believe that?

> > yeah. It was in all the papers.

> If there were no difference, then why all the hoopla over the election?

Search me.

1966. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-27 01:48:13 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <9n847tsaghg6aefn0chqk45s5necaevk18@4ax.com>
Source record: 2216

Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com> wrote:
>Mobiles usually use vertical whip antennas. How do you solve
>the NVIS issue in that situation?

What is NVIS?

>[Aaron: IMO CW is the least effective tool for any emergency...]
>Even on the FISTS frequencies?

I am not a CW purist, I am a CW enthusiast. I enjoy CW for
recreational purposes, but I also realize it's modern practical
limitations. It's not that it wouldn't work in a pinch, it's just that
there are other devices or modes which usually are a much better
choice to use in a personal emergency...

>so enough of me being a jerk (according to Hans).

I didn't take any offense in your question Brian,
and I don't think that you are a jerk... :-)

1967. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-27 02:18:02 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A722FDA.C4D3A5FF@IEEE.org>
Source record: 2217

Aaron Jones wrote:
>
> Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com> wrote:
> >Mobiles usually use vertical whip antennas. How do you solve
> >the NVIS issue in that situation?
>
> What is NVIS?

Near Vertical Incidence Skywave
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

1968. Re: QCWA TELLS FCC TO END INCENTIVE LICENSING

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-27 03:09:55 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010126220955.13167.00001049@ng-mb1.aol.com>
Source record: 2218

>From: Bob Wex w2ilp

>The ARRL could be a driving force to do so...but
>apparently it is not at the present time interested in strengthining
>the basis and purpose of the hobby.

The ARRL is not interested in doing it exactly the way you say it should, so in your mind, it is not doing it at all.

It is too bad; the things you are choosing to say to tear down amateur radio to be "right" are undermining the very principles you stand for.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1969. Re: Amateur license renewals lost by FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-27 03:18:09 UTC
From: JR <jr@some.net>
Message-ID: <3A722EB6.712F36E9@some.net>
Source record: 2219
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Nice try, but pure garbage.

Bill Hammack wrote:

> The following notice just arrived in my email:
>
> The change of administration has been anything but smooth. You have
> heard about the problems at the White House, well the staffers under
> William Kennard may have done the same. After Michael Powell was
> appointed as the FCC Chairman, staffers found that some of the computer
> files had become corrupted. One of the corrupted files contained all of
> the Amateur License renewals for the last four years. Anyone that has
> renewed their license in the last four years will need to submit FCC
> Form 605 Schedule D with a copy of their original FCC Form 610.
>
> "The FCC has implemented a 180 day grace period to refile before licenses
> will be considered expired. After the grace period, Amateur license
> holders will have to reapply for their call as a "Vanity" call and pass
> all the required examinations.
>
> Sincerely Yours,
> Rob Hgien

1970. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-27 03:21:26 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010126222126.13167.00001050@ng-mb1.aol.com>
Source record: 2220

>From: Cecil Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>> What is NVIS?

>Near Vertical Incidence Skywave

To add a bit to that, it is a term applied to the energy from an antenna that is radiated nearly vertically upward from the antenna. At lower frequencies (perhaps up to about 10 MHz or so, under some circumstances), it is returned to earth by the ionosphere, relatively close to the transmitting station. It is most useful on 3.5 MHz, and sometimes on 7 MHz, for communications out to about 100 miles or so.

A vertical antenna radiates very little NVIS, so it is not as good a "local F hop" antenna as is a low horizontal dipole.

See:
http://www.arrl.org/tis/info/pdf/8102019.pdf

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1971. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-27 03:23:14 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010126222314.13167.00001051@ng-mb1.aol.com>
Source record: 2221

>From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

>Probably because they don't see any value in knowing how to use CW on
>the air, I'd imagine. But so far they don't keep insisting it's a
>Federal civil rights case, at least on rrap.

Just like those who support keeping code testing, each no-code test advocate seems to have their own technique for supporting their cause. Some on both sides make valid point; others on both sides appear ridiculous in their assertations.

73,
Ed Hare,W1RFI

1972. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-27 03:25:11 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010126222511.13167.00001052@ng-mb1.aol.com>
Source record: 2222

>From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

> Which really means it is vital that FCC and ARRL be in direct constant
>communication so that there is no doubt about what is important and what
>is not. I'm not sure that has been happening effectively and reliably in
>the past few years.

I agree; there is considerable room for improvement in that area. OTOH, I can speak of my own work and my good relationship with OET and the Enforcement Bureau on RFI matters. I speak of my own work because I know it better than I know about everybody else's. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

1973. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-27 03:29:32 UTC
From: Larry Klose <lklose@net-link.net>
Message-ID: <3a7240ac$0$35019$44a10c7e@news.net-link.net>
Source record: 2223

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:94s3jg$4l6$0@208.206.142.91...

> Probably because they don't see any value in knowing how to use CW on
> the air, I'd imagine. But so far they don't keep insisting it's a
> Federal civil rights case, at least on rrap.

You are incorrect in assuming my initial comments
were about a "civil rights issue", if you read carefully you
will realize that I was saying a "due process".

But, it now appears that the Morse code exam
requirement is not in conformity with law.
5 USC 706(2)(a). The FCC stated that the only reason
to retain the 5wpm exam was ITU rule S25.5.

No sense fight about "civil rights" or "due process"
when 5 USC 706 will due the job.

Larry

1974. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-27 04:07:51 UTC
From: Larry Klose <lklose@net-link.net>
Message-ID: <3a7249ab$0$35020$44a10c7e@news.net-link.net>
Source record: 2225

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nospam.spam> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.g7qny42.pminews@ca.news.verio.net...
> On Wed, 24 Jan 2001 20:38:04 -0500, Larry Klose wrote:
>
> >Are saying that person petitioning his government to change a regulation
> >that he believes is not in conformity with law and not in the public
> >interest has no standing to file that petition?
>
> Well-known provision of law in the US - One has no standing to
> file unless and until one is injured somehow by that law.
> Federal law requires an actual "case or controversy". "Bystander
> gotchas" don't count.

Prior to April 15, 2000, a person who took a 13 or 20 wpm code and
fails it, was adversely effected by 47 CFR 97.503(a)(2)&(3);
therefore, had standing.

> >The matter more or less before the Commission is complaint against the
> >political, legal and constitutional validity of a the Morse code exam
> >regulation. An attack against the petitioner is irrelevant.
>
> Attacking the standing of the petitioner is _de rigeur_ in such
> cat fights.
>
> One more example of being a wannabe and missing the gut-level
> recognition of the above principles of litigation.

So far, no one need to prove standing. Indeed the FCC took action on their
own intitiative, to wit:

The 13 and 20 word per minute telegraphy examination was removed as a
requirement in 1999. The FCC stated in its Report and Order (FCC 99-142)
for WT Docket #98-143 that:
(a) "the public interest will best be served by reducing the telegraphy
examination requirement to the minimum requirement that we have found that
meets the Radio Regulations" ;
(b) "an individual's ability to demonstrate increased Morse code proficiency
is not necessarily indicative of that individual's ability to contribute to
the advancement of the radio art" ;
(c) "such a license qualification rule [Morse code exam] is not in
furtherance of the purpose of the amateur service and we do not believe that
it continues to serve a regulatory purpose" ;
(d) "the amateur service is fundamentally a technical service, the emphasis
on Morse code proficiency as a licensing requirement does not comport with
the basis and purpose of the service" ;

(e) "reducing the emphasis on telegraphy proficiency as a licensing requirement will allow the amateur service to, as it has in the past, attract technically inclined persons, particularly the youth of our country, and encourage them to learn and to prepare themselves in the areas where the United States needs expertise" ; and
(f) "telegraphy proficiency is not a significant factor in determining an individual's ability to provide or be prepared to provide emergency communications" .

After the Commission put that ink on the parchment, how hard to do think they wil
fight the keep ITU rule S25.5 afloat.

Larry

1975. Re: ARRL Life Membership

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-27 04:08:05 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <94thj5bel0@208.207.71.157>
Source record: 2224

Brian wrote:
>
> In article <20010125045003.07593.00003976@nso-ch.aol.com>,
> yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote:
> > In article <3A6E68AD.B49B121@bctv.com>, Keith Wood <kw@bctv.com>
> writes:
> >
> > >> Can anybody tell me what are the benefits of becoming a Life
> Member of the
> > >> ARRL. Thanks
> > >
> > >Well, they can't raise membership rates on you -- the only way to get
> > >more money per year of your membership is to kill you.
> >
> > Keith:
> >
> > Shhhhh! Ixnay on the illkay talk -- or the next thing you know, the
> > League will be sending out "hit squads" to terminate Life Members
> > en masse!
>
> Larry, shhhhh! Ixnay on the "ithay quadsey" talk! Thats why radio
> commando MD dropped out of sight. He's on a mission.

Are you growing eyes in the back of your head? Gotcher ears on? He may
be close by!

1976. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-27 04:12:06 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <94thqmbel1@208.207.71.157>
Source record: 2226

Aaron Jones wrote:
>
> Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com> wrote:

> >so enough of me being a jerk (according to Hans).
>
> I didn't take any offense in your question Brian,
> and I don't think that you are a jerk... :-)

Naw, he's a lightweight, a tweaking twerp.

1977. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-27 04:13:44 UTC
From: RyanCA <hass@aznet.net>
Message-ID: <3A724AF7.7F74AE8B@aznet.net>
Source record: 2228

```
Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> Larry Klose wrote:
> > Before April 15, 200 a person could become an Extra and miss
> > every question on Part 97 rules except two question on the Novice test.
>
> > Apparent the rules were not as important a manual Morse code proficiency.
>
> They were less concerned with testing back then, because the Hammurabi
> code was pretty much the rule of the day. ;-)

One Rule- Know Code or be bored. :)
```

1978. Re: ARRL Life Membership - Don't buy one!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-27 04:17:04 UTC
From: RyanCA <hass@aznet.net>
Message-ID: <3A724BC0.61ABA1B@aznet.net>
Source record: 2229

K0HB wrote:

> Mostly the early amateurs that "amateur radio was built on" were a
> bunch of unruly rascals who roamed the spectrum at will, interfering
> with commercial and military stations alike, and had to be rounded up
> and corralled at "200 meters and below". Far worse than today's CB
> crowd by a long shot!

Very gentlemanly though I once heard. Oh Well, they never gave up and survived.

>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB
> --
> "We are fellow travelers on a journey between two
> eternities, and it's a trip far too brief for me
> to be concerned about your speed at the Code of
> Morse."
>
> Sent via Deja.com
> http://www.deja.com/

1979. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-27 04:19:12 UTC
From: Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com>
Message-ID: <3A724C40.FCE7CCC4@dvol.com>
Source record: 2227

Len Over 21 wrote:

>
> >I don't know of a single big-gun HF weak signal wonk who
> >uses a spectrum analyzer and I kow a bunch of those.

> ...Hmmm...I guess that is supposed to settle that? :-)

>
Exactly. If by this point in history hams had found any particular real-world advantage to using spectrum analyzers for on-the-air ops the things would be in all over the catalogs. They ain't and sure as hell that settles that. Writing off spectrum analyzers as useful communications tools has to do with seasoned radio operators being able to separate the wheat from the chaff, ya know what I mean Len?
>

>
> >> Sound interesting? :-)
> >
> >Write the article.
>
> I'm not. I know of two such projects already in the works,
> both for amateur radio use. One is upstate California, the
> other one is local to me. I'm in an advisory capacity in the
> group down here. It simply wouldn't do to have some non-
> ham be in the byline of such an article, would it? :-)

>
Contributions is contributions, I don't care where they come from.

> didit

>
w3rv

1980. Re: Amateur license renewals lost by FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-27 04:26:05 UTC
From: KC8JBO <roger_kc8jbo@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <94tiko$3tm$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2230
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <3A722EB6.712F36E9@some.net>,
JR <jr@flash.net> wrote:
> Nice try, but pure garbage.

But that's all your little brain-stem can process, Jacking Rube!

> Bill Hammack wrote:
>
> > The following notice just arrived in my email:
> >
> > The change of administration has been anything but smooth. You have
> > heard about the problems at the White House, well the staffers under
> > William Kennard may have done the same. After Michael Powell was
> > appointed as the FCC Chairman, staffers found that some of the
computer
> > files had become corrupted. One of the corrupted files contained
all of
> > the Amateur License renewals for the last four years. Anyone that
has
> > renewed their license in the last four years will need to submit FCC
> > Form 605 Schedule D with a copy of their original FCC Form 610.
> >
> > "The FCC has implemented a 180 day grace period to refile before
licenses
> > will be considered expired. After the grace period, Amateur license
> > holders will have to reapply for their call as a "Vanity" call and
pass
> > all the required examinations.
> >
> > Sincerely Yours,
> > Rob Hgien
>
>

--
73 de Roger, KC8JBO
EM99 |ARRL|VE [ARRL & W5YI]|ARES |RACES
Yaesu FT-920 |Inverted Vee @ 40 ft.
Yaesu FT-90R

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1981. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-27 04:42:00 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <q8k47t82vgphv054j2f2n718n7r91vhi7h@4ax.com>
Source record: 2231

w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:
>Near Vertical Incidence Skywave [NVIS]
>To add a bit to that, it is a term applied to the energy from an antenna that
>is radiated nearly vertically upward from the antenna.

Ah, very short skip. Should have said VSS :-). I've noticed it lately
on 40 meters around noon. A regular in my group about 10 miles away
who usually runs S5 (on groundwave) has been booming in here at +20
over with QSB...

>A vertical antenna radiates very little NVIS, so it is not as good a "local F
>hop" antenna as is a low horizontal dipole.

Brian asked if a mobile antenna being a vertical would be good for
NVIS. I think he was commenting that perhaps mobile HF might not be as
good for *local* emergency communications. I would agree HF might not
be the best choice for local personal emergencies. A cell phone likely
would be. However to answer the question Brian, you don't really need
to rely on NVIS for someone close by on HF. You only need someone with
a telephone anywhere in skip-land who can make an emergency long
distance call for you...

1982. Re: Amateur license renewals lost by FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-27 05:38:45 UTC
From: Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com>
Message-ID: <3A725EE5.EC7DD7FD@dvol.com>
Source record: 2232
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Bill Hammack wrote:

> The following notice just arrived in my email:
>
> "The FCC has implemented a 180 day grace period to refile before licenses
> will be considered expired. After the grace period, Amateur license
> holders will have to reapply for their call as a "Vanity" call and pass
> all the required examinations.

>
Troll, troll yer boat but ignoring your utter inanity I have my 1x2 license
nailed to the wall and it doesn't expire until 2008. End of.
>

> Rob Hgien

>
w3rv

1983. Re: FCC proposal for new Amateur "Colt" License Class

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-27 05:41:06 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010127004106.01651.00000493@nso-fp.aol.com>
Source record: 2235

In article <9R2b6.1092$e5.2740349@news.ntplx.net>, "Ed Hare, W1RFI"
<w1rfi@arrl.net> writes:

>> I can drive 2 miles to an HRO outlet in Burbank, CA. It's in a
>> mini-mall across Buena Vista from another mini-mall. :-)
>
>There were more "local" radio and electronics stores then than now. Mail
>order electronics has become the norm. Back then, to get a part I had to
>drive across town and hope it is stock. Today, I make a phone call and give
>them my credit-card number. :-)

Ed, in Rockford, Illinois of the 1950s there were only TWO stores
that sold radio parts suitable for amateur radio equipment. [that's
where I grew up] I was visiting there last September and there
are now at least FOUR such places. Three of those are also
heavy into carrying computer-related stuff...which should not be
a surprise.

Right now, at home in a suburb of Los Angeles, there are at
least THREE stores within a 3-mile driving radius which carry
"ham radio parts," one of them the HRO branch mentioned.
None of what I mentioned are of the "consumer electronics"
chain stores such as Circuit City, Best Buy, or Radio Shack.

Electronics distributors will sell over-the-counter as a general
rule. Out here, there's an Avnet place within 2 miles and an
Allied Electronics within 10 miles (at the other end of the
Valley). Problem is that hardly any distributors or retailers
carry "ham radio parts" as such...it is all electronics parts.

Within 4 miles radius of my home there are three "surplus"
places but the surplus is electronics manufacturer's surplus,
not old WW2 war surplus radio stuff. There might be one in
Pasadena still left (dunno, haven't looked there in years) at
a distance of 6 miles from my house...they carried military
radio stuff back in '71. :-)

I flipped through my Rolodex for electronics parts vendors
in my locality and there are over NINETY of them (probably
130 total but I quit counting those that also carried computer
goodies)...and none of them are the consumer electronics
chain stores or computer things only type places. Only
three have walk-in-and browse ham stuff and one of those
is another HRO way down in Anaheim over 40 miles away.

In this urban area at least, there is NO dearth of radio parts vendors. That demise of "ham radio stores" may exist in other localities...I have no dispute on that...but few seem to realize that consumer electronics and non-ham electronics hobbyists have grown together in both numbers and variety.

didit

1984. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-27 05:41:07 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010127004107.01651.00000494@nso-fp.aol.com>
Source record: 2234

In article <94sqph$g29$1@nnrp1.deja.com>, xjim@my-deja.com writes:

>> Actually, you could include a solar panel and/or a hand generator
>> to power it.
>
>The solar panel would be far too fragile, but the hand generator idea
>has promise. There is a Short-Wave receiver on the market, that has a
>clock spring generator, that can power the radio for 30 minutes after
>being wound up. Neat!

The "wind-up" receiver has been around for at least three years,
first mass marketed by a South African company which designed
it. My neighbor has an AM-FM broadcast one that includes a
"fragile" solar cell array. Several pocket calculators have a
"fragile" solar cell array.

The US Army had the 10 to 15 Watt RF output AN/GRC-9 in WW2,
manpack by two men, one carrying the arm-powered generator with
its funny tripod-seat arrangement. Trust me, after a half hour of
continuous winding (peak load on transmit was 40 W max.), the
"winder" was QRT and needed replacing.

All of this is rather old hat and been done before. If anyone is trying
to seriously cruise for new ideas on "emergency power," doubtful
IMHO, then they should investigate leg power. Leg musculature
has more mass and can be conditioned by exercise off of a bike-
mount-like generator adaptation. This leaves the arms and hands
free to control an Rx-Tx.

didit

1985. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-27 05:41:08 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010127004108.01651.00000495@nso-fp.aol.com>
Source record: 2233

In article <20010126222126.13167.00001050@ng-mb1.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>>From: Cecil Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>
>>> What is NVIS?
>
>>Near Vertical Incidence Skywave
>
>To add a bit to that, it is a term applied to the energy from an antenna that
>is radiated nearly vertically upward from the antenna. At lower frequencies
>(perhaps up to about 10 MHz or so, under some circumstances), it is returned
>to earth by the ionosphere, relatively close to the transmitting station. It
is
>most useful on 3.5 MHz, and sometimes on 7 MHz, for communications out to
>about 100 miles or so.
>
>A vertical antenna radiates very little NVIS, so it is not as good a "local F
>hop" antenna as is a low horizontal dipole.

Very few vertical antennas radiate "end fire" Ed. :-)

Look at US Army and USMC humvees equipped with HF-VHF
radios and long whips. Those are already tied back at a slant
courtesy of an extra little cord and clip. The radiation blob is
now upwards a lot more. Army has been doing that for years.

NVIS technique is standard doctrine in military field radio.

didit

1986. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-27 05:43:49 UTC
From: Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com>
Message-ID: <3A726015.AE096592@dvol.com>
Source record: 2236

W1RFI wrote:

> I agree; there is considerable room for improvement in that area. OTOH, I can
> speak of my own work and my good relationship with OET and the Enforcement
> Bureau on RFI matters. I speak of my own work because I know it better than I
> know about everybody else's. :-)

>
. . . I could but I'll bite my tounge again . .
>

> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

>
b.

1987. Re: Before responding to the Colt thread.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-27 15:14:41 UTC
From: "Steven J Robeson", K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <94uokv$sj0$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2237
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <94klf2bco1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
RanHefner <ranhefner@my-deja.com> wrote:

> You just don't seem to understand. Maybe you should ask some of your
> amateur radio friends what the word "hobby" means as it pertains to
> amateur radio.

I think you may be the one who is a bit shy on understanding,
Randy. The point is about FRS being used for hobby purposes, NOT
Amatuer Radio.

73

Steve, K4YZ

"The Measure Of A Man Is Not In How He Touches A Woman, But In How He
Touches A Woman's Heart"

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1988. Re: VHF history (long) (was: any ideas on HOw to learn Morse

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-27 15:30:15 UTC
From: "Steven J Robeson", K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <94upi8tba1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2238

In article <Owjb6.1124$e5.2796228@news.ntplx.net>,
"Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net> wrote:

> Do you think that Len believes that what he says is untrue?

Of course he doesn't, Ed. And some people still think the world
is flat and the moon is made of cheese, too.

For the record, a "lie" need not simply be "No, I did not cut down
that cherry tree..." would be a direct lie.

However making statements that are deliberately misleading,
untruthful, or decietful is also lying.

Lennie's frequent assertions of conspiracy, deception or attempts
to manipulate ham radio for some ulterior motive are certainly lies.

The facts are there for all to see, and the ARRL certainly makes
every effort to keep it's program well above board. I consider
Lennie's assertions of impropriety by the League, it's board members or
membership in general to somehow undermine Ham Radio to be a blatant,
bitter lie.

In a minor change of subject, I have been trying to wean this
thread, yet you and Hans keep seeming to perpetuate it. Things slow
these days?

73

Steve, K4YZ
--
http://hometown.aol.com/k4yz/myhomepage/index.html

"The Measure Of A Man Is Not In How He Touches A Woman, But In How He
Touches A Woman's Heart"

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1989. Re: ARRL Life Membership - Don't buy one!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-27 15:38:24 UTC
From: Dean Arthur <dearthur@silverstar.com>
Message-ID: <3A72EB72.304E@silverstar.com>
Source record: 2241
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.swap

As with government, if you don't participate, shut your mouth and go along with what the participants are doing.

If you don't like the policies and practices of the incumbents, then get off your duff and become one of the leadership so you can put forth your ideas for better ham radio.

1990. Re: FCC Proposal for New Novice Class License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-27 15:43:33 UTC
From: "Steven J Robeson", K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <94uqb4$tp3$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2239

In article <20010123191033.17535.00001144@nso-fy.aol.com>,
lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:

> Ah, so an expression of patriotism for the USA is suddenly
> passe'?

From you...?!?! Yes. YOU are the one always trying to jade
others about "being wrapped in patriotic bunting".

Of course, when it's LENNIE that's pontificating, THAT'S alright.

You have made some excellent post's in other threads vis-a-vis
spectrum analyzers and such. You should STICK to something you KNOW.

Adios.
--
http://hometown.aol.com/k4yz/myhomepage/index.html

"The Measure Of A Man Is Not In How He Touches A Woman, But In How He
Touches A Woman's Heart"

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1991. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-27 15:55:44 UTC
From: "Steven J Robeson", K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <94ur1v$u70$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2240

In article <20010123191032.17535.00001143@nso-fy.aol.com>,
lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:

> While I did not expect boldness and vision in leadership, I am
> heartened that the BoD went as far as it did. Given the past
> emphasis on morse code abilities thought necessary for all
> radio amateurs, the BoD decision seemed to be a Major
> Upheaval in Attitude! I have to give the BoD a warm round of
> applause in appreciation of actually getting around to changing
> its collective mind!

We'll be sure to drop them a line and let them know you have
granted your approval.

Of course, I think it's been stated to you on occassions too
numerous to count that the ARRL is representitive of it's membership.
no the other way around.

It would be inappropriate for the BoD of an organization that
espouses democratic principles to tell it's members what it's policies
are.

In fact, the ARRL must represent the views of the membership.

Just as it did with the NCT in 1990, the League, once solidly "pro-
code", "changed" it's policies on same when it was apparent that the
generally held opinion of the membership was no longer the one
PREVIOUSLY held.

I fail to see the controversy in that posturing. It's what's
SUPPOSED to happen.

Steve

--
http://hometown.aol.com/k4yz/myhomepage/index.html

"The Measure Of A Man Is Not In How He Touches A Woman, But In How He
Touches A Woman's Heart"

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1992. Re: The knuckle head here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-27 17:22:20 UTC
From: kg9qm@nomail.net
Message-ID: <gtDc6.438$pL5.362271@news1.iquest.net>
Source record: 2242

>
> Suture self, Doc.

Sew what?

1993. Re: ARRL Life Membership

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-27 22:23:41 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <94vhp7fpe1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2243

In article <94thj5bel0@208.207.71.157>,
Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > In article <20010125045003.07593.00003976@nso-ch.aol.com>,
> > yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote:

> > > Shhhhh! Ixnay on the illkay talk -- or the next thing you know,
the
> > > League will be sending out "hit squads" to terminate Life Members
> > > en masse!
> >
> > Larry, shhhhh! Ixnay on the "ithay quadsey" talk! Thats why radio
> > commando MD dropped out of sight. He's on a mission.
>
> Are you growing eyes in the back of your head? Gotcher ears on? He
> maybe close by!

Sulpherous cat gas, Batman, I think Dick is developing a cents of u-mer.

Mike won't be hard to detect. His labored breathing from dragging that
duffel bag full of call signs will give him away.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1994. Re: ARRL Life Membership

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-27 22:29:10 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <94vi3g$g4f$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2244

In article <20010125045004.07593.00003977@nso-ch.aol.com>,
yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote:
> In article <20010123230419.18743.00000881@ng-fg1.aol.com>,
rasta567@aol.com
> (Rasta567) writes:
>
> >
> >Can anybody tell me what are the benefits of becoming a Life Member
of the
> >ARRL. Thanks
>
> Simple. It's a hedge against future membership dues increases,
> like the one the ARRL Board of Directors just approved. I wish I'd
> invested in a Life Membership 20 years ago!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

You're betting that the ARRL and/or the ARS will be around. You're also
betting that you'll be around.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1995. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-27 22:36:42 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <94vihqgba1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2245

In article <94s5kn$9jq$0@208.206.142.91>,
Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>
>
> W1RFI wrote:

> > Even our friend Riley Hollingsworth is trying to give us a message
> > about the effect of what he terms "petty squabbles."
>
> Yeah, but he's concerned with the nonsense frequencies on SSB. As
> N2EY points out, you don't hear that stuff on CW.

Then why does Larry's friend send QFU on CW?

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1996. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-27 22:54:49 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <94vjjm$h6f$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2246

In article <q8k47t82vgphv054j2f2n718n7r91vhi7h@4ax.com>,
Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com> wrote:
> w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:
> >Near Vertical Incidence Skywave [NVIS]
> >To add a bit to that, it is a term applied to the energy from an
antenna that
> >is radiated nearly vertically upward from the antenna.
>
> Ah, very short skip. Should have said VSS :-). I've noticed it lately
> on 40 meters around noon. A regular in my group about 10 miles away
> who usually runs S5 (on groundwave) has been booming in here at +20
> over with QSB...
>
> >A vertical antenna radiates very little NVIS, so it is not as good a
"local F
> >hop" antenna as is a low horizontal dipole.
>
> Brian asked if a mobile antenna being a vertical would be good for
> NVIS. I think he was commenting that perhaps mobile HF might not be as
> good for *local* emergency communications. I would agree HF might not
> be the best choice for local personal emergencies.

I was getting there. Using a whip tilt adapter would allow NVIS with an
80/75 and 40M whip. Once the ARRL releases that 5mhz band to the rest
of us, it can be added to the NVIS arsenal.

> A cell phone likely
> would be. However to answer the question Brian, you don't really need
> to rely on NVIS for someone close by on HF. You only need someone with
> a telephone anywhere in skip-land who can make an emergency long
> distance call for you...

Yablo Hayspanyol? Guess what happens when they dial 911 for you? Or if
they don't have your local phone book. SW Bell might not give directory
assistance to an Ameritech customer.

Back when I cared a lot about emergency comms, I would carry last years
phone book in my vehicle. I also had a hazmat ID book, repeater
directory, state and county roadmaps, ...

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1997. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-27 23:09:22 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <94vkeu$i1f$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2247

In article <20010127004108.01651.00000495@nso-fp.aol.com>,
lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:

> Look at US Army and USMC humvees equipped with HF-VHF
> radios and long whips. Those are already tied back at a slant
> courtesy of an extra little cord and clip. The radiation blob is
> now upwards a lot more. Army has been doing that for years.
>
> NVIS technique is standard doctrine in military field radio.
>
> didit

Yup, Doctrine! Everyone thinks it's to pass under low overhangs.

But there's such a DX following in amateur radio that these antennas get
cutesy labels such as "cloud warmers" and dummy loads and such.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1998. Morse Code replacement? Bigtime flame war article!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-27 23:46:55 UTC
From: Jethro Jumbalaya Twain <qwasty@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <94vmlejkg1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2248
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna

The article is about a replacement for Morse that's easier to learn.
It's a lot like Morse, just a different code.

http://www.eham.net/articles/1681

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

1999. Re: Morse Code replacement? Bigtime flame war article!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-28 00:59:35 UTC
From: Peter Lemken <plemken@gmx.de>
Message-ID: <3A736EF7.9F581CBF@gmx.de>
Source record: 2249
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna

Jethro Jumbalaya Twain wrote:
>
> The article is about a replacement for Morse that's easier to learn.
> It's a lot like Morse, just a different code.

Read my reply.

Warning: Not for the humor impaired.

Peter Lemken
DF5JT
Berlin

--
DeeeeeeeX'ing in the new Millenium. Scream for an hour and go
check the online logs to see if you gotta scream for an hour again
tomorrow nite. [KH2D in rec.radio.amateur.dx]

2000. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-28 01:03:25 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010127200325.15119.00002077@ng-cs1.aol.com>
Source record: 2250

>From: Brian brianburke@my-deja.com

>Once the ARRL releases that 5mhz band to the rest
>of us, it can be added to the NVIS arsenal.

Just a minor correction; it is the FCC, not the ARRL, that will release the band to the rest of us.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2001. Re: ARRL Life Membership

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-28 01:05:12 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010127200512.15119.00002078@ng-cs1.aol.com>
Source record: 2251

>From: Brian brianburke@my-deja.com
>

>Mike won't be hard to detect. His labored breathing from dragging that
>duffel bag full of call signs will give him away.

From what I read on the enforcement logs, that duffel bag is probably quite a bit lighter of late. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2002. Re: ARRL Life Membership - Don't buy one!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-28 01:07:29 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010127200729.15119.00002079@ng-cs1.aol.com>
Source record: 2252

>From: Dean Arthur dearthur@silverstar.com

>If you don't like the policies and practices of the incumbents, then get
>off your duff and become one of the leadership so you can put forth your
>ideas for better ham radio.

I have seen no small number of occasions where an ARRL elected position does not have opposition. Of course, running for office and then executing the duties of that office are usually a LOT more work that not liking what the other guy is doing. :-) I certainly would not want the responsibilities. I have found other ways to serve.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2003. Re: Morse Code replacement? Bigtime flame war article!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-28 01:10:58 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccoll@radiks.net>
Message-ID: <6jKc6.7966$Tb.1617098@nntp1.onemain.com>
Source record: 2253
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna

"Jethro Jumbalaya Twain" <qwasty@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:94vmlejkg1@nnrp1.deja.com...
> The article is about a replacement for Morse that's easier to learn.
> It's a lot like Morse, just a different code.
>
> http://www.eham.net/articles/1681
>
>
> Sent via Deja.com
> http://www.deja.com/

Another bleater that feels he needs five newsgroups to make a point.

We all know Morse testing is going to disappear, we all know it will take
3-10 years to do so. So your problem is whether to study or moo.

Dick N&#65533;BK with apologies for the crosspost

2004. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-28 01:11:49 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010127201149.15119.00002080@ng-cs1.aol.com>
Source record: 2254

>From: Steven J Robeson, K4YZ k4yz@my-deja.com

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:

>> While I did not expect boldness and vision in leadership, I am
>> heartened that the BoD went as far as it did. Given the past
>> emphasis on morse code abilities thought necessary for all
>> radio amateurs, the BoD decision seemed to be a Major
>> Upheaval in Attitude! I have to give the BoD a warm round of
>> applause in appreciation of actually getting around to changing
>> its collective mind!

> We'll be sure to drop them a line and let them know you have
>granted your approval.

Len can drop them a line, too. I certainly let Tom Frenaye know what I thought of the recent ARRL Board action and what I think the ARRL should do about the US position when the time is right to make that decision.

> Just as it did with the NCT in 1990, the League, once solidly "pro-
>code", "changed" it's policies on same when it was apparent that the
>generally held opinion of the membership was no longer the one
>PREVIOUSLY held.

> I fail to see the controversy in that posturing. It's what's
>SUPPOSED to happen.

I certainly hope so, otherwise, I will have to update my resume. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2005. Re: VHF history (long) (was: any ideas on HOw to learn Morse

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-28 01:15:36 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010127201536.15119.00002081@ng-cs1.aol.com>
Source record: 2255

>From: Steven J Robeson, K4YZ k4yz@my-deja.com

>> Do you think that Len believes that what he says is untrue?

> Of course he doesn't, Ed.

Then he is not lying. He may be mistaken, but if he is saying what he believes, he is not a liar.

>However making statements that are deliberately misleading,
>untruthful, or decietful is also lying.

If he believes what he says is true, then he is not being deliberately misleading, untruthful or deceitful.

> I consider Lennie's assertions of impropriety by the League,
> it's board members or membership in general to somehow undermine
> Ham Radio to be a blatant, bitter lie.

They are only lies if Len believes that they are not true, but says them anyway. If you didn't lie when you said that you do not think he believes them to untrue, then he is not lying.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2006. Re: Morse Code replacement? Bigtime flame war article!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-28 01:50:01 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010127205001.15091.00002511@ng-cs1.aol.com>
Source record: 2256

>From: "Richard McCollum"

>> http://www.eham.net/articles/1681

>Another bleater that feels he needs five newsgroups to make a point.

Unless AOL is lying to me again, this post should go only to rrap. :-)

>We all know Morse testing is going to disappear, we all know it will take
>3-10 years to do so. So your problem is whether to study or moo.

Actually, that code may very well be legal on HF. I see no reason that a "digital" signal could not be OOK CW, which is a legal modulation on HF. The other requirement is that a digital code sent must be publically documented. I would have to check with a few legal types, but I bet this would meet the requirements, under the same provisions that allow PSK-31, AMTOR, and a number of others.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2007. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-28 01:51:51 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nospam.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.g7uf7b2.pminews@ca.news.verio.net>
Source record: 2257

On Fri, 26 Jan 2001 23:07:51 -0500, Larry Klose wrote:

>Prior to April 15, 2000, a person who took a 13 or 20 wpm code and
>fails it, was adversely effected by 47 CFR 97.503(a)(2)&(3);
>therefore, had standing.

Correct.

>So far, no one need to prove standing.

Depends on the proceeding. I'm sensitive to "standing" - I
represented a (commercial) frequency coordination group in a
fight against a specific Commission license grant in opposition
to the coordinator's recommendation and was shot down by the
grantee (and ultimately by the Commission) on the basis that my
client did not have standing - we interpreted various Public
Notices as granting us standing but "the fix was in" and the
Bureau backed down. We won in the end, though -the business
was sold and the new owners cancelled the license.

As I explained in an earlier posting, one of the obligations
in Federal civil litigation is for the petitioner to show that
that court has jurisdiction and that the petitioner has
standing to bring the suit.

Indeed the FCC took action on their own intitiative, to wit:

The FCC can ALWAYS do so in accordance with their Congressional
mandate to regulate the use of the spectrum. You will see
this indicated in documents as "action _sua sponte_" or"action
on [its/our] own motion".

>After the Commission put that ink on the parchment, how hard to do think
>they will fight the keep ITU rule S25.5 afloat.

They couldn't care less, but "Inertia is a Terrible Thing".

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

2008. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-28 01:52:44 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010127205244.15091.00002512@ng-cs1.aol.com>
Source record: 2258

>From: vlfiscus@mcn.net (Vince Fiscus, KB7ADL)

>It's not hard ED, the league knew how its members felt long before the
>issue came up from results of member surveys, but the board of directors
>choose to stick their heads up their rectums and ignored us.

As I remember that survey, >50% of ARRL members wanted 4 classes of license or less. The ARRL asked for 4 classes of license. >50% of those who answered the survey wanted a General Class code speed of 5 wpm or less (0 wpm). >50% of those wanted a maximum code speed of 12/13 wpm or less. Go back and look at the article that published the survey results again.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2009. Re: ARRL Life Membership - Don't buy one!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-28 02:07:51 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <94vutn$fo1$0@208.206.142.105>
Source record: 2259

RyanCA wrote:
>
> K0HB wrote:
>
> > Mostly the early amateurs that "amateur radio was built on" were a
> > bunch of unruly rascals who roamed the spectrum at will, interfering
> > with commercial and military stations alike, and had to be rounded up
> > and corralled at "200 meters and below". Far worse than today's CB
> > crowd by a long shot!
>
> Very gentlemanly though I once heard. Oh Well, they never gave up and survived.
>

I don't think that Hiram P. Maxim would agree that they were an "unruly bunch".
Every radio signal within range interfered with every other radio signal in those days of very wideband spark transmitters, very low noisy frequencies and characteristically poor receive sensitivity, particularly in many if not most homebrew ham recievers. Certainly the QRM sure wasn't intentional, just an artifact of the technology and lack of regulation of the day. As today, hams often transmitted without realizing that the frequency might have been busy,since they often could hear only one side of the contact and that when that side was recieving the frequency would be quiet.
The chaos on radio in those early days can't be laid to the "unruly hams". It was a part of the evolution of radio communication that hams had started.
Marconi always considered himself a ham although he never held a ham radio license.
Dick

2010. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-28 02:26:44 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <950014$jb2$0@208.206.142.105>
Source record: 2260

Brian wrote:
>
> In article <94s5kn$9jq$0@208.206.142.91>,
> Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
> >
> >
> > W1RFI wrote:
>
> > > Even our friend Riley Hollingsworth is trying to give us a message
> > > about the effect of what he terms "petty squabbles."
> >
> > Yeah, but he's concerned with the nonsense frequencies on SSB. As
> > N2EY points out, you don't hear that stuff on CW.
>
> Then why does Larry's friend send QFU on CW?

I dunno. QFU isn't on my Q-signal list. I've never heard it on the air.
Maybe he's coining a new one. Maybe that's another urban legend.

2011. Re: ARRL Life Membership - Don't buy one!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-28 02:38:31 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010127213831.00714.00004492@nso-md.aol.com>
Source record: 2261

In article <xEmc6.1229$e5.3045170@news.ntplx.net>, "Ed Hare, W1RFI"
<w1rfi@arrl.net> writes:

>
>In its comments to the FCC wrt restructuring, the ARRL you espouse so
>strongly asked the FCC to increase the technical content of the written
>exams to offset any changes in Morse-code testing.

Ed:

All of which makes me axe the musical question -- What does increasing
the technical content of the written exams have to do with testing to
ensure proficiency in a practical, manual communications skill? The
two concepts are not mutually exclusive. So why, then, are supposedly
intelligent and presumably educated people implying that they are?

73 de Larry, K3LT

2012. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-28 02:38:31 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010127213831.00714.00004493@nso-md.aol.com>
Source record: 2263

In article <20010126055054.12054.00001693@ng-fl1.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>
>Then you are concerned about his code speed. 0 is as real a number as 5.
>
>If you ARE concerned about people having a code speed, you would be concerned
>about the large number of hams who pass their code tests and never use the
>code. Those who do not operate are also at 0 wpm.
>
>73,
>Ed Hare, W1RFI

Ed:

I agree, which is why I now advocate the code tests being dropped altogether. Five WPM isn't fast enough to approach the proficiency which would give a code learner the confidence to try out his skills on-the-air. I never transmitted so much as a "dit" before I passed my 5 WPM test; nobody did, actually. However, it was months of regular on-the-air practice which got me from 5 WPM to 20 WPM -- and that would not have happened without the fun and excitement of my on-the-air experience. And, the better I got at CW, the less thrilled I became at 'phone. I was originally licensed in '81, and by '87, I was pretty much finished with HF 'phone. A particularly henious experience on 10-meters in '91 put the final nail in that coffin! Unfortunately, with a 5 WPM maximum code testing speed, the Morse code learning process starts and stops at the same time. Therefore, what good is the test anymore? The only problem now is to figure out how to retain CW spectrum -- which, in the absence of relevant testing, is going to be a neat trick!

73 de Larry, K3LT

2013. Re: Top 10 Problems facing Amteur Radio? (was Re: ARRL code test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-28 02:38:32 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010127213832.00714.00004494@nso-md.aol.com>
Source record: 2262

In article <20010126055408.12054.00001694@ng-fl1.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>>From: Brian Kelly kelly@dvol.com
>
>>Have any idea when you might be in Philly? N2EY and self will
>>pop for the lobster at Bookbinders.
>
>No, but I will try to keep you posted. My next trip is to Miami next weekend.
>
>

Philly is close enough to me...let me know when it is, and if it's on a Saturday, I'll try to join you!

73 de Larry, K3LT

2014. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-28 02:40:22 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <gl177tcjge2rke0h8o0e500v7i1tqlo2th@4ax.com>
Source record: 2264

Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com> wrote:
>Or if they don't have your local phone book.

If you travel only in your local area, I don't suggest HF for personal emergencies. Cell phones are the best. However if you're traveling cross country, *by any route*, you can't beat HF for continuous coverage...

Probably the most likely personal emergency need for me would be if I had a vehicle breakdown 50 miles from the nearest town. I have a 1-800 number to call for that, which would be easy to relay on HF if the cell phone was dead. In a real emergency like a serious illness or accident, I would just have the HF ham contact his local authorities and give them the information. They would then make the appropriate calls...

2015. Re: The knuckle head here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-28 02:56:20 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010127215620.00714.00004496@nso-md.aol.com>
Source record: 2265

In article <gtDc6.438$pL5.362271@news1.iquest.net>, kg9qm@nomail.net (don) writes:

>> Suture self, Doc.
>
>
>Sew what?

Cat gut your tongue?

73 de Larry, K3LT

2016. Re: Morse Code replacement? Bigtime flame war article!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-28 03:09:23 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccoll@radiks.net>
Message-ID: <M1Mc6.549$9m.1894477@nntp3.onemain.com>
Source record: 2266

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20010127205001.15091.00002511@ng-cs1.aol.com...
> >From: "Richard McCollum"
>
> >> http://www.eham.net/articles/1681
>
> >Another bleater that feels he needs five newsgroups to make a point.
>
> Unless AOL is lying to me again, this post should go only to rrap. :-)
>
> >We all know Morse testing is going to disappear, we all know it will
take
> >3-10 years to do so. So your problem is whether to study or moo.
>
> Actually, that code may very well be legal on HF. I see no reason that
a
> "digital" signal could not be OOK CW, which is a legal modulation on HF.
The
> other requirement is that a digital code sent must be publically
documented. I
> would have to check with a few legal types, but I bet this would meet
the
> requirements, under the same provisions that allow PSK-31, AMTOR, and a
number
> of others.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

You did hold it to one. This is a variation on a code used by POWs in the
Civil War that supposedly was never cracked. To make it writable, it used
two # and two X. In tap form, it used 4 bits to indicate the box and 9
for position.

I think (or methinks if you like) the key phrase is 'easier to learn' than
Morse. Perhaps my feelers are set a bit tight but escaping a code test
sure seemed to be the object of the game.
Personally, I am getting tired of the whole verstunken debate; providing a
path for the 5wpm contingent to get to journeyman levels is far more
important to the hobby than defending the medium from bleating cattle.

Dick

2017. Re: QCWA TELLS FCC TO END INCENTIVE LICENSING

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-28 03:31:00 UTC
From: Bob Wex w2ilp <w2ilp@juno.com>
Message-ID: <9503pktmi1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2267

In article <20010126220955.13167.00001049@ng-mb1.aol.com>,
w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:
> >From: Bob Wex w2ilp
>
> >The ARRL could be a driving force to do so...but
> >apparently it is not at the present time interested in strengthining
> >the basis and purpose of the hobby.
>
> The ARRL is not interested in doing it exactly the way you say it
should, so in
> your mind, it is not doing it at all.
>
> It is too bad; the things you are choosing to say to tear down
amateur radio to
> be "right" are undermining the very principles you stand for.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

Ed..I'm sorry if you think that my intention is to "tear down" ham radio. I don't want to do that. I just want to make you aware of the present sociology, technology and economics that may result in the "tear down" of ham radio...at least ham radio as most of us would like to see it. Many hams recognize the same problems that I see and are disgusted by the way things are going. I'm not a goody-good. As an engineer and as a teacher I often get people disgusted when I present facts that seem pessimistic...BUT somebody has to tell them that the Emperor is nude. I take such tasks on myself and don't mind being at risk for it.

The fact that ham radio (as most of us know it and want it to survive) is becoming obsolete has been a subject even among the most avid hams. Some have been disgusted since 1951 when the original technician licenses were issued. The idea of ham radio without short wave (HF) was considered a new dimention that polarized the HF hams from the VHF and above ones. Now we are entering a new era. Morse code as a ham requirement is being deemphisized worldwide. Will that get more Technicians to eventually work the HF bands? Perhaps it will. Perhaps some Techs see the hobby as two meter repeater clunking and that is their only bag. The modes and the frequencies that individual hams want to use should not divide them socially...
BUT
Now there are other communicators who can use cell phones and the Internet for fun and games as well as for business and household applications. Lots of hams also use cell-phones and the Internet.

DXers are sending QSLs via e-mail and there is a lot of relaying between the medias. This might not mean much to each ham involved but there is certainly going to be a metamorphasis of hams leaving the ham bands for more practical communicating methods which might better fit their needs and take up their valuable time. Can old timer hams truthfully recommend ham radio to youngsters? I would like to do so myself...BUT everytime I try to sell our hobby to an inteligent young potential techie, I find it more impossible.

It has always been my opinion that ham radio can be saved...not just as it is now but as a valuable technical educational asset. To do so ham radio leaders must rethink the hobby. Like an old computer, the hobby needs a lot of up-grading if it is to remain competative. The basis of the hobby must be organized so as to give it NEW purpose. If it sticks to present modes and methods it can not be accepted as an modern emergency asset, nor as an intermittent messanger of international good-will. It is obsolete when comparede to unlicensed communication as well as to the organization of commercial witrless services and the World Wide Web. If the ham licenses are to be given away without real incentives they can hold no value and their holders can thus hold no proof of being a national or international asset.

Once upon a time there were two ham handbooks. "The Radio Amateur's Handbook" was an ARRL publication. "The Radio Handbook" was a publication of the Editors and Engineers. "The Radio Handbook" was labeled: - "The Standard of the Field - for advanced amateurs, practical radiomen, practical engineers, practical technicians". The ARRL was in the north east, but the Editor's and Engineers were westerners and had a somewhat different slant on what ham technology was about. The editor of the latter has very recently passed away. He was Bill Orr, W6SAI. First Lew McCoy...Now Bill Orr...Maybe their passing is a sign of the end of the golden era of ham radio; The time when senior hams were respected for their technical abilities. Bill worked for Eimac and was in tune with the rapidly developing electronic industries of California and the other western states...not just New England, New York and New Jersey. I mention this because even though Ham Radio is National and International, it draws on the progress of hams in different environments, who apply technologies at different rates and have different foresight. If ham radio stops attracting such innovators as McCoy and Orr it will not progress in the coming century. Large corporations will not research and develop any innovative equipment for the dwindling ham population...even some of the Japanese corporations may drop out of the picture. If a new mode of modulation was developed, could it be given FCC approval and widely accepted among hams as single-sideband was in the 50s? There is no Art Collins and his crew at Cedar Rapids, no Collins Radio (It was bought by Rockwell International).

Even if there are capable ham experimenters, can they afford to revolutionize the hobby and bring it up to modern standards? How many world class electrical engineers are now willing to devote most of

their working efforts to ham radio? I dunno for sure, but the present trends all seem in the wrong direction and ill conceived.

Hams need more incentives, more license classes, more ham exams...and more respect.

73,
Bob Wex w2ilp (I Like Progress)

There are a thousand hacking at the branches of
evil to one who is hacking at the root.
--Henry David Thoreau--

A great statesman is he who knows when to depart
from traditions, as well as when to adhere to them.
--John Stuart Mill--

In our complex world, there cannot be fruitful
initiative without government, but unfortunately
there can be government without initiative.
-Bertrand Russel--

A government that can let anyone be a ham, can
eventually let no one be a ham.
--w2ilp--

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2018. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-28 04:16:27 UTC
From: billsohl@mindspring.com
Message-ID: <3a738779.5105449@news.mindspring.com>
Source record: 2268

On 24 Jan 2001 23:35:21 GMT, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:

>I have little doubt that the ARRL Board will re-examine the issue when it
>appears that it will come up at the US regulatory level. I don't know what
>decision the Board will reach. That will depend on member input, I am sure.
>Rest assured, I will be communicating with Tom on a regular basis on a lot of
>issues, and this will be one of them. I would imagine that your note to Mr Race
>told him what you thought the results of the re-examination should be. The
>Board will probably re-examine it, but could decide to drop it, to keep it the
>same, or to ask for some sort of change.
>
>My personal view is that the "Sohl" proposal, as I call it after his
>Correspondence piece in QST, to keep some code-copying testing in the exams,
>but include the results of the questions along with all of the other questions.
> That keeps code testing on a par with other modes that are important to
>amateur radio operation.

My my, you take a business trip to London for a few days and
return to find major upheaval in the policy department.
Well done ARRL! I disagree with the possibile retention
of a code test for USA, but that's far enough out that I am
quite happy with the change regarding S25.5.

As to my "Sohl" proposal ala QST some years back...I'd not
oppose having some questions along the lines of those
similar to the questions regarding knowledge of the phonetic alphabet.
(e.g. The morse code characters for SOS is: dididit dahdahdah dididit
with other answers being incorrect versions).

>As a code guy, I think it is important that the applicant be exposed to the
>code from the getgo and that he or she be given as much opportunity to learn it
>as other modes. To me, this is probably a compromise position that both sides
>should consider.

I think that will be determined more by the FCC than anything
else. Time will tell.

Again, kudos to ARRL...and thankfully I renewed for 3 years
a few months ago before the now approved dues increase :-)

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK
ARRL LGL
NCI BOD

2019. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-28 04:16:28 UTC
From: billsohl@mindspring.com
Message-ID: <3a739cc7.10560697@news.mindspring.com>
Source record: 2269

On 26 Jan 2001 03:34:03 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

>Bill Sohl wrote:
>>
>> The problem is, as you note, "if I ran across the...".
>> The reality is that there isn't any common HF assigned
>> emergency frequency that people (hams) might be able
>> to monitor for that unexpected emergency.
>
> *OF COURSE* there is! Every state has at least one emergency frequency.
>As always, you naturally assume that no one on a SSB frequency would
>ever have any reason to use CW instead of SSB.

And just where are those "every state has one" frequencies
posted or found? Part 97? ARRL web site? Is someone
keeping this all a secret?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2020. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-28 04:25:26 UTC
From: billsohl@mindspring.com
Message-ID: <3a739e20.10905563@news.mindspring.com>
Source record: 2270

On 26 Jan 2001 15:03:12 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

>W1RFI wrote:
>>
>> >From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
>> >> I don't believe that Larry is going through all of the work of serving on
>> >> the NCI Board because he feels that doing so is easier than learning the
>> >> code.
>>
>> >No, it's an inflated sense of selfpity.
>>
>> And why do you feel that Bill Sohl and Carl Stevenson are serving on the
>> NCI Board?
>
> Probably because they don't see any value in knowing how to use CW on
>the air, I'd imagine.

Minor correction here: I (I'll speak for myself only) don't see any
value in requiring EVERY ham with an HF license to know
how to use CW on the air. For those that use CW, enjoy CW,
that is a personal value that I can't and won't argue against.
To each his own.

>But so far they don't keep insisting it's a
>Federal civil rights case, at least on rrap.

Personal opinion follows: In my opinion, I think a
case could probably be made today on the ADA issue
of code requirments...BUT, I don't believe such a case
would be easily won, nor would it be inexpensive...and hence
I see no point in attempting such nor in argueing pro
or con on that basis.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2021. Re: Enough already

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-28 05:19:12 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3A73ABAA.3390872C@sccoast.net>
Source record: 2271

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> W1RFI wrote:
> >
> > How would we feel if all of the CB
> > newsgroup posts were cross-posted here?
> > Do you think it would be disruptive?
>
> I'd feel like some idjut like Cecil
> deliberately added their NGs to some
> response post just to stir things up.
> Not the first time either.

Actually, Dick, rec.radio.cb was added to this thread by Stewart R Teaze, the person who started this thread. And, I'm sure he added rec.radio.cb because CB'ers are members of the radio community and therefore might have some interest in a discussion about a proposed new radio service.

Of course, since then, it has become very obvious that some CB'ers don't want to be considered part of the radio community, and are therefore not interested in discussions about that. So, I'm sure Stewart R Teaze will take that into consideration before adding that newsgroup to future discussions.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net

2022. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-28 05:54:32 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A73B418.2D8FA4FE@IEEE.org>
Source record: 2272

W1RFI wrote:
> Just a minor correction; it is the FCC, not the ARRL, that will release the
> band to the rest of us.

I'm ready. My IC-706 is already unlocked. :-)
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2023. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-28 06:03:08 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A73B61C.981E1BB5@IEEE.org>
Source record: 2273

Bill Sohl wrote:
> Personal opinion follows: In my opinion, I think a
> case could probably be made today on the ADA issue
> of code requirments...BUT, I don't believe such a case
> would be easily won, nor would it be inexpensive...and hence
> I see no point in attempting such nor in argueing pro
> or con on that basis.

Somebody recently reported that such a case had been presented
to the courts and the ADA won. I certainly don't see any benefit
at all for a deaf person having to learn Morse code unless he/she
simply wants the gigantic challenge of reading Morse code while
looking at an LED or feeling of a speaker in the normally noisy HF
environment.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2024. Re: Morse Code replacement? Bigtime flame war article!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-28 08:29:57 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <950la5$e8b$0@208.207.71.134>
Source record: 2274

Richard McCollum wrote:
>
> Personally, I am getting tired of the whole verstunken debate; providing a
> path for the 5wpm contingent to get to journeyman levels is far more
> important to the hobby than defending the medium from bleating cattle.
>

Yes. And so I have stated on numerous occasions,though that fact seems
tohave been overlooked in their zeal to overpower it still, even though
it has already been killed. The code test in toto is as dead as the
molasses of officialdom will allow it to be, tho it won't totally
disappear for an unknown number of years hence due to that very effect.
And with the ingenuity of those whose whole intent seems bent on
avoiding learning Morse at all costs, even to the poinbt of advocating
the "tap code" as it's replacement, the idea of persuading many of them
to voluntarily become skilled to useful Morse speeds doesn't seem to
hold much realistic promise.

Dick

2025. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-28 08:33:59 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <950lhn$e8b$1@208.207.71.134>
Source record: 2275

Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> On 26 Jan 2001 03:34:03 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>
> >Bill Sohl wrote:
> >>
> >> The problem is, as you note, "if I ran across the...".
> >> The reality is that there isn't any common HF assigned
> >> emergency frequency that people (hams) might be able
> >> to monitor for that unexpected emergency.
> >>
> > *OF COURSE* there is! Every state has at least one emergency frequency.
> >As always, you naturally assume that no one on a SSB frequency would
> >ever have any reason to use CW instead of SSB.
>
> And just where are those "every state has one" frequencies
> posted or found? Part 97? ARRL web site? Is someone
> keeping this all a secret?

Uh, Bill, order the ARRL publication "ARRL Net Directory".

2026. Re: ARRL Life Membership

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-28 10:33:58 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <950simfil1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2276

In article <20010127200512.15119.00002078@ng-cs1.aol.com>,
w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:
> >From: Brian brianburke@my-deja.com
> >
>
> >Mike won't be hard to detect. His labored breathing from dragging
that
> >duffel bag full of call signs will give him away.
>
> From what I read on the enforcement logs, that duffel bag is probably
quite a
> bit lighter of late. :-)
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

I ran a QRZ.com search a couple of weeks ago. Not much is turning up on
him anymore.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2027. Re: CA power crisis caused by internet

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-28 12:30:00 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccoll@radiks.net>
Message-ID: <1fUc6.627$9m.2217052@nntp3.onemain.com>
Source record: 2277

> Kerry King wrote:
>
> > The California power crisis is not due to what we have been led to
> > believe. Instead, it is the fault of the internet.

Like a lot of people, I kind of blew this bit of opinion off.
Deregulation was handled so poorly in CA that a collapse was inevitable.
Nothing new has changed that situation. But the suddenness and ferocity
of the collapse may have indeed been influenced by the New Economy.

1990 1996 1997 2000

Demand GW-H 240k 258k 250k 300k
Capacity (gigawatts) 55 56 53.6 53.8

Capacity excludes out-of-state and micropower.

What the hell happened? The only thing I know for sure is that Silicon
Valley's consumption has grown at over 8% per year. The man has a point
albeit a fairly small one.

The 'deregulation that wasn't' is adequately summarized in the Economist:
"...California reforms are a ragbag of muddled half-measures and downright
anti-competitive clauses".

But the man who predicted this whether deregulated or not would have to
have a big red S on his sweatshirt.

Dick NBK

2028. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-28 13:20:20 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010128082020.21683.00001748@ng-mj1.aol.com>
Source record: 2278

>From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

> Uh, Bill, order the ARRL publication "ARRL Net Directory".

It is available on-line at:

http://www.arrl.org/FandES/field/nets/

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2029. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-28 13:24:51 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010128082451.21683.00001750@ng-mj1.aol.com>
Source record: 2279

>From: billsohl@mindspring.com (Bill Sohl)

>I disagree with the possibile retention of a code test for USA, but that's far

>enough out that I am quite happy with the change regarding S25.5.

The Board chose not to change the US policy at this time.

>As to my "Sohl" proposal ala QST some years back...I'd not
>oppose having some questions along the lines of those
>similar to the questions regarding knowledge of the phonetic alphabet.

How would you feel about the test containing 5 minutes of Morse code at 5 wpm,
and a reasonable number of questions about its content?

>Again, kudos to ARRL...and thankfully I renewed for 3 years
>a few months ago before the now approved dues increase :-)

I did it after they announced the dues increase, but it is not too late; the
increase goes into effect in July. Every time the League raises dues, there is
an increase in multi-year renewals. I don't even mind paying the increase, but
I would rather make a contribution to something specific of interest to me,
like the Big Project or the ARRL Lab Test Equipment fund. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2030. Re: ARRL Life Membership - Don't buy one!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-28 13:30:32 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010128083032.21683.00001751@ng-mj1.aol.com>
Source record: 2280

>From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

> What does increasing the technical content of the written exams
> have to do with testing to ensure proficiency in a practical,
> manual communications skill?

The rationale, if memory serves, is that the ARRL wanted to see the overall level of difficulty and accomplishment remain the same.

IMHO, the relationship is indirect, at best. OTOH, I believe that testing for an understanding of the technical fundamentals is more valuable to the Amateur Radio Service than is testing about Morse code decoding proficiency.

> So why, then, are supposedly intelligent and presumably educated people
> implying that they are?

You tell me, Larry; I am sure if I did a deja search I would find you stating that Morse code testing is required because the written exams are "easily" memorized, or otherwise inadequate.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2031. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-28 13:31:30 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010128083130.21683.00001752@ng-mj1.aol.com>
Source record: 2281

>From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

>QFU isn't on my Q-signal list. I've never heard it on the air.

I have heard it on the air and I didn't need a list to know exactly what it meant.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2032. Re: ARRL Life Membership - Don't buy one!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-28 13:33:05 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010128083305.21683.00001753@ng-mj1.aol.com>
Source record: 2282

>From: Dick Carroll

>Marconi always considered himself a ham although he never held a ham
>radio license.

I think he should have been grandfathered and just given one. I don't think, however, that his code speed would have been high enough that he could have been allowed on more than the Tech+ bands on HF.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2033. Re: Morse Code replacement? Bigtime flame war article!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-28 13:51:17 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010128085117.21683.00001754@ng-mj1.aol.com>
Source record: 2283

>From: "Richard McCollum"

>I think (or methinks if you like) the key phrase is 'easier to learn' than
>Morse. Perhaps my feelers are set a bit tight but escaping a code test
>sure seemed to be the object of the game.

If that is the object of the game, the game has been lost. If legal, it can be used on VHF by those who have not passed a code test (so can Morse code), but to use a digital mode on HF, under the present rules, one would require a Technician license and the HF endorsement granted by passing a 5 wpm test.

> providing a path for the 5wpm contingent to get to journeyman levels is
> far more important to the hobby than defending the medium from
> bleating cattle.

If those of us who enjoy Morse code want to see newcomers use and enjoy the mode, too, you are quite right -- ways of getting people from 5 wpm to higher speeds are pretty important.

I am NOT impressed with the methods being used. To the contrary, I believe that the anger, the bitterness and the name calling that is being done by some to "defend" the mode is setting the stage for failure. Telling newcomers that Morse code is a difficult task that will test their character and help keep the riff-raff out of ham radio will not send a message that this is something they can use and enjoy. A message that explains why it is enjoyable, why it is effective and letting them see love of the mode in your eyes and in your words will be much more likely to gain converts that much of what I have seen here.

I think most of us realize that, sooner, or later, the Morse code requirement for testing will either be dropped or significantly changed. If it is, many of those things that are being said right now by people who claim to be Morse code proponents will be more likely to keep people away from the mode than to encourage them to use it. Think for a minute about what you will say to encourage new hams to use code if the code test is no longer part of the the requirements. THOSE words are the ones you should be using right now, to the large number of hams who have not yet passed a code test and to the ones who have passed a code test, but are not yet trying out the mode. I have seen the collective memory of the Amateur Radio Service over incentive licensing. Over a quarter of a century later, the ill will still echoes in our circles. Don't doubt for a minute that this next generation of hams will remember what was said today, whether they have to remember if 3 years hence, or 10.

Those who really want to preserve the use of Morse code on the ham bands should be encouaging new hams to give it a try. They should be forming slow-code nets, and looking for those 5 wpm CQs and giving them a nice QSO and some affirmation that this is a fun mode that will bring value and enjoyment to

their use of it. Where are these things? Has ARRL done them? Has FISTS? Have you? All I see by those who may think they are "defending" Morse code is posturing and name calling. IMHO, taking real steps to get people from 5 wpm to what you term "journeyman" levels is more valuable than the use of the term "bleating cattle" on rrap.

I noted in the ARRL Board minutes that the Board has directed ARRL HQ staff to take steps to promote the use of Morse code on the bands. At this point, I don't know what those steps will be, nor am I sure that ARRL will actually pull this one off, but I sure intend to offer my input to what may be needed to make that happen. Although at this time, I have a very short list of what will help, perhaps the first thing on the list is to drop all the name calling and bring back the fun.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2034. Re: Morse Code replacement? Bigtime flame war article!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-28 13:55:05 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010128085505.21683.00001756@ng-mj1.aol.com>
Source record: 2284

>From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

>Yes. And so I have stated on numerous occasions,though that fact seems
>tohave been overlooked in their zeal to overpower it still, even though
>it has already been killed.

Morse code use on the bands has not been killed at all, Dick. Are you really trying to destroy is just to be "right" in this debate? If so, you are wrong.

> the idea of persuading many of them to voluntarily become skilled to useful
> Morse speeds doesn't seem to hold much realistic promise.

If you really are giving up, perhaps you could stand back and let those with a more positive outlook take over from here. Your choice of words is really trying to hasten the demise of my favorite mode. I disagree with you that Morse code use is unable to stand on its own merits.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2035. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-28 13:57:52 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010128085752.21683.00001757@ng-mj1.aol.com>
Source record: 2285

>From: Aaron Jones nomail@nomail.com

>In a real emergency like a serious illness or
>accident, I would just have the HF ham contact his local authorities
>and give them the information. They would then make the appropriate
>calls...

The SSB County Hunters and Mobile Emergency net meets daily and continously when the band is open on 14.336 MHz. The CW net meets on 14.0565, but the operation is a bit more sporadic. If I had a mobile emergency, I would break the 336 net and be pretty confident that someone would have good propagation to me and would ensure that I got help.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2036. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-28 14:23:17 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <951a0i$o48$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2286

In article <20010128083130.21683.00001752@ng-mj1.aol.com>,
w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:
> >From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
>
> >QFU isn't on my Q-signal list. I've never heard it on the air.
>
> I have heard it on the air and I didn't need a list to know exactly
> what it meant.

Maybe it was sent with a "Coconut Boat Swing" and he couldn't copy it.

Poor Dick. You have to wonder if he operates at all. ;)

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2037. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-28 14:30:22 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <951advogt1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2287

In article <20010127200325.15119.00002077@ng-cs1.aol.com>,
w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:
> >From: Brian brianburke@my-deja.com
>
> >Once the ARRL releases that 5mhz band to the rest
> >of us, it can be added to the NVIS arsenal.
>
> Just a minor correction; it is the FCC, not the ARRL, that will
release the
> band to the rest of us.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

I thought it was the ARRL that picked the beta-testers of the band, so
it would be the ARRL that lets the rest of us on it. I stand corrected.

;)

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2038. Re: Morse Code replacement? Bigtime flame war article!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-28 15:09:43 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010128100943.02315.00004299@nso-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 2289

In article <20010128085117.21683.00001754@ng-mj1.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>> providing a path for the 5wpm contingent to get to journeyman levels is
>> far more important to the hobby than defending the medium from
>> bleating cattle.

>If those of us who enjoy Morse code want to see newcomers use and enjoy the
>mode, too, you are quite right -- ways of getting people from 5 wpm to higher
>speeds are pretty important.
>
>I am NOT impressed with the methods being used. To the contrary, I believe
>that the anger, the bitterness and the name calling that is being done by
>some
>to "defend" the mode is setting the stage for failure. Telling newcomers
>that
>Morse code is a difficult task that will test their character and help keep
>the riff-raff out of ham radio will not send a message that this is something
>they can use and enjoy.

Ed:

I agree with the above, but there's only one problem -- it is the people who were AGAINST code testing who were making those claims! All of the anger, bitterness, and name calling was started by those who sought to avoid code testing by discrediting those who were in favor of it on the basis that they were being mean-spirited and not being "inclusive" in their attitude toward newcomers to ham radio. The touchy-feely, politically-correct liberals whined, and the League, the equipment manufacturers, and the ham radio publications took up their cause, because they knew on which side their bread was buttered -- or so they thought!

>A message that explains why it is enjoyable, why it is
>effective and letting them see love of the mode in your eyes and in your
>words
>will be much more likely to gain converts that much of what I have seen here.

Which is exactly the message the pro-code test people have been giving all along -- in addition to largely ignored offers to assist people in learning the Morse code. The problem is -- nobody wants to make the required effort. A classic "You can lead a horse to water, but you can't make him drink" scenario. Just what exactly are the Post-Restructuring numbers of newly-licensed hams with a General or Extra ticket?

>I think most of us realize that, sooner, or later, the Morse code requirement
>for testing will either be dropped or significantly changed. If it is, many
>of
>those things that are being said right now by people who claim to be Morse
>code
>proponents will be more likely to keep people away from the mode than to
>encourage them to use it.

No, Ed, what will keep people away from Morse code is the necessity to learn it and practice it enough to gain operational proficiency. In other words, the same thing that kept people away from it all along.

>Think for a minute about what you will say to
>encourage new hams to use code if the code test is no longer part of the the
>requirements. THOSE words are the ones you should be using right now, to the
>large number of hams who have not yet passed a code test and to the ones who
>have passed a code test, but are not yet trying out the mode. I have seen
>the
>collective memory of the Amateur Radio Service over incentive licensing. Over
>a
>quarter of a century later, the ill will still echoes in our circles. Don't
>doubt for a minute that this next generation of hams will remember what was
>said today, whether they have to remember if 3 years hence, or 10.

Bull$hit, Ed! Just more touchy-feely PoliticKally-CorrecKtness spewing from that liberal enclave at 225 Main St. Seriously, you should really consider wearing some flowers in your hair! Go hug a tree or something!

>Those who really want to preserve the use of Morse code on the ham bands
>should
>be encouaging new hams to give it a try. They should be forming slow-code
>nets, and looking for those 5 wpm CQs and giving them a nice QSO and some
>affirmation that this is a fun mode that will bring value and enjoyment to
>their use of it. Where are these things? Has ARRL done them? Has FISTS?
>Have you?

Yes, Ed, I have! As usual, participation is practically nil. Everyone who was interested is now "grandfathered" to the Extra-class due to having passed a 5 WPM test years ago; and they're all on HF phone with a vengeance.

>All I see by those who may think they are "defending" Morse code is
>posturing and name calling.

That's funny -- that's exactly what I've seen coming from those who were seeking to reduce/eliminate code testing requirements!

> IMHO, taking real steps to get people from 5 wpm
>to what you term "journeyman" levels is more valuable than the use of the
>term
>"bleating cattle" on rrap.

No, Ed, what would have worked was a willingness of those who wanted HF licensure to make the effort to learn and gain useful proficiency in Morse

code -- as opposed to their incessant, cattle-like bleating about how learning a useful communications skill was inhibiting the development of high-speed digital modes, etc, etc, etc.

>I noted in the ARRL Board minutes that the Board has directed ARRL HQ staff
>to
>take steps to promote the use of Morse code on the bands. At this point, I
>don't know what those steps will be, nor am I sure that ARRL will actually
>pull
>this one off, but I sure intend to offer my input to what may be needed to
>make
>that happen. Although at this time, I have a very short list of what will
>help, perhaps the first thing on the list is to drop all the name calling and
>bring back the fun.

Ed, I've never done any "name calling" except within the confines of the small, closed society of Usenet. My in-person behavior to prospective ham radio newcomers has never given anyone any cause to reject the notion of learning the Morse code. In every case, once these people found out that learning this skill would require a serious commitment and genuine effort on their part, they disappeared in droves -- only to show up on the VHF/UHF repeaters praying for some "ducting." So, one of the first things you'll have to come up with is some way to overcome the natural laziness of people who just want to get a microphone in their hot little hands and start talking!

The only thing that kept the CW mode alive as long as this was the REQUIREMENT to learn it at levels which lead to operational proficiency. In the absence of that requirement, the mode WILL die. And no amount of blowing sunshine up people's asses will change that. The problem is called LAZINESS. That's what you're up against. Good luck.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2039. Re: ARRL Life Membership - Don't buy one!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-28 15:09:44 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010128100944.02315.00004300@nso-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 2288

In article <20010128083305.21683.00001753@ng-mj1.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>
>>Marconi always considered himself a ham although he never held a ham
>>radio license.
>
>I think he should have been grandfathered and just given one. I don't think,
>however, that his code speed would have been high enough that he could have
>been allowed on more than the Tech+ bands on HF.

Ed:

I think you're thinking about Lee DeForrest. Marconi was a proficient CW operator. I don't think DeForrest ever knew the Morse code.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2040. Re: ARRL Life Membership - Don't buy one!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-28 15:09:44 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010128100944.02315.00004301@nso-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 2290

In article <20010128083032.21683.00001751@ng-mj1.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>
>> So why, then, are supposedly intelligent and presumably educated people
>> implying that they are?
>
>You tell me, Larry; I am sure if I did a deja search I would find you stating
>that Morse code testing is required because the written exams are "easily"
>memorized, or otherwise inadequate.

Ed:

I'll betcha a lobster dinner you can't! I've never said that there was any direct relationship between code testing and written exams. I've *always* said that the two were separate and equally important tests, and that I supported the updating of the written exams, including a change from the short-term memorization paradigm now so common today. However, I've also said that the written exams were appropriate for an *amateur* radio license examination (emphasis on the word *amateur* is important). If you can find a quote from me where I clearly state that the written tests were directly related to, and could serve as a replacement for the code tests, you've won a second lobster dinner from me!

73 de Larry, K3LT

2041. Re: CA power crisis caused by internet

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-28 15:44:08 UTC
From: Keith Wood <kw@bctv.com>
Message-ID: <3A743E48.461D2926@bctv.com>
Source record: 2291

Richard McCollum wrote:
>
> > Kerry King wrote:
> >
> > > The California power crisis is not due to what we have been led to
> > > believe. Instead, it is the fault of the internet.
>
> Like a lot of people, I kind of blew this bit of opinion off.
> Deregulation was handled so poorly in CA that a collapse was inevitable.
> Nothing new has changed that situation. But the suddenness and ferocity
> of the collapse may have indeed been influenced by the New Economy.
>
> 1990 1996 1997 2000
>
> Demand GW-H 240k 258k 250k 300k
> Capacity (gigawatts) 55 56 53.6 53.8
>
> Capacity excludes out-of-state and micropower.
>
> What the hell happened? The only thing I know for sure is that Silicon
> Valley's consumption has grown at over 8% per year. The man has a point
> albeit a fairly small one.
>
> The 'deregulation that wasn't' is adequately summarized in the Economist:
> "...California reforms are a ragbag of muddled half-measures and downright
> anti-competitive clauses".
>
> But the man who predicted this whether deregulated or not would have to
> have a big red S on his sweatshirt.

Nope, I predicted it over 20 years ago, in a column regarding the
anti-powerplant folks and their move into the California Legislature.

You can't get electricity from a generator which wasn't built. More
people means more need. Economic expansion means more people AND more
commercial power use, but the Neanderthals in Sacramento made it all but
impossible to build capacity to follow the increase in need.

Your computer has about the same current drain as the one you had 10
years ago -- the rough equivalent of running your living room lights --
AND today's computers are "energy aware," dropping consumption during
periods of non-use. While there are a few more computers today than a
decade ago (most systems sold are replacing existing hardware, and the
older machines are not being re-used), there are not enough to cause a
major shift in consumption patterns.

2042. Re: CA power crisis caused by internet

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-28 15:52:02 UTC
From: Keith Wood <kw@bctv.com>
Message-ID: <3A744022.DE478880@bctv.com>
Source record: 2292

Kerry King wrote:
>
> On Sun, 28 Jan 2001 06:30:00 -0600, Richard McCollum wrote:
>
> : Like a lot of people, I kind of blew this bit of opinion off.
> : Deregulation was handled so poorly in CA that a collapse was inevitable.
> : Nothing new has changed that situation. But the suddenness and ferocity
> : of the collapse may have indeed been influenced by the New Economy.
>
> That wasn't my opinion; I was merely relaying what had been reported as
> the findings of a blue ribbon panel at
>
> http://www.cnn.com/2001/TECH/computing/01/17/internet.energy.idg/index.html
>
> In that article, statements such as the following one certainly make it
> at least look probable that the internet has indeed had a huge impact on
> California power consumption:
>
> ... So concluded a premier agency of the electric
> power industry and officials at some utilities,
> who cited a huge increase in demand in areas where
> Internet hubs and data centers have come online in
> the past few years. In the heart of Silicon
> Valley, for example, power demands skyrocketed by
> 12% last year, while the rest of the state saw an
> overall increase of 2% to 3%, said John Roukeme, a
> spokesman for Silicon Valley Power, the municipal
> utility for the city of Santa Clara, Calif.
>
> "A single [Internet] data center - and we have
> many in the area - can easily consume more power
> than the largest manufacturing plant we serve,"
> Roukeme said.

Of course, he's lying. At least from my perspective, having worked my
way through school in manufacturing plants and now being involved with
computers.

2043. Code Quick RULEZ!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-28 16:31:37 UTC
From: jason_hsu@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <951hh9tpu1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2293
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

The answer can be summed up in two words: Code Quick!

The web site is:
http://www.cq2k.net/

Too bad there hasn't been a review of Code Quick in QST. It's also too bad that Code Quick isn't better well known or better well promoted.

Code Quick may be silly, cutesy, and over-the-top, but it WORKS!!! I challenge you to find anyone who will say, "I really, really tried, but Code Quick didn't work." (That's right, none of the Code Quick critics actually used it.) Then compare the failure rate of Code Quick to the failure rates of the more conventional methods (Koch method, listening to Code tapes, memorizing dits and dahs, listening to Morse Code and expecting divine inspiration to take over, etc.).

If you don't believe me, just search for "Code Quick" on eham.net, deja.com, and other sites.

--
Jason Hsu, AG4DG
jason_hsu@@@@@@@planetmail.com
http://www.bigfoot.com/~jason_hsu/

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2044. Re: ARRL Life Membership - Don't buy one!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-28 16:35:23 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A744A4B.AFDA33A3@IEEE.org>
Source record: 2294

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> I've never said that there was any
> direct relationship between code testing and written exams. I've
> *always* said that the two were separate and equally important tests, ...

"Separate and equal", eh? Why do you consider Morse code skill as
important as everything else in amateur radio combined?

Seems to me Morse code skill may be around 5% of what amateur radio
is all about. Seems Bill's and Ed's idea would work very well if
5% of the written exam was on Morse code skill.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2045. Re: Morse Code replacement? Bigtime flame war article!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-28 16:38:19 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A744AFB.140BB694@IEEE.org>
Source record: 2295

W1RFI wrote:
> If you really are giving up, perhaps you could stand back and let those with a
> more positive outlook take over from here. Your choice of words is really
> trying to hasten the demise of my favorite mode. I disagree with you that Morse
> code use is unable to stand on its own merits.

Ditto for me. QRP interest is on the rise.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2046. Re: Morse Code replacement? Bigtime flame war article!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-28 16:58:22 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A744FAE.47E5893E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 2296

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> >Telling newcomers that
> >Morse code is a difficult task that will test their character and help keep
> >the riff-raff out of ham radio will not send a message that this is something
> >they can use and enjoy.
>
> I agree with the above, but there's only one problem -- it is the people who
> were AGAINST code testing who were making those claims!

People who were AGAINST code testing said that Morse code builds character
and keeps the riff-raff out of ham radio????? Give us an ever-loving break,
Larry. What an absolutely ridiculous assertion.

> >A message that explains why it is enjoyable, why it is
> >effective and letting them see love of the mode in your eyes and in your words
> >will be much more likely to gain converts that much of what I have seen here.
>
> Which is exactly the message the pro-code test people have been giving
> all along ...

"Know code = know ham" gives that message????? Shirley, you jest.

> Ed, I've never done any "name calling" except within the confines of the
> small, closed society of Usenet.

Larry, Usenet is read world-wide by a large number of potential hams.
You have reached magnitudes more people on Usenet that you will ever
reach in person or over ham radio. You cannot possibly undo the anti-
Morse sentiment that you have caused.

> The only thing that kept the CW mode alive as long as this was the
> REQUIREMENT to learn it at levels which lead to operational proficiency.

I do not believe that is true, Larry. But if it is true and CW cannot
stand on its own merits without governmental welfare support, then it
deserves to be laid to rest in the sands of time. I believe CW will
endure because it has merits, the ones that you believe it lacks.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2047. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-28 17:05:39 UTC
From: xjim@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <951jgv$va9$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2298

> The US Army had the 10 to 15 Watt RF output AN/GRC-9 in WW2,
> manpack by two men, one carrying the arm-powered generator with
> its funny tripod-seat arrangement. Trust me, after a half hour of
> continuous winding (peak load on transmit was 40 W max.), the
> "winder" was QRT and needed replacing.
>
OH YA!

I had the opportunity to test one out when a school chum brought one into the electronics class. I suspect that any grunt under E3 would have ditched such a contraption on the first march. I thought much more horsepower than 40 watts worth was being lost to the tube filiments and gearbox and grease losses.

About the same time, one of the kid Novices (campus ham club) homebrewed a bicycle mounted QRP station that really worked The generator would keep the NiCads up between stationary CW ops. The 10 mile ride to and from school could just about do it.

I imagine that you could get a lot more efficiency today out of the manual generator. Not very practical for the rubber raft, but where would we be if the power grid went south for a month or more? For stationary power generation, wind and hydraulic are doable on a small scale, very cheaply with rewound alternators and such. One such contraption out of Pop Mechanix had a wind turbine made out of an 80 gal oil drum cut up like a rooftop vent turbine and spun on a wheel bearing. It drove a rewound car alternator to keep a battery topped off. About 90 miles east of here, is a vast array of wind turbines that catches the wind as it funnels through the pass just this side of Palm Springs, CA. It probably won't pay for itself, but it does put power onto the grid.

Jim, ac6tk

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2048. Re: ARRL Life Membership - Don't buy one!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-28 17:13:27 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <951jvhvmn1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2299

In article <3A744A4B.AFDA33A3@IEEE.org>,
Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > I've never said that there was any
> > direct relationship between code testing and written exams. I've
> > *always* said that the two were separate and equally important
tests, ...
>
> "Separate and equal", eh? Why do you consider Morse code skill as
> important as everything else in amateur radio combined?
>
> Seems to me Morse code skill may be around 5% of what amateur radio
> is all about. Seems Bill's and Ed's idea would work very well if
> 5% of the written exam was on Morse code skill.

"Separate but Equal?"

Lemme see, if CW gets 5% of the written, and RTTY gets 5% of the
written, and AM gets 5% of the written, and USB and LSB each get 2.5% of
the written, and SSTV gets 5% of the written, and NBFM gets 5% of the
written, and FSTV gets 5% of the written, and Packet gets 5% of the
written, and psk1 gets 5% of the written, and msk...

We're already at 50% of the exam and haven't touched rules or
authorizations, let alone safety.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2049. Re: Code Quick RULEZ!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-28 17:15:05 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A745399.7299DD6C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 2300
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

jason_hsu@my-deja.com wrote:
> Too bad there hasn't been a review of Code Quick in QST. It's also too
> bad that Code Quick isn't better well known or better well promoted.

Code Quick probably works well at 5wpm. I could be wrong, but seems to
me, it wouldn't work above about 15wpm and would actually limit one's
maximum code speed.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2050. Re: Morse Code replacement? Bigtime flame war article!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-28 17:17:44 UTC
From: Ed Cregger <ecregger@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <YuYc6.3268$2t5.293747@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 2297
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna

So where did you mention antennas?
--
Ed Cregger
ecregger@earthlink.net

"Jethro Jumbalaya Twain" <qwasty@hotmail.com> wrote in
message news:94vmlejkg1@nnrp1.deja.com...
> The article is about a replacement for Morse that's easier
to learn.
> It's a lot like Morse, just a different code.
>
> http://www.eham.net/articles/1681
>
>
> Sent via Deja.com
> http://www.deja.com/
>

2051. Re: ARRL Life Membership - Don't buy one!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-28 17:20:20 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <951kcd$5g$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2301

In article <20010128100944.02315.00004300@nso-fi.aol.com>,
yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote:
> In article <20010128083305.21683.00001753@ng-mj1.aol.com>,
w1rfi@aol.com
> (W1RFI) writes:
>
> >
> >>Marconi always considered himself a ham although he never held a ham
> >>radio license.
> >
> >I think he should have been grandfathered and just given one. I
don't think,
> >however, that his code speed would have been high enough that he
could have
> >been allowed on more than the Tech+ bands on HF.
>
> Ed:
>
> I think you're thinking about Lee DeForrest. Marconi was a proficient
> CW operator. I don't think DeForrest ever knew the Morse code.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

As long as you're not talking about FB Morse. He didn't know dink about
radio. ;)

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2052. Re: ARRL Life Membership - Don't buy one!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-28 17:22:05 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A74553C.D1C09694@IEEE.org>
Source record: 2303

Brian wrote:
> Lemme see, if CW gets 5% of the written, and RTTY gets 5% of the
> written, and AM gets 5% of the written, and USB and LSB each get 2.5% of
> the written, and SSTV gets 5% of the written, and NBFM gets 5% of the
> written, and FSTV gets 5% of the written, and Packet gets 5% of the
> written, and psk1 gets 5% of the written, and msk...
>
> We're already at 50% of the exam and haven't touched rules or
> authorizations, let alone safety.

Well, I would only allocate 5% to SSB, FM, and CW. The less popular
modes would be allocated less than 5%.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2053. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-28 17:24:57 UTC
From: xjim@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <951kl2$8p$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2302

I thought all ham frequencies were Emergency frequencies!?

Jim, ac6tk

> > Uh, Bill, order the ARRL publication "ARRL Net Directory".
>
> It is available on-line at:
>
> http://www.arrl.org/FandES/field/nets/
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2054. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-28 17:52:25 UTC
From: Jim Weir <jim@rst-engr.com>
Message-ID: <ljm87t487cpqil6f6j93l6lis36hcnbahf@4ax.com>
Source record: 2304

w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI)
shared these priceless pearls of wisdom:

->How would you feel about the test containing 5 minutes of Morse code at 5 wpm,
->and a reasonable number of questions about its content?

Ed...

As you know, I'm a proponent of the elimination of code tests overall, except perhaps the one that is of some practical use like the ASCII code {;-)

HOWEVER, if there is great feeling that somehow Morse Code is a relic to keep holy, then the 5 wpm should be straight text out of the newspaper or a schoolbook. Learning the code and then all the arcane jargon that is used in hamspeak at the same time is a rather daunting task. And yes, I'll run my college "RF Communications 101" class again this summer and yes, I'll teach the stupid code, and yes, I'll infect my students with the "this is stupid to have to learn" attitude. Perhaps if I can turn out enough students that will percolate to positions where they can do something about it, change will happen.

In politics, this is called the "septic tank principle". Most of the $#!+ flows down, but the really big chunks float to the top!!

Regards,

Jim
Jim Weir, VP Eng. RST Eng. WX6RST
A&P, CFI, and other good alphabet soup

2055. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-28 18:39:35 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <jop87t471lll1okuce0tut797uutuv48q8@4ax.com>
Source record: 2305

w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:
>How would you feel about the test containing
> 5 minutes of Morse code at 5 wpm, and a reasonable
> number of questions about its content?

Are you going to use published questions and
answers here too? Then you could pass the test
without knowing the code and the written material... :-)

>I don't even mind paying the [dues] increase, but
>I would rather make a contribution to something specific of interest to me,
>like the Big Project or the ARRL Lab Test Equipment fund. :-)

I'm sure the League would be happy to cut your salary and apply the
savings to the test equipment fund. Let me know how it goes... :-)

2056. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-28 18:39:37 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <3op87tcnd9pb7h6t57kcbq41pbt6qobi7a@4ax.com>
Source record: 2306

w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:
>The SSB County Hunters and Mobile Emergency net meets daily...
> If I had a mobile emergency, I would break the 336 net and be
> pretty confident that someone would have good propagation to
>me and would ensure that I got help.

Especially if you were in a rare county... :-)

2057. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-28 18:39:38 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <hmp87tgqi01m0n0dqr3s41tkkgtb1i4qj5@4ax.com>
Source record: 2307

xjim@my-deja.com wrote:
>I thought all ham frequencies were Emergency frequencies!?

Nope. Only the ones with hams capable of handling
your emergency traffic are... :-)

2058. Re: Morse Code replacement? Bigtime flame war article!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-28 18:45:28 UTC
From: "Peter O. Brackett" <ab4bc@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <951pc7htt1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 2308
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna

CW Antennas are just fine...

CW does have some relationship to antennas. Cannot antennas be optimized for use in the CW band segments, so...

I'd like to see designs for CW optimized yagi's and such...

-Peter

"Ed Cregger" <ecregger@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:YuYc6.3268$2t5.293747@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
> So where did you mention antennas?
> --
> Ed Cregger
> ecregger@earthlink.net
>
> "Jethro Jumbalaya Twain" <qwasty@hotmail.com> wrote in
> message news:94vmlejkg1@nnrp1.deja.com...
> > The article is about a replacement for Morse that's easier
> to learn.
> > It's a lot like Morse, just a different code.
> >
> > http://www.eham.net/articles/1681
> >
> >
> > Sent via Deja.com
> > http://www.deja.com/
> >
>
>

2059. Re: Code Quick RULEZ!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-28 18:45:53 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <951pcv$411$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2309
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

In article <3A745399.7299DD6C@IEEE.org>,
Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> jason_hsu@my-deja.com wrote:
> > Too bad there hasn't been a review of Code Quick in QST. It's also
too
> > bad that Code Quick isn't better well known or better well promoted.
>
> Code Quick probably works well at 5wpm. I could be wrong, but seems to
> me, it wouldn't work above about 15wpm and would actually limit one's
> maximum code speed.

Dog did it. Hmmm, starts with the word dog, and dog starts with the
letter "D" so it must be a d. Heck of a look up table you have to carry
around in your head.

Thank God we only need 5wpm anymore.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2060. Re: CA power crisis caused by internet

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-28 19:10:53 UTC
From: W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com>
Message-ID: <951qse$k6j$1@iac5.navix.net>
Source record: 2310

Two major problems, first a very faulty deregulation law. The second is a decrease in generating capability during a rise in demand.

Deregulation has caused the power companies to go so far in the hole that the only reason they are getting electricity from the grid is through executive order. This ends in two weeks. The suppliers are afraid they won't get paid.

The environmentalists have done a really good job of blocking any new plant construction as well. In short California has created their own problems, I say let them stew in their own juices. Maybe they can get the Clinton fund raisers to raise money for the ailing power distributors. 8>}

Personally, I feel, anything that happens to the fruits and nuts on the left coast is well deserved. Turn off the klieg lights at the porno film studios, the heaters at the faggot bath houses, and there will be plenty of electricity.

"Keith Wood" <kw@bctv.com> wrote in message
news:3A744022.DE478880@bctv.com...
>
>
> Of course, he's lying. At least from my perspective, having worked my
> way through school in manufacturing plants and now being involved with
> computers.

2061. Re: Morse Code replacement? Bigtime flame war article!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-28 19:55:58 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010128145558.21648.00001997@ng-mj1.aol.com>
Source record: 2311

>From: Cecil Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>I disagree with you that Morse
>> code use is unable to stand on its own merits.

>Ditto for me. QRP interest is on the rise.

The QRP community has been discussing the need to incorporate 5 wpm hams into its ranks, and some have started some fun 5-10 wpm operating events. Looks like they are leading the way.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2062. Re: Code Quick RULEZ!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-28 19:58:02 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010128145802.21648.00001999@ng-mj1.aol.com>
Source record: 2312

>From: Cecil Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>I could be wrong, but seems to me, it wouldn't work above about 15wpm
>and would actually limit one's maximum code speed.

I am sure that the way I learned code wouldn't work above 15 wpm, but it didn't seem to limit my maximum code speed to 14 wpm.

To those whose primary reason for learning the code is to get their HF priveleges, Code Quick is as good a way as any.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2063. Re: CA power crisis caused by internet

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-28 19:58:44 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccoll@radiks.net>
Message-ID: <zQ_c6.3484$bC.1219052@nntp2.onemain.com>
Source record: 2313

```
"Keith Wood" <kw@bctv.com> wrote in message
news:3A743E48.461D2926@bctv.com...
>
>
> Richard McCollum wrote:
> >
> > > Kerry King wrote:
> > >
> > > > The California power crisis is not due to what we have been led to
> > > > believe. Instead, it is the fault of the internet.
> >
> > Like a lot of people, I kind of blew this bit of opinion off.
> > Deregulation was handled so poorly in CA that a collapse was
inevitable.
> > Nothing new has changed that situation. But the suddenness and
ferocity
> > of the collapse may have indeed been influenced by the New Economy.
> >
> > 1990 1996 1997
2000
> >
> > Demand GW-H 240k 258k 250k 300k
> > Capacity (gigawatts) 55 56 53.6 53.8
> >
> > Capacity excludes out-of-state and micropower.
> >
> > What the hell happened? The only thing I know for sure is that
Silicon
> > Valley's consumption has grown at over 8% per year. The man has a
point
> > albeit a fairly small one.
> >
> > The 'deregulation that wasn't' is adequately summarized in the
Economist:
> > "...California reforms are a ragbag of muddled half-measures and
downright
> > anti-competitive clauses".
> >
> > But the man who predicted this whether deregulated or not would have
to
> > have a big red S on his sweatshirt.
>
> Nope, I predicted it over 20 years ago, in a column regarding the
> anti-powerplant folks and their move into the California Legislature.
```

>
> You can't get electricity from a generator which wasn't built. More
> people means more need. Economic expansion means more people AND more
> commercial power use, but the Neanderthals in Sacramento made it all but
> impossible to build capacity to follow the increase in need.
>
> Your computer has about the same current drain as the one you had 10
> years ago -- the rough equivalent of running your living room lights --
> AND today's computers are "energy aware," dropping consumption during
> periods of non-use. While there are a few more computers today than a
> decade ago (most systems sold are replacing existing hardware, and the
> older machines are not being re-used), there are not enough to cause a
> major shift in consumption patterns.

Still begs the question: where did a 25% increase come from in 3 years after 7 of flat demand?
I have no doubt that you predicted it 20 years ago -- a simple extrapolation at that point in time would have done the job. As Peter Drucker once pointed out, had Rip van Winkle done his 50-year sleep act in 1913 leaving a 50 year extrapolation in his pocket, he could have looked at it in 1963 with great satisfaction, two world wars and a major depression not withstanding.

Using some QD estimates, 50 gigawatts is not enough capacity at 250 terrawatt-hours annually let alone 300 and probably does not even meet baseload today. This has been brewing awhile, no doubt about that. The village idiot is not going to let the legislature off the hook.

Also agree that home compooters are not a good blame-sink either. Servers, memories, etc. might be a piece but it is hard to see them as all of it.

I suspect that going back further and correlating to such things as population would give one a far better analysis which could not have been politically sold given the 1990-1997 experience in any case.

Still, where in hell did the increase come from - or as I suspect is the case, what is so odd about 1990-1997?

Dick

2064. Re: CA power crisis caused by internet

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-28 20:04:29 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccoll@radiks.net>
Message-ID: <oV_c6.691$9m.2572576@nntp3.onemain.com>
Source record: 2314

"W4JLE" <Fred@w4jle.com> wrote in message
news:951qse$k6j$1@iac5.navix.net...
> Two major problems, first a very faulty deregulation law. The second is
a
> decrease in generating capability during a rise in demand.
>
> Deregulation has caused the power companies to go so far in the hole
that
> the only reason they are getting electricity from the grid is through
> executive order. This ends in two weeks. The suppliers are afraid they
won't
> get paid.
>
> The environmentalists have done a really good job of blocking any new
plant
> construction as well. In short California has created their own
problems, I
> say let them stew in their own juices. Maybe they can get the Clinton
fund
> raisers to raise money for the ailing power distributors. 8>}
>
> Personally, I feel, anything that happens to the fruits and nuts on the
left
> coast is well deserved. Turn off the klieg lights at the porno film
studios,
> the heaters at the faggot bath houses, and there will be plenty of
> electricity.
>

And now comes the resident ideologue to spread his horseshit over our
unworthy bodies.

2065. Re: ARRL Life Membership - Don't buy one!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-28 20:05:28 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010128150528.21648.00002000@ng-mj1.aol.com>
Source record: 2315

>From: Brian brianburke@my-deja.com

>Lemme see, if CW gets 5% of the written, and RTTY gets 5% of the
>written, and AM gets 5% of the written . .

>We're already at 50% of the exam and haven't touched rules or
>authorizations, let alone safety.

Do you believe that full-carrier, double-sideband AM and OOK CW using Morse encoding are both 5% of what ham radio is about? Why would you think a mode that is operated by only a couple of percent of hams is equal to one that is used by about 1/3 of hams?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

>

2066. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-28 20:07:53 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010128150753.21648.00002002@ng-mj1.aol.com>
Source record: 2316

>From: Brian brianburke@my-deja.com

>I thought it was the ARRL that picked the beta-testers of the band, so
>it would be the ARRL that lets the rest of us on it. I stand corrected.

The ARRL may indeed have selected those that are using the band right now, but
it is not the ARRL's place to decide that everyone can use it.

Are you interested in being one of the beta testers? I can find out if there
are any "openings."

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2067. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-28 21:00:51 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nospam.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.g7vvjz3.pminews@ca.news.verio.net>
Source record: 2318

On Sun, 28 Jan 2001 04:16:27 GMT, Bill Sohl wrote:

>similar to the questions regarding knowledge of the phonetic alphabet.
>(e.g. The morse code characters for SOS is: dididit dahdahdah dididit
>with other answers being incorrect versions).

Totally irrelevant, because the Maritime Distress System no
longer uses Morse signals such as "SOS" and in any event, it
never properly belonged in the Amateur Service, only the
Maritime Services using manual Morse telegraphy.

I would rather see questions on "good operating practice".

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

2068. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-28 21:00:52 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nospam.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.g7vw6l4.pminews@ca.news.verio.net>
Source record: 2317

On 28 Jan 2001 13:31:30 GMT, W1RFI wrote:

>>From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
>
>>QFU isn't on my Q-signal list. I've never heard it on the air.
>
>I have heard it on the air and I didn't need a list to know exactly what it
>meant.

QFU is in the series assigned to the Aeronautical Services -
that series does not appear in the ITU Radio Regs so I don't
know its exact (legal) meaning. The "de facto" meaning is
obvious.....

Anyone have access to the ICAO Regs?

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

2069. Top ten signs you're staying at a racist Hiram, GA hotel

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-28 21:05:19 UTC
From: SLee@houston.net
Message-ID: <9521if$9me$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 2319
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Top ten signs you're staying at a racist, Hiram hotel

10. Their slogan is, "We'll leave the WHITE on for ya!"

9. First tip-off: Those Confederate Flag pillow cases.

8. Sign in the lobby announces: "Pat Buchanan Rally This Saturday!!!"

7. Sign behind the front desk reads: "You're damn right we're open on Martin Luther King Day!"

6. Sign above the beds reads: "Absolutely no HIP-HOPPING on the mattresses!!!"

5. Sheets and towels already have eye-holes cut in them.

4. No rating by the AAA. . . but 5-stars by the KKK.

3. Bible on the nightstand replaced with a copy of "Mien Kampf".

2. Instead of a "Presidential Suite" they have a "Grand Wizard Suite".

And the Top Sign You're Staying at a racist, Hiram Hotel. . .

1. Every morning the front desk will give you a "wake-up slur".

2070. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-28 21:14:06 UTC
From: billsohl@mindspring.com
Message-ID: <3a748b3c.15151125@news.mindspring.com>
Source record: 2320

On 28 Jan 2001 08:33:59 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

>Bill Sohl wrote:
>>
>> On 26 Jan 2001 03:34:03 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>>
>> >Bill Sohl wrote:
>> >>
>> >> The problem is, as you note, "if I ran across the...".
>> >> The reality is that there isn't any common HF assigned
>> >> emergency frequency that people (hams) might be able
>> >> to monitor for that unexpected emergency.
>> >
>> > *OF COURSE* there is! Every state has at least one emergency frequency.
>> >As always, you naturally assume that no one on a SSB frequency would
>> >ever have any reason to use CW instead of SSB.
>>
>> And just where are those "every state has one" frequencies
>> posted or found? Part 97? ARRL web site? Is someone
>> keeping this all a secret?
>
> Uh, Bill, order the ARRL publication "ARRL Net Directory".

The fact still remains that there is NOT any set freuency where
a ham can be reasonably sure that other hams are monitoring.
That is the bottom line. Ironic too that CBers maintain channel 9
as an exclsuive safety/emergency channel.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2071. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-28 21:16:12 UTC
From: billsohl@mindspring.com
Message-ID: <3a748bc8.15291834@news.mindspring.com>
Source record: 2321

On 28 Jan 2001 13:24:51 GMT, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:

>>From: billsohl@mindspring.com (Bill Sohl)
>
>>I disagree with the possibile retention of a code test for USA, but that's far
>
>>enough out that I am quite happy with the change regarding S25.5.
>
>The Board chose not to change the US policy at this time.
>
>>As to my "Sohl" proposal ala QST some years back...I'd not
>>oppose having some questions along the lines of those
>>similar to the questions regarding knowledge of the phonetic alphabet.
>
>How would you feel about the test containing 5 minutes of Morse code at 5 wpm,
>and a reasonable number of questions about its content?

I'd have mixed opinion. It really isn't needed anymore and
that's pretty much the bottom line.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2072. Re: Code Quick RULEZ!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-28 21:49:25 UTC
From: Web <WebFx27@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <Ft0d6.28695$ek.4315598@news02.optonline.net>
Source record: 2322
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Got to get to 5 wpm before 15 wpm. What's really the magic of code quick is that it allows your to PASS the 5 wpm and demonstrates that anyone CAN learn CW!!

Hey once I passed 5wpm I too began to learn the farnsworth method it was easy know I had a good foundation having use code quick

Web

"Cecil" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:3A745399.7299DD6C@IEEE.org...
> jason_hsu@my-deja.com wrote:
> > Too bad there hasn't been a review of Code Quick in QST. It's also too
> > bad that Code Quick isn't better well known or better well promoted.
>
> Code Quick probably works well at 5wpm. I could be wrong, but seems to
> me, it wouldn't work above about 15wpm and would actually limit one's
> maximum code speed.
> --
> http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2073. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-28 22:31:54 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <9526kq$ev2$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2323

In article <20010128150753.21648.00002002@ng-mj1.aol.com>,
w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:
> >From: Brian brianburke@my-deja.com
>
> >I thought it was the ARRL that picked the beta-testers of the band,
so
> >it would be the ARRL that lets the rest of us on it. I stand
corrected.
>
> The ARRL may indeed have selected those that are using the band right
now, but
> it is not the ARRL's place to decide that everyone can use it.
>
> Are you interested in being one of the beta testers? I can find out
if there
> are any "openings."

I'm sure I wouldn't be qualified as has been pointed out every so often.

Perhaps the ARRL News Letter will soon mention how the beta testers are
doing.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2074. Re: ARRL Life Membership - Don't buy one!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-28 22:42:27 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <95278ifeh1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2324

In article <20010128150528.21648.00002000@ng-mj1.aol.com>,
w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:
> >From: Brian brianburke@my-deja.com
>
> >Lemme see, if CW gets 5% of the written, and RTTY gets 5% of the
> >written, and AM gets 5% of the written . .
>
> >We're already at 50% of the exam and haven't touched rules or
> >authorizations, let alone safety.
>
> Do you believe that full-carrier, double-sideband AM and OOK CW using
Morse
> encoding are both 5% of what ham radio is about? Why would you think
a mode
> that is operated by only a couple of percent of hams is equal to one
that is
> used by about 1/3 of hams?
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

I think it is as valid as the "how long does a SSTV image take to
transmit" question. I think Cop McDonald is the only one who knows that
one.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2075. Re: ARRL Life Membership - Don't buy one!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-28 23:02:18 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <9528dmgcn1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2325

In article <3A74553C.D1C09694@IEEE.org>,
Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> Brian wrote:
> > Lemme see, if CW gets 5% of the written, and RTTY gets 5% of the
> > written, and AM gets 5% of the written, and USB and LSB each get
2.5% of
> > the written, and SSTV gets 5% of the written, and NBFM gets 5% of
the
> > written, and FSTV gets 5% of the written, and Packet gets 5% of the
> > written, and psk1 gets 5% of the written, and msk...
> >
> > We're already at 50% of the exam and haven't touched rules or
> > authorizations, let alone safety.
>
> Well, I would only allocate 5% to SSB, FM, and CW. The less popular
> modes would be allocated less than 5%.

I thought the idea was to be "equal" with the other modes.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2076. Re: Morse Code replacement? Bigtime flame war article!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-28 23:19:17 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <9529df$h8d$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2326

In article <20010128085505.21683.00001756@ng-mj1.aol.com>,
w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:
> >From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
>
> >Yes. And so I have stated on numerous occasions,though that fact
seems
> >tohave been overlooked in their zeal to overpower it still, even
though
> >it has already been killed.
>
> Morse code use on the bands has not been killed at all, Dick. Are you
really
> trying to destroy is just to be "right" in this debate? If so, you
are wrong.

Bruce/WA8ULX used to claim that he was going to destroy the ARS because
the restructuring wasn't going his way. Unfortunately, the mold wasn't
broke on Bruce.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2077. Re: Top ten signs you're staying at a racist Hiram, GA hotel

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-29 00:02:14 UTC
From: kk4tl@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010128190214.25354.00000675@ng-cg1.aol.com>
Source record: 2327

>2. Instead of a "Presidential Suite" they have a "Grand Wizard Suite"
>
Never heard of a Grand Wizard. Grand Dragon yes. He reports to the Imperial
Wizard. Who is the top banana. But, thanks to Morris Dees, the organization
is so fragmented now, there is no telling what new wrinkles have been added.

2078. Re: Morse Code replacement? Bigtime flame war article!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-29 01:26:35 UTC
From: Ed Juge/NM <ed_juge@zianet.com>
Message-ID: <3a75d123.0@oracle.zianet.com>
Source record: 2426
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna

I agree with Ed. This isn't the ng for code discussions.

Ed, W5EJ

"Peter O. Brackett" <ab4bc@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:951pc7htt1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net...
> CW Antennas are just fine...
>
> CW does have some relationship to antennas. Cannot antennas be optimized
for
> use in the CW band segments, so...
>
> I'd like to see designs for CW optimized yagi's and such...
>
> -Peter
>
> "Ed Cregger" <ecregger@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:YuYc6.3268$2t5.293747@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
> > So where did you mention antennas?
> > --
> > Ed Cregger
> > ecregger@earthlink.net
> >
> > "Jethro Jumbalaya Twain" <qwasty@hotmail.com> wrote in
> > message news:94vmlejkg1@nnrp1.deja.com...
> > > The article is about a replacement for Morse that's easier
> > to learn.
> > > It's a lot like Morse, just a different code.
> > >
> > > http://www.eham.net/articles/1681
> > >
> > >
> > > Sent via Deja.com
> > > http://www.deja.com/
> > >
> >
> >
>
>

2079. Re: CA power crisis caused by internet

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-29 02:56:43 UTC
From: W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com>
Message-ID: <952m6o$6a0$1@iac5.navix.net>
Source record: 2328

You got that right Richard, I was afraid I had stuttered and you didn't get the message. Once more with feelings, California liberals and their ilk passed legislation that had no chance for success. Don't blame me, you could not pay me to live there if you put the mint on a three shift day.

"Richard McCollum" <rmccoll@radiks.net> wrote in message news:oV_c6.691$9m.2572576@nntp3.onemain.com...
>
> "W4JLE" <Fred@w4jle.com> wrote in message
> news:951qse$k6j$1@iac5.navix.net...
> > Two major problems, first a very faulty deregulation law. The second is
> a
> > decrease in generating capability during a rise in demand.
> >
> > Deregulation has caused the power companies to go so far in the hole
> that
> > the only reason they are getting electricity from the grid is through
> > executive order. This ends in two weeks. The suppliers are afraid they
> won't
> > get paid.
> >
> > The environmentalists have done a really good job of blocking any new
> plant
> > construction as well. In short California has created their own
> problems, I
> > say let them stew in their own juices. Maybe they can get the Clinton
> fund
> > raisers to raise money for the ailing power distributors. 8>}
> >
> > Personally, I feel, anything that happens to the fruits and nuts on the
> left
> > coast is well deserved. Turn off the klieg lights at the porno film
> studios,
> > the heaters at the faggot bath houses, and there will be plenty of
> > electricity.
> >
>
> And now comes the resident ideologue to spread his horseshit over our
> unworthy bodies.
>
>

2080. Re: Morse Code replacement? Bigtime flame war article!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-29 03:18:27 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010128221827.04710.00000131@ng-ff1.aol.com>
Source record: 2329

>From: Brian brianburke@my-deja.com

>Bruce/WA8ULX used to claim that he was going to destroy the ARS because
>the restructuring wasn't going his way. Unfortunately, the mold wasn't
>broke on Bruce.

I met the type in grammar school; they are still with us in adult life.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2081. Re: ARRL Life Membership - Don't buy one!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-29 03:20:26 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010128222026.04710.00000132@ng-ff1.aol.com>
Source record: 2330

>From: Brian brianburke@my-deja.com

>I thought the idea was to be "equal" with the other modes.

It is. The testing for the other modes is somewhat related to the relative importance of the mode to amateur radio.

If you think I was saying that all modes must be tested in equal percentages, you misunderstood.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2082. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-29 03:24:29 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010128222429.04710.00000134@ng-ff1.aol.com>
Source record: 2331

>From: billsohl@mindspring.com (Bill Sohl)

>>How would you feel about the test containing 5 minutes of Morse
>> code at 5 wpm, and a reasonable number of questions about its content?

>I'd have mixed opinion. It really isn't needed anymore and
>that's pretty much the bottom line.

Morse code is still in widespread use in the Amateur Radio Service, Bill; that alone is, IMHO, sufficient reason to have some testing related to its use. A decoding test is a long-time traditional way of accomplishing just that. The way it is being done today, however, sets Morse code decoding at a level equal to all of the other material hams must know. Doing what you and I have both suggested at times, with the questions about the content of the transmission being part of the overall exam, is a reasonable way to balance the need vs the testing.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

>
>Cheers,
>Bill K2UNK
>
>
>
>
>
>
>

2083. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-29 03:26:28 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010128222628.04710.00000135@ng-ff1.aol.com>
Source record: 2332

>From: Brian brianburke@my-deja.com

>> Are you interested in being one of the beta testers? I can find out
>if there
>> are any "openings."

>I'm sure I wouldn't be qualified as has been pointed out every so often.

It may have been pointed out every so often, but why does that make you sure
you are not qualified? Are you basing your opinion of your worth on what
others say?

>Perhaps the ARRL News Letter will soon mention how the beta testers are
>doing.

Good point.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2084. Re: CA power crisis caused by internet

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-29 03:52:56 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <952peo$87t$0@208.207.71.165>
Source record: 2333

Richard McCollum wrote:
>
> > Kerry King wrote:
> >
> > > The California power crisis is not due to what we have been led to
> > > believe. Instead, it is the fault of the internet.
>
> Like a lot of people, I kind of blew this bit of opinion off.
> Deregulation was handled so poorly in CA that a collapse was inevitable.
> Nothing new has changed that situation. But the suddenness and ferocity
> of the collapse may have indeed been influenced by the New Economy.
>
> 1990 1996 1997 2000
>
> Demand GW-H 240k 258k 250k 300k
> Capacity (gigawatts) 55 56 53.6 53.8
>
> Capacity excludes out-of-state and micropower.
>
> What the hell happened? The only thing I know for sure is that Silicon
> Valley's consumption has grown at over 8% per year. The man has a point
> albeit a fairly small one.
>
> The 'deregulation that wasn't' is adequately summarized in the Economist:
> "...California reforms are a ragbag of muddled half-measures and downright
> anti-competitive clauses".
>
> But the man who predicted this whether deregulated or not would have to
> have a big red S on his sweatshirt.

I just read an op-ed piece in the Jan 29 issue of U S News and World
Report newesmag on this very subject and came away with a bit more
sobering knowledge on the subject, stuff you'd really rather not know,
or more accurately you'd rather wasn't so.
In a singlepage article entitled "The Price Isn't Right - it's easy to
forget there's no such thing as a free download" a fella by the name of
Randall Stross, who lives in that area writes, and I quote:

"...Does California's pitiful state seem due comeuppance for our
annoying tendency to lay claim to the future first? From afar, does our
degregulation mess seem comfortably distant from your own doorstep, or
precisely from your own power outlets? Do you still believe in Reddy
Kilowatt?
"Having just suffered through a temporary blackout here in Menlo Park,
Ca I am tempted to join in local demands that the thievin' power gougers

be brought to swift and rough justice. Yet I confess to feelin a twinge of guilt. For I personally contribute, in sundry ways, to the mismatch between electrical power supply and demand.I believe you too, dear reader, are culpable and will eventually be affected. Not because of the regional reach of the Grid and California Governor Gray Davis's (literal) power grab; and not because you may reside in one of the 25 other states now considering energy deregulation.

"Rather, the California crisis is larger than it may at first appear because it exposes a universal fact that has been overlooked: On our way to the digital future, we have been enjoying a free or near-free ride, a form of transportation that, regrettably, exists only in the land of makebelieve.

"In the news coverage of the crisis, much attention has been devoted to prices, narrowly defined as the mismatch between the newly unregulated wholesale price of electricity and the still-frozen retail price. Left ignored is other pricing that contributes to the present imbroglio: Flat rates for monthly Internet access and cost-free downloading of gigabytes of data, a combination that means the household that gobbles data like a University of Nebraska lineman in the college cafeteria pays no more than the Joffrey ballerina who only nibbles.

"The cost of maintaining websites...is absorbed by the site sponsers which
pay other companies to maintain "server farms". These are concentrated in Silicon Valley. A single such data center occupies the space of a modest office building but consumes the power of 10,000 single-family homes. Exodus Communications, the company which takes care of eBay and Yahoo! among other, has six data centers in just Silicon Valley, which will soon draw an estimated 25 percent of the area's power. (Remember, this is a state that hasn't built a major power plant in more than a decade).

"Feeling virtuous because you're careful to shut down your home PC every night? It's a laudable gesture. But the desktop PC consumes only 20 percent of the power used by the Internet. Add up the costs of running the routers, caching pages, cooling the equipment and so on and you'll find that to create and move 2 megabytes of data over the Net is said to require the energy
equivalent of a pound of coal.

"The Internet, that bucket brigade transferring data around the globe, sprang up without a master plan for commercialization, and there is no simple way to make heavy users pay the true costs. The famous 1954 prediction of Lewis Strauss, chairman of the U S Atomic Energy Commission, that electrical power would be "too cheap to meter" has not come to pass. But as consumers, we can take as large a byte of the Internet's vast offerings as we wish without having to pay a charge related to the volume of data ingested. Insulated from the costs, Web surfers will naturally enough take due advantage, heedless of what economists refer to as externalities, or the costs that someone else has to pay (or an entire city of someone elses, as when the next rolling blackout instantly makes San Francisco look like Lagos.)

Unlimited Internet access for a flat monthly rate is a luxury that Web

surfers in most European countries do not enjoy. It is not directly responsible for California's energy shortage. But the mentality that it reinforces, that using technology carries no marginal cost is plain wrong. Only five years ago AOL still charged its members on an hourly basis. Reluctantly, the $20 a month flat price set by independent Internet providers forced it too to move to a flat-price model. AOL then weathered an embarrassing breakdown of tis dial-up systems when users gorged themselves on the unmetered service.
At the time of the change, AOL head Steve Case sent an E-mail asking that members "moderate" their use at peak evening times during the transition. ("Just as you would be sensitive about using a public phone booth if there were others waiting in line") In just two days, his plea drew 17,000 messages from irate members, livid that he was hedging on the "unlimited use" bargain.
That, in microcosm, is the larger problem we will face as a society at some point: how to moderate use of energy-gobbling resources to which we currently have nearly unlimited access. Who would prefer the intricacies of cost accounting to the all-you-can-eat buffet? No one. That is, until the lights go out."

End of quoted material

QRP anyone?

Dick

2085. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-29 03:57:12 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <952pmo$87t$1@208.207.71.165>
Source record: 2334

W1RFI wrote:
>
> >From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
>
> >QFU isn't on my Q-signal list. I've never heard it on the air.
>
> I have heard it on the air and I didn't need a list to know exactly what it
> meant.

No, you assumed you knew what it meant.

2086. Re: ARRL Life Membership - Don't buy one!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-29 03:58:44 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <952ppk$87t$2@208.207.71.165>
Source record: 2335

W1RFI wrote:
>
> >From: Dick Carroll
>
> >Marconi always considered himself a ham although he never held a ham
> >radio license.
>
> I think he should have been grandfathered and just given one. I don't think,
> however, that his code speed would have been high enough that he could have
> been allowed on more than the Tech+ bands on HF.

Oh, I don't know. He made a bunch of longrange CW contacts if you
recall. Also as has been belabored here so often, the code test early on
was at 5wpm.

2087. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-29 04:14:09 UTC
From: Larry Klose <lklose@net-link.net>
Message-ID: <3a74ee24$0$35014$44a10c7e@news.net-link.net>
Source record: 2336

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:3a739e20.10905563@news.mindspring.com...
> >But so far they don't keep insisting it's a
> >Federal civil rights case, at least on rrap.
>
> Personal opinion follows: In my opinion, I think a
> case could probably be made today on the ADA issue
> of code requirments...BUT, I don't believe such a case
> would be easily won, nor would it be inexpensive...and hence
> I see no point in attempting such nor in argueing pro
> or con on that basis.

For the record, I have never said the Morse code
exam was an ADA issue. I agreed with the FCC medical
waiver decision because the code test was not a valid
requirement; however, the decision was a technical
judicial error in that it did not waive the test for all, and
instead created more discrimination. Discrimination
by government are can addressed by "due process"
and does not always require ADA or Civil Rights
Act remedies.

I further believe that the FCC has dealt fairly with the
issue presented to it in the 1990 Codeless Technician
Decision and 1999 License Restructuring Decision.
And, I further expect the Commission, when presented
with the ITU rule S25.5 issue, will deal with it in a
fair and proper manner.

Larry KC8EPO

2088. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-29 04:31:06 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <952rmabjp0@208.207.71.165>
Source record: 2337

Phil Kane wrote:
>
> On 28 Jan 2001 13:31:30 GMT, W1RFI wrote:
>
> >>From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
> >
> >>QFU isn't on my Q-signal list. I've never heard it on the air.
> >
> >I have heard it on the air and I didn't need a list to know exactly what it
> >meant.
>
> QFU is in the series assigned to the Aeronautical Services -
> that series does not appear in the ITU Radio Regs so I don't
> know its exact (legal) meaning.
>

See, Ed? I told you it was legal! You can't depend on a codefree ham
like Brian for dependable information about radiotelegraph operations.

2089. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-29 04:38:41 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <952s4h$f53$0@208.207.71.165>
Source record: 2338

Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> The fact still remains that there is NOT any set freuency where
> a ham can be reasonably sure that other hams are monitoring.
> That is the bottom line. Ironic too that CBers maintain channel 9
> as an exclsuive safety/emergency channel.

No, Bull, the "fact" is that in an emergency situation, it is normal procedure for anyone involved or interested in the emergency to repair to the State emergency net frequency. I wouldn't expect you to know that, given that you don't actually have that much experience in ham radio.
There are other frequencies generally active on a routine basis that are available for emergency service on an ongoing basis. The Eastcars and Westcars mobile service SSB nets on 7255, and Midcars on 72587258 are still active, at least Midcars is, as I sometimes monitor there. Most any repeater can be used as emergency comms, if only you can get anyone to answer your call. Then there is the Maritime Mobile Service Net on 14.313, if there's anything left of it these days after the trashing it got by thugs a few years ago and since.

But, of course, you're right - there is no "frequency" that is singularly monitored for emergency purposes. Instead, there are many. But you've got to know enough about it to know where to look.

2090. Re: CA power crisis caused by internet

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-29 04:39:28 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nospam.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.g7whjr1.pminews@ca.news.verio.net>
Source record: 2339

On Sun, 28 Jan 2001 21:56:43 -0500, W4JLE wrote:

>You got that right Richard, I was afraid I had stuttered and you didn't get
>the message. Once more with feelings, California liberals and their ilk
>passed legislation that had no chance for success. Don't blame me, you could
>not pay me to live there if you put the mint on a three shift day.

Gee, I've always considered that "deregulation" was the darling
of "conservatives" who didn't want "the gov'mint" setting caps
on profits and interfering with their business endeavors by
telling "industry" what to do.

Foolish me....must have been us "liberals" all along, eh? FDR
must be spinning in his grave.

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

2091. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-29 04:43:04 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <952sco$fo7$0@208.207.71.165>
Source record: 2340

Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> On 28 Jan 2001 13:24:51 GMT, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:
>
> >>From: billsohl@mindspring.com (Bill Sohl)
> >
> >>I disagree with the possibile retention of a code test for USA, but that's far
> >
> >>enough out that I am quite happy with the change regarding S25.5.
> >
> >The Board chose not to change the US policy at this time.
> >
> >>As to my "Sohl" proposal ala QST some years back...I'd not
> >>oppose having some questions along the lines of those
> >>similar to the questions regarding knowledge of the phonetic alphabet.
> >
> >How would you feel about the test containing 5 minutes of Morse code at 5 wpm,
> >and a reasonable number of questions about its content?
>
> I'd have mixed opinion. It really isn't needed anymore and
> that's pretty much the bottom line.
>

It's quite clear that Bill has no use for ham radio for anything other
than just a very occasional, causual passtime, and thus he truly
believes that no one else does or ever has had, either. He evidently
doesn't read much or just ignores the emergency columns in all the mags
that have published reams on such activity by hams for far longer than
he has had a license.
But I guess that would be the attitude one could expect from a fella
who has very little actual interest in the hobby, and being employed in
a commercial communications endeavor he surely wouldn't advocate hams
handling serious traffic in competition.

2092. Re: ARRL Life Membership - Don't buy one!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-29 04:45:37 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <952shh$vt2$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2342

In article <94vutn$fo1$0@208.206.142.105>,
Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

> Marconi always considered himself a ham although he never held a ham
> radio license.

Lotsa guys like that hanging out just below 10 meters.

73, Hans, K0HB
--
"We are fellow travelers on a journey between two
eternities, and it's a trip far too brief for me
to be concerned about your speed at the Code of
Morse."

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2093. Re: CA power crisis caused by internet

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-29 04:58:58 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <952tai$i2q$0@208.207.71.165>
Source record: 2341

Phil Kane wrote:
>
> On Sun, 28 Jan 2001 21:56:43 -0500, W4JLE wrote:
>
> >You got that right Richard, I was afraid I had stuttered and you didn't get
> >the message. Once more with feelings, California liberals and their ilk
> >passed legislation that had no chance for success. Don't blame me, you could
> >not pay me to live there if you put the mint on a three shift day.
>
> Gee, I've always considered that "deregulation" was the darling
> of "conservatives" who didn't want "the gov'mint" setting caps
> on profits and interfering with their business endeavors by
> telling "industry" what to do.
>
> Foolish me....must have been us "liberals" all along, eh? FDR
> must be spinning in his grave.
>

Phil, that was the problem in a nutshell. "Liberal Deregulation", in
which the retail price is strictly controlled so as to definitely never
offend a single voter by causing him to have to pay actual costs (until
the lights go out, anyway) but unfortunately they forgot that they
couldn't control the prices charged by all those out-of-state suppliers!
Evidently they just closed their eyes and hoped the ship would hit the
sand so far in the future they'd be off the scene when the
recriminations started...

2094. Re: Amateur license renewals lost by FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-29 06:42:09 UTC
From: JR <jr@some.net>
Message-ID: <3A750150.26BB6EA1@some.net>
Source record: 2343
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Oh you hurt my widdle feelings!!

KC8JBO wrote:

> In article <3A722EB6.712F36E9@some.net>,
> JR <jr@flash.net> wrote:
> > Nice try, but pure garbage.
>
> But that's all your little brain-stem can process, Jacking Rube!

2095. Re: Top ten signs you're staying at a racist Hiram, GA hotel

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-29 09:28:38 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3A7537BB.784A048C@sccoast.net>
Source record: 2344

KK4TL wrote:
>
> Never heard of a Grand Wizard. Grand Dragon yes.
> He reports to the Imperial Wizard. Who is the
> top banana. But, thanks to Morris Dees, the
> organization is so fragmented now, there is no
> telling what new wrinkles have been added.

The KKK is alive and well. Recruitment is active all over the country (a friend was approached in Washington state and I've heard of recruitment around here). All Dees did was drive the KKK underground (into cell-like groups), which probably makes it more dangerious.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net

2096. Re: CA power crisis caused by internet

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-29 10:44:33 UTC
From: Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com>
Message-ID: <3A754991.D193138@dvol.com>
Source record: 2345

Phil Kane wrote:

>
>
> Foolish me....must have been us "liberals" all along, eh? FDR
> must be spinning in his grave.
>
> --
> 73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

>
Reaganesque degregulated supply + FDR-style price controls and cost supports + the need for Sierra Club stamps on building permits = Deal with the blatently obvious results.
>
In the end, five-ten years out when reality is imposed amidst great howls of protest and anguish over actually cutting down trees to build generating capacity the Leftist Coasters will be paying 15-20 cents per kwh like us smokestack-loving fully-deregulated Fascist Coasters have been doing for eons. That's the real bottom line, pay for what the amp hours actually cost to deliver plus some (wash my mouf) profit or the lights are gonna go out. Not a palatable concept in places where a primary purpose of gummint is to protect consumers from reality, pore things.
>
Not that I actually believe it of course but our incarnation of Davis claims that deregulation saved PA consumers $2.18 billion last year. We also have *mothballed* generating capacity as a result of the profit-driven environment which got dropped on us and them a few years back. The 'lectric company here made money on excess capacity back then thanks to the foibles of regulation and now they can't so they took the excess capacity offline real quick but it's still out there.
>
w3rv

2097. Re: Top ten signs you're staying at a racist Hiram, GA hotel

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-29 10:55:16 UTC
From: Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com>
Message-ID: <3A754C14.A0966BFB@dvol.com>
Source record: 2346
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Stagger Lee wrote:

> Top ten signs you're staying at a racist, Hiram hotel
>
> 10. Their slogan is, "We'll leave the WHITE on for ya!"
>
> 9. First tip-off: Those Confederate Flag pillow cases.
>
> 8. Sign in the lobby announces: "Pat Buchanan Rally This Saturday!!!"
>
> 7. Sign behind the front desk reads: "You're damn right we're open on
> Martin Luther King Day!"
>
> 6. Sign above the beds reads: "Absolutely no HIP-HOPPING on the
> mattresses!!!"
>
> 5. Sheets and towels already have eye-holes cut in them.
>
> 4. No rating by the AAA. . . but 5-stars by the KKK.
>
> 3. Bible on the nightstand replaced with a copy of "Mien Kampf".
>
> 2. Instead of a "Presidential Suite" they have a "Grand Wizard Suite".
>
> And the Top Sign You're Staying at a racist, Hiram Hotel. . .
>
> 1. Every morning the front desk will give you a "wake-up slur".

>
You're a mindless pile of trash to the core.
>
Brian Kelly w3rv
Secane, Pa.

2098. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-29 11:43:41 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <953l1c$i2j$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2347

In article <952sco$fo7$0@208.207.71.165>,
Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>
>
> Bill Sohl wrote:
> >
> > On 28 Jan 2001 13:24:51 GMT, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:
> >
> > >From: billsohl@mindspring.com (Bill Sohl)
> > >
> > >I disagree with the possibile retention of a code test for USA,
but that's far
> > >
> > >enough out that I am quite happy with the change regarding S25.5.
> > >
> > >The Board chose not to change the US policy at this time.
> > >
> > >As to my "Sohl" proposal ala QST some years back...I'd not
> > >oppose having some questions along the lines of those
> > >similar to the questions regarding knowledge of the phonetic
alphabet.
> > >
> > >How would you feel about the test containing 5 minutes of Morse
code at 5 wpm,
> > >and a reasonable number of questions about its content?
> >
> > I'd have mixed opinion. It really isn't needed anymore and
> > that's pretty much the bottom line.
> >
>
> It's quite clear that Bill has no use for ham radio for anything
other
> than just a very occasional, causual passtime, and thus he truly
> believes that no one else does or ever has had, either. He evidently
> doesn't read much or just ignores the emergency columns in all the
mags
> that have published reams on such activity by hams for far longer than
> he has had a license.
> But I guess that would be the attitude one could expect from a fella
> who has very little actual interest in the hobby, and being employed
in
> a commercial communications endeavor he surely wouldn't advocate hams
> handling serious traffic in competition.

Nevermind that even the professional emergency communicators have abandoned code long ago. If you like, I'll dig out the website where you can listen to the last holdout, the US Coast Guard's last CW transmission.

If you want to get saved, you'll have to learn to use phone.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2099. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-29 12:40:51 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010129074051.12194.00001983@ng-cd1.aol.com>
Source record: 2348

>From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

>But, of course, you're right - there is no "frequency" that is
>singularly monitored for emergency purposes. Instead, there are many.
>But you've got to know enough about it to know where to look.

There is a single HF frequency that is monitored extensively for emergencies,
Dick, at least while the band is expected to be open. Of course:

>I wouldn't expect you to know that, given that you don't actually have that
>much experience in ham radio.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2100. Re: ARRL Life Membership - Don't buy one!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-29 12:43:25 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010129074325.12194.00001984@ng-cd1.aol.com>
Source record: 2350

>From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

>Oh, I don't know. He made a bunch of longrange CW contacts if you
>recall. Also as has been belabored here so often, the code test early on
>was at 5wpm.

I didn't mean to imply that he didn't know the code. I don't know if he knew the code to 20 wpm when he did those early experminents. Seeing as this was before April 15, 2000, shouldn't he have done them above 50 MHz, where he belonged? :-)

I have to wonder, if the 5 wpm code test was enough to get Amateur Radio off to such a flying start (looking at the resultant growth), why is it looked upon with such disdain by some today?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2101. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-29 12:44:22 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010129074422.12194.00001985@ng-cd1.aol.com>
Source record: 2349

>From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

>No, you assumed you knew what it meant.

Not another "what does 'is' mean?" :-)

Context, son, context; it is all in the context.

73,
Ed Hare,W1RFI

2102. Re: VHF history (long) (was: any ideas on HOw to learn Morse

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-29 13:03:56 UTC
From: "Steven J Robeson", K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <953pnqlge1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2401

In article <20010127201536.15119.00002081@ng-cs1.aol.com>,
w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:

>They are only lies if Len believes that they are not true, but says
>them anyway. If you didn't lie when you said that you do not think he
>believes them to untrue, then he is not lying.

If you say so Ed. I can't for the life of me understand why you
support that creep, but then it's not uncommon for the abused to rally
to the abuser.

I am not one of either.

73

Steve, K4YZ

--
http://hometown.aol.com/k4yz/myhomepage/index.html

"The Measure Of A Man Is Not In How He Touches A Woman, But In How He
Touches A Woman's Heart"

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2103. Re: Top ten signs you're staying at a racist Hiram, GA hotel

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-29 13:57:31 UTC
From: KC8JBO <roger_kc8jbo@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <953ss8ntq1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2402
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <3A754C14.A0966BFB@dvol.com>,
Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com> wrote:
>
>
> Stagger Lee wrote:
>
> > Top ten signs you're staying at a racist, Hiram hotel
> >
> > 10. Their slogan is, "We'll leave the WHITE on for ya!"
> >
> > 9. First tip-off: Those Confederate Flag pillow cases.
> >
> > 8. Sign in the lobby announces: "Pat Buchanan Rally This
Saturday!!!"
> >
> > 7. Sign behind the front desk reads: "You're damn right we're open
on
> > Martin Luther King Day!"
> >
> > 6. Sign above the beds reads: "Absolutely no HIP-HOPPING on the
> > mattresses!!!"
> >
> > 5. Sheets and towels already have eye-holes cut in them.
> >
> > 4. No rating by the AAA. . . but 5-stars by the KKK.
> >
> > 3. Bible on the nightstand replaced with a copy of "Mien Kampf".
> >
> > 2. Instead of a "Presidential Suite" they have a "Grand Wizard
Suite".
> >
> > And the Top Sign You're Staying at a racist, Hiram Hotel. . .
> >
> > 1. Every morning the front desk will give you a "wake-up slur".
>
> >
> You're a mindless pile of trash to the core.
> >
> Brian Kelly w3rv
> Secane, Pa.
>

He'd have to evolve for EONS just to get to *that* place!

--
73 de Roger, KC8JBO
EM99 |ARRL|VE [ARRL & W5YI]|ARES |RACES
Yaesu FT-920 |Inverted Vee @ 40 ft.
Yaesu FT-90R

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2104. Re: Amateur license renewals lost by FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-29 14:09:55 UTC
From: KC8JBO <roger_kc8jbo@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <953tjeoeb1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2403
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <3A750150.26BB6EA1@some.net>,
JR <jr@some.net> wrote:
> Oh you hurt my widdle feelings!!

Good. Now go back down to the street corner and sell crack coaciane to
the kids, which is what you do for a living.

> KC8JBO wrote:
>
> > In article <3A722EB6.712F36E9@some.net>,
> > JR <jr@flash.net> wrote:
> > > Nice try, but pure garbage.
> >
> > But that's all your little brain-stem can process, Jacking Rube!
>
>

--
73 de Roger, KC8JBO
EM99 |ARRL|VE [ARRL & W5YI]|ARES |RACES
Yaesu FT-920 |Inverted Vee @ 40 ft.
Yaesu FT-90R

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2105. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-29 14:31:03 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <953ur8$pg9$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2404

In article <953l1c$i2j$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com> wrote:

>
> If you want to get saved, you'll have to learn to use phone.
>

Naw, that won't work. You have to get your sinful ass baptized,
go to church often, and don't make fun of George Duh-bya Shrub.

73, de Hans, K0HB
--
"We are fellow travelers on a journey between two
eternities, and it's a trip far too brief for me
to be concerned about your speed at the Code of
Morse."

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2106. Re: The knuckle head here is.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-29 15:15:09 UTC
From: kg9qm@nomail.net
Message-ID: <1Ofd6.13$c5.12673@news1.iquest.net>
Source record: 2405

This thread is knot on topic.

don

In article <20010127215620.00714.00004496@nso-md.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam
was of the opinion...
>
>In article <gtDc6.438$pL5.362271@news1.iquest.net>, kg9qm@nomail.net (don)
>writes:
>
>>> Suture self, Doc.
>>
>>
>>Sew what?
>
>Cat gut your tongue?
>
>73 de Larry, K3LT
>

2107. Re: ARRL Life Membership - Don't buy one!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-29 17:20:14 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010129122014.25659.00001424@nso-fk.aol.com>
Source record: 2407

In article <20010129074325.12194.00001984@ng-cd1.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>>From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
>
>>Oh, I don't know. He made a bunch of longrange CW contacts if you
>>recall. Also as has been belabored here so often, the code test early on
>>was at 5wpm.
>
>I didn't mean to imply that he didn't know the code. I don't know if he knew
>the code to 20 wpm when he did those early experminents. Seeing as this was
>before April 15, 2000, shouldn't he have done them above 50 MHz, where he
>belonged? :-)
>
>I have to wonder, if the 5 wpm code test was enough to get Amateur Radio off
>to such a flying start (looking at the resultant growth), why is it looked
upon
>with such disdain by some today?

I'm not sure of the context of these two messages.

Following the thread back, the mention was of Guglielmo Marconi, alleging that "he considered himself a ham." That is doubtful since Marconi essentially went to England to set up a profit-making business out of his radio experiments. He succeeded rather well, including getting as many patents and licenses-for-manufacture as he could. Hardly "not for pecuniary reasons."

Marconi got his S back from Poldhu in 1901. Radio back then was all about SPARK transmission (the Alexanderson Alternator would not reach its peak until around 1919). The ONLY practical means of communications over spark-transmitted radio was by on-off keying codes. On-off keying was the only practical means of amateur radio communications until the 1930s, regardless of a very, very few amateurs trying out the newfangled voice and music transmissions using vacuum tubes.

Okay, here we are in the year 2001, three generations removed from 1935. Radio amateurs are no longer dependent on on-off keying as the ONLY practical communications...there are many more modes, nearly all of them more practical than on-off keying. Why is there still an international standard requiring administrations to give code cognition tests in order to be granted a license having below-30-MHz-privileges?

Those who advocate removal of the code test for an amateur radio license do not view the retention of the code test with "disdain." It is viewed as unneccesary, archaic, and, in the case of so many that got rank/status/privilege through that singular skill, little more than an federally-granted merit badge. If there is disdain, then it is the disdain of those who wave that merit badge and badger others with it as some sort of "superiority" proof.

Were you implying that amateur radio got a "flying start" because of morse code? That's beggaring a definition considering that the ONLY mode for amateurs in the "start" was on-off keying.

Growth in US amateur radio: According to AH0A statistics the GROWTH occurring in US amateur radio is still due to the no-code-test Technician licensees at the end of 2000.

didit

2108. Re: CA power crisis caused by internet

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-29 17:20:21 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010129122021.25659.00001425@nso-fk.aol.com>
Source record: 2406

In article <3A754991.D193138@dvol.com>, Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com> writes:

>Phil Kane wrote:
>
>> Foolish me....must have been us "liberals" all along, eh? FDR
>> must be spinning in his grave.

>Reaganesque degregulated supply + FDR-style price controls and cost supports
>+the need for Sierra Club stamps on building permits = Deal with the blatently
>obvious results.
>>
>In the end, five-ten years out when reality is imposed amidst great howls of
>protest and anguish over actually cutting down trees to build generating
>capacity the Leftist Coasters will be paying 15-20 cents per kwh like us
>smokestack-loving
>fully-deregulated Fascist Coasters have been doing for eons. That's the real
>bottom line, pay for what the amp hours actually cost to deliver plus some
>(wash my mouf) profit or the lights are gonna go out. Not a palatable concept
in
>places where a primary purpose of gummint is to protect consumers from
reality,
>pore things.
>>
>Not that I actually believe it of course but our incarnation of Davis claims
>that deregulation saved PA consumers $2.18 billion last year. We also have
>*mothballed* generating capacity as a result of the profit-driven environment
>which got dropped on us and them a few years back. The 'lectric company here
>made money on excess capacity back then thanks to the foibles of regulation
and
>now they can't so they took the excess capacity offline real quick but it's
still
>out there.

...the whole thread has evolved into a grandiose (and gratuitous) mini-
forum where everyone can trot out their favorite "hate" subjects and
expound on it as if they knew anything. Few do.

This morning's paper carries an interesting AP wire story on the
"PX" or Power Exchange in Southern California. The goal of the
California deregulation was to "lower electric power prices to the
consumer." That was the legislative statement four years ago.

Of course, deregulation hasn't done spit for lowering telephone
rates after deregulation of that...any telephone subscriber can
look at present and past bills to see that didn't work as advertised.
Cable TV service was essentially deregulated (in price) from the

beginning and needed some federal intervention in order to keep the subscriber charges from skyrocketing a few years ago.

To complicate matters in electric power supply-demand, CA started a "beta test" version of an "electric stock exchange." [AP story descriptions] The thought was that electric power is somehow just like stocks and/or durable goods that could be traded. The BIG players in electric power generation contracted with the PX and tried to ride that unbroken horse. Add to this that there were more customers for buying electric power than there were sellers. It became a sellers' market. Sellers sought to gain as much profit as possible by increasing electric power sales rates.

California electric utilities are bound by state PUC caps on rates they can charge customers. On one hand they became committed to buying electric power at terribly increased rates but could not pass the charge on to customers. On the other hand, they did not plan effectively in their own operations by assuming they could get electric power at reasonable rates and went into debt on outside-purchases. Since last summer there have been rather gross rate hikes on electric power sold. As much as forty times rate increase in one year...no change in existing plant facilities, just an enormous rate increase because the sellers were able to get away with it.

As a rather obvious but overlooked fact is that many of the moderate and small electric power utilities already had quite adequate generating capability, planned for it, and rode it all out. Proper management makes a difference. The Los Angeles Department of Water and Power is a moderate electric power player with 3.8 million customers. All through-out the "electric shortage" periods, the LA DWP not only kept on producing electricity but even sold excess to other utilities. The LA DWP facilites didn't need to build new plants nor did they get bound by PX contracts nor give in to greed.

If anything, S. David Freeman, GM of the DWP was criticized by Mayor Riordan of LA for selling power at nominal rates! Riordan's anti-up-state attitude is fueled by fears of not being able to be paid for DWP's sales...or it is some baseless fear that goes into being another politician.

General Manager Freeman has accepted an unpaid role in heading up a group that will attempt to reduce the crisis in politics-plus-bad-utility-management that lead to the much-publicized electric problems in some parts of California.

Politicians will criticize Freeman and other volunteers on whatever they do. The fact of the matter is that Freeman and others on the panel were able to plan and effectively operate electric power generation without having problems of being

forced to buy power at exhorbitant rates.

There is NO real lack of electric power generation capability
in the whole of this state. It is there even if this most
populous state (approx. 30 million) keeps growing...but the
management of the bigger electric utilities is suspect and
certainly the legislature is suspect of mishandling the situation
that began the whole scene.

There is no real problem from "tree huggers" nor some imagined
"left coast mentality" that caused the problems in part of the
state. It can be summarized in a single word: Greed.

Greed happens. Anyplace.

didit

>>
>w3rv

2109. Re: ARRL Life Membership - Don't buy one!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-29 18:00:54 UTC
From: "Steven J Robeson", K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <954b4f$5bc$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2410

In article <20010129122014.25659.00001424@nso-fk.aol.com>,
lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
> In article <20010129074325.12194.00001984@ng-cd1.aol.com>,
w1rfi@aol.com

>>(W1RFI) writes:

>>>From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

> I'm not sure of the context of these two messages.

Then why waste bandwidth postulating on them?

> Okay, here we are in the year 2001, three generations removed
> from 1935. Radio amateurs are no longer dependent on on-off
> keying as the ONLY practical communications...(SNIP)

We weren't dependent on Morse Code as the "ONLY" practical
communications then.

>...there are
> many more modes, nearly all of them more practical than on-off
> keying. Why is there still an international standard requiring
> administrations to give code cognition tests in order to be
> granted a license having below-30-MHz-privileges?

Because most of the third world countries who, despite having NO
internal communications infrastracture in ANY mode, have the same vote
as those who have technology out the wazoo. Morse Code levels the
playing field for them.

> Those who advocate removal of the code test for an amateur
> radio license do not view the retention of the code test with
> "disdain."

Sure they do. Read the definition of "disdain", Lennie, then flip
back through the pages of Deja and tell me the anti-Code "advocates"
don't "disdain" code testing.

> It is viewed as unneccesary, archaic, and, in the
> case of so many that got rank/status/privilege through that
> singular skill, little more than an federally-granted merit
> badge.

And I teach CPR to people who think what they watched on "Rescue 9-
1-1" was sufficient...until they needed it....

> If there is disdain, then it is the disdain of those who
> wave that merit badge and badger others with it as some
> sort of "superiority" proof.

Lennie trying to make another of "us-versus-them" fights.

> Growth in US amateur radio: According to AH0A statistics
> the GROWTH occurring in US amateur radio is still due to
> the no-code-test Technician licensees at the end of 2000.

But only becuase it is the first rung on the ladder. We've opened
the door, now we have to make them feel at home. You're invited in,
Lennie, but you just keep peeing on the lawn and barking at the moon.

Your loss.
--
http://hometown.aol.com/k4yz/myhomepage/index.html

"The Measure Of A Man Is Not In How He Touches A Woman, But In How He
Touches A Woman's Heart"

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2110. Re: VHF history (long) (was: any ideas on HOw to learn Morse

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-29 18:01:37 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <Rfid6.9$HH5.40127@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 2408

<Steven J Robeson>; K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com> wrote:

> In article <20010127201536.15119.00002081@ng-cs1.aol.com>,
> w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:

> >They are only lies if Len believes that they are not true, but says
> >them anyway. If you didn't lie when you said that you do not think he
> >believes them to untrue, then he is not lying.

> If you say so Ed.

It is not my say-so that determines what words mean, Steve.

> I can't for the life of me understand why you support that creep, ...

I have found the incorrect useage of the term liar to be confusing. It appears you do not want to change your belief in what the word means, or at least you do not feel it necessary to use the word correctly, so I will simply assume you mean "incorrect" or "wrong" when you use the term "liar" or "lie." It is no big deal, but please do forgive me if I forget to keep track of your special meaning of the word.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2111. Re: QCWA TELLS FCC TO END INCENTIVE LICENSING

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-29 18:05:11 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <bjid6.10$HH5.40276@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 2409

Bob Wex w2ilp <w2ilp@juno.com> wrote:

> > It is too bad; the things you are choosing to say to tear down
> amateur radio to
> > be "right" are undermining the very principles you stand for.

> Ed..I'm sorry if you think that my intention is to "tear down" ham
> radio.

I didn't say that it is your intention to tear down ham radio. That is just a byproduct of the things you say about ham radio.

Sorry, the rest of your post was a bit long; I don't have time to respond to much of it. It does seem like a rehash of things we have been through a few times before.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2112. Re: CA power crisis caused by internet

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-29 18:06:08 UTC
From: "Steven J Robeson", K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <954be7$5of$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2412

In article <20010129122021.25659.00001425@nso-fk.aol.com>,
lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:

>>...the whole thread has evolved into a grandiose (and gratuitous)
>>mini-forum where everyone can trot out their favorite "hate" subjects
>>and expound on it as if they knew anything. Few do.

Thereupon follows Lennie's own political pontificating. The data
is reasonable, but Lennie had to take a swipe at everyone else who
dared to do the same thing HE does.

> There is no real problem from "tree huggers" nor some imagined
> "left coast mentality" that caused the problems in part of the
> state. It can be summarized in a single word: Greed.

Uh oh...we AGREE on something.

> Greed happens. Anyplace.

Even in Amateur Radio related newsgroups by unlicensed persons who
demand everything for nothing.

--
http://hometown.aol.com/k4yz/myhomepage/index.html

"The Measure Of A Man Is Not In How He Touches A Woman, But In How He
Touches A Woman's Heart"

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2113. Re: CA power crisis caused by internet

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-29 18:17:23 UTC
From: W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com>
Message-ID: <954c4c$2m1$1@iac5.navix.net>
Source record: 2411

Deregulation, and true Capitalism Yes! Pseudo deregulation and competition
No!

Had the power companies not been hampered in their expansion, you would see
electrical energy be dispensed in the same way that telephone and internet
services are today. Once the building of cheap sources of energy i.e.
nuclear power were stifled, the chance for competition was removed.

Remove all the nonsense regulations and your monthly power can be bought
from an energy provider for $19.95 a month. Some smart entrepreneur would
build an energy farm and become the next AOL of the power industry.

We do not have competition or a free market place in the field of energy.

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nospam.spam> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.g7whjr1.pminews@ca.news.verio.net...
> On Sun, 28 Jan 2001 21:56:43 -0500, W4JLE wrote:
>
> >You got that right Richard, I was afraid I had stuttered and you didn't
get
> >the message. Once more with feelings, California liberals and their ilk
> >passed legislation that had no chance for success. Don't blame me, you
could
> >not pay me to live there if you put the mint on a three shift day.
>
> Gee, I've always considered that "deregulation" was the darling
> of "conservatives" who didn't want "the gov'mint" setting caps
> on profits and interfering with their business endeavors by
> telling "industry" what to do.
>
> Foolish me....must have been us "liberals" all along, eh? FDR
> must be spinning in his grave.
>
> --
> 73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP
>
>
>
>
>

2114. Re: ARRL Life Membership - Don't buy one!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-29 18:35:11 UTC
From: W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com>
Message-ID: <954d5s$366$1@iac5.navix.net>
Source record: 2413

Might be because the 5 wpm was required by the Navy to identify emergency signals to start. Later the speed was raised to provide trained operators for war time use of the military.

The problem today is couched in code speed, code is NOT the problem. The problem is watching any standard in any part of our life being removed be cause "I want it" attitudes. Not only are the IWI group never satisfied, but want to belittle any established rules of life.

It matters not if it is religious, morality, or code. "You" are archaic, elitist, etc. etc if "Your" values stand in the way of "my" instant desires. Once we move from the logical to the emotional, there is no easy solution.

We who had to do the code, do not have any real objections to it's removal for logical reasons, I dam well object to the snot nosed kids that think it should be removed because "they" think it is just being kept by the old (insert favorite expletive) who are standing in "their" way.

NCI the Madelyn Murry O'Hare of Amateur radio.

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20010129074325.12194.00001984@ng-cd1.aol.com...
> I have to wonder, if the 5 wpm code test was enough to get Amateur Radio
off to
> such a flying start (looking at the resultant growth), why is it looked
upon
> with such disdain by some today?
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

2115. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-29 18:58:05 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nospam.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.g7xka02.pminews@ca.news.verio.net>
Source record: 2414

On Mon, 29 Jan 2001 11:43:41 GMT, Brian wrote:

>Nevermind that even the professional emergency communicators have
>abandoned code long ago. If you like, I'll dig out the website where
>you can listen to the last holdout, the US Coast Guard's last CW
>transmission.

The last holdout was the closedown transmission from Marine
Coast Station KFS, Bolinas/Point Reyes, CA, on July 12, 1999 at
2359 GMT:

DE KFS = THIS IS THE FINAL CW TRANSMISSION FROM STATION KFS -
THE LAST COMMERCIAL RADIOTELEGRAPH STATION IN NORTH AMERICA.
APPROPRIATELY, WE CLOSE CW AND EMBARK ON A NEW ERA OF
COMMUNICATION WITH SAMUEL F.B. MORSE'S WORDS OF 155 YER ?
YEARS AGO = NW CL 73 = WHAT HATH GOD WROUGHT = DE KFS

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

2116. Re: CA power crisis caused by internet

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-29 18:58:07 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nospam.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.g7xkny3.pminews@ca.news.verio.net>
Source record: 2416

On 29 Jan 2001 03:52:56 GMT, Dick Carroll wrote:

> That, in microcosm, is the larger problem we will face as a society at
>some point: how to moderate use of energy-gobbling resources to which we
>currently have nearly unlimited access. Who would prefer the intricacies
>of cost accounting to the all-you-can-eat buffet? No one. That is, until
>the lights go out."
>
>End of quoted material
>
>
> QRP anyone?

Nuclear, anyone? Four 2-unit plants would have provided more
than enough power to make this "crisis" disappear before it got
started. The fuel is readily available - in fact, a major
"crisis" in the eco-world is how to store/dispose of the
reprocessed fuel not being used.

But NIMBY-ism prevailed.

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP
(P.E. in EE since 1960)

2117. Re: CA power crisis caused by internet

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-29 18:58:09 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nospam.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.g7xl8q5.pminews@ca.news.verio.net>
Source record: 2415

On Mon, 29 Jan 2001 05:44:33 -0500, Brian Kelly wrote:

>The 'lectric company here made money on excess capacity back
>then thanks to the foibles of regulation and now they can't so
>they took the excess capacity offline real quick but it's still
>out there.

Get them turbines spinnin'.....

(My wife was one of the engineering types who did the Limerick
expansion design some 30 years ago....)

What ever happened to Electric Company bonds which guaranteed a
regulated 6% income in good times and bad?

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

2118. Re: CA power crisis caused by internet

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-29 18:58:10 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nospam.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.g7xkxb4.pminews@ca.news.verio.net>
Source record: 2417

On 29 Jan 2001 04:58:58 GMT, Dick Carroll wrote:

>> Foolish me....must have been us "liberals" all along, eh? FDR
>> must be spinning in his grave.
>>
>
> Phil, that was the problem in a nutshell. "Liberal Deregulation", in
>which the retail price is strictly controlled so as to definitely never
>offend a single voter by causing him to have to pay actual costs (until
>the lights go out, anyway) but unfortunately they forgot that they
>couldn't control the prices charged by all those out-of-state suppliers!
> Evidently they just closed their eyes and hoped the ship would hit the
>sand so far in the future they'd be off the scene when the
>recriminations started...

I consider myself a 1950s-style "liberal" which appears to be
the inverse of what folks hang that label on today. In "my
style" the gov'mint's job is to look out for the benefit
of the consumer, both long-term and short-term.

As I said, FDR must be spinning in his grave.

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

2119. Re: CA power crisis caused by internet

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-29 18:59:13 UTC
From: Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com>
Message-ID: <3A75BD81.8E3F9177@dvol.com>
Source record: 2418

Len Over 21 wrote:
>

> There is no real problem from "tree huggers" nor some imagined
> "left coast mentality" that caused the problems in part of the
> state.

>
Only to the extent that one of the reasons (excuses?) for not building new capacity is that it takes years to get a construction permit past a bureaucracy overloaded with "environmental impact studies" types of endless regulatory pushups. Those were imposed by the tree huggers and there are a hulluva lot more of those local regs on the Left Coast than there are here. Dubya weighed in yesterday and announced that an administration objective will be to get the red tape cut and pave the way for building new capacity ASAP. Which in the end is the only viable long-term solution.

> It can be summarized in a single word: Greed.
>
> Greed happens. Anyplace.

For certain.
>
w3rv

2120. Re: ARRL Life Membership - Don't buy one!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-29 19:02:38 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nospam.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.g7xlvb6.pminews@ca.news.verio.net>
Source record: 2419

On Mon, 29 Jan 2001 18:00:54 GMT, Steven J Robeson wrote:

> Because most of the third world countries who, despite having NO
>internal communications infrastracture in ANY mode, have the same vote
>as those who have technology out the wazoo. Morse Code levels the
>playing field for them.

CELLULAR/WIRELESS technology is what's leveling the playing
field for them, bypassing wired and conventional single-channel
and multi-channel communications.

The world moves on...

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

2121. Re: Amateur license renewals lost by FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-29 19:10:51 UTC
From: JR <jr@some.net>
Message-ID: <3A75B0F7.7FA98CEA@some.net>
Source record: 2420
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

We all know you really want to become a wit, well keep trying, you're half way there.

KC8JBO wrote:

> In article <3A750150.26BB6EA1@some.net>,
> JR <jr@some.net> wrote:
> > Oh you hurt my widdle feelings!!
>
> Good. Now go back down to the street corner and sell crack coaciane to
> the kids, which is what you do for a living.

2122. Re: I will no longer tolerate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-29 19:18:50 UTC
From: JR <jr@some.net>
Message-ID: <3A75B2D5.BB3D9A36@some.net>
Source record: 2421
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Amen, Windows is a piece of crap. IBM OS/2 was much more stable, too bad they could not market it properly.

Stagger Lee wrote:

> On Fri, 26 Jan 2001 02:46:11 GMT, Toll Free <tollfree@bigradios.com> wrote:
> : And what would you call a "real OS"?
>
> Almost anything other than the buggy, unstable product Microsoft has chosen
> to call "Windows."

2123. Re: Amateur license renewals lost by FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-29 19:53:52 UTC
From: KC8JBO <roger_kc8jbo@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <954hoabqp1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2422
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <3A75B0F7.7FA98CEA@some.net>,
Sheep fucker JR <jr@some.net> wrote:
> We all know you really want to become a wit, well keep trying, you're
half
> way there.

And that's still WAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAY above what you could ever acheive,
kiddie porn merchant.

> KC8JBO wrote:
>
> > In article <3A750150.26BB6EA1@some.net>,
> > JR <jr@some.net> wrote:
> > > Oh you hurt my widdle feelings!!
> >
> > Good. Now go back down to the street corner and sell crack coaciane
to
> > the kids, which is what you do for a living.
>
>

--
73 de Roger, KC8JBO
EM99 |ARRL|VE [ARRL & W5YI]|ARES |RACES
Yaesu FT-920 |Inverted Vee @ 40 ft.
Yaesu FT-90R

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2124. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-29 20:01:54 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A75CC32.3859946B@uci.edu>
Source record: 2423

Bill Sohl wrote:
> >>As to my "Sohl" proposal ala QST some years back...I'd not
> >>oppose having some questions along the lines of those
> >>similar to the questions regarding knowledge of the phonetic alphabet.
> >
> >How would you feel about the test containing 5 minutes of Morse code at 5 wpm,
> >and a reasonable number of questions about its content?
>
> I'd have mixed opinion. It really isn't needed anymore and
> that's pretty much the bottom line.

In other words, you don't support the "Sohl Proposal"?

73, AC6XG

2125. Re: CA power crisis caused by internet

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-29 20:02:27 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccoll@radiks.net>
Message-ID: <PZjd6.931$9m.3490191@nntp3.onemain.com>
Source record: 2424

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nospam.spam> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.g7xkny3.pminews@ca.news.verio.net...
>
> Nuclear, anyone? Four 2-unit plants would have provided more
> than enough power to make this "crisis" disappear before it got
> started. The fuel is readily available - in fact, a major
> "crisis" in the eco-world is how to store/dispose of the
> reprocessed fuel not being used.
>
> But NIMBY-ism prevailed.
>
>
> --
> 73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP
> (P.E. in EE since 1960)

The challenges before the advocates of nuclear power, and I am one, is to both re-engineer the concept in light of our experience with earlier generations of nukes and then sell it to a public that does not believe it. My lites are on at the moment by way of a nuke at Ft Calhoun NE that has run like a Swiss watch. While no one was watching the proportion of power done by nukes has risen in the US although none were built; they run longer and harder than they did when they were built. Kind of like jet aircraft vs the old prop jobs.

But there is a price to be paid and this may be harder than the engineering. Like any base-load plant only more so, nukes have heavy front-end costs but generate power pretty cheaply. The cost of long-term financing and the willingness of regulators (including Congress and the IRS) to allow the depreciation schedule to pay off the bonds is absolutely critical. The break-up of ATT was largely at ATTs request (as was the Communications act of 1934) because the Bell System had become the second-biggest borrower next only to Sam of long term funds in the US largely because the depreciation schedules from the regulators assumed crossbar exchanges would last into the 24th century. Kind of like NYC being solvent if the retirement plan used a mortality table from 1917.

Regulation of these things is necessary for no better reason that the front-end cost is a significant barrier to entry (which CA made worse by requiring new entrants to bear some of the 'stranded cost' of the old system. Stranded costs because of inadequate depreciation.) But the back side of regulation is that in return for limited tariffs, the regulator guarantees a profit. It is a bargain with the devil, more or less, but a very necessary one. If we are not willing to provide a planning horizon, it is a pretty fair bet no one is going to plan.

One of the minor joys of living on the Union Pacific mainline is to watch the coal unit-trains roll along I-80. Coal plants have similar problems but not to the extent of nukes and they are generally borne by a number of organizations in addition to the utility. Wyoming coal is low-sulfur to be sure but is dusty as hell and has about half the heat content of eastern coals. Coal has a place in the problem but no one wants to talk about the costs of extraction, transportation, handling, use, and disposal of the end products including Carbon 14 which is radioactive BTW. Disposal of nuclear fuel waste (although not obsolete plants to my knowledge anyway) is pretty well known.

And finally, if the benefit of nuclear power is to be fully realized, the peak-and-valley of demand patterns have to be muted a bit and that implies hourly metering and pricing. To cite an example, in the morning every coffee pot and electric range in existence comes on line. But does every electric water heater have to kick in as well? Is Madame Housewife (if any are left) incapable of noting that 2 PM is not a great time to dry a load of clothes? Perhaps in the long run of things natural gas would make more sense, particularly if the alternate use is to use the gas to make the electric power? Here is where the market's biggest advantage lies -- everyone making his own decisions with readily available information.

Perhaps the biggest single mistake regulators and politicians make is to assume consumers are idiots. Unfortunately, it is true that most viewers are brighter than Barbie and Ken doing the local TV news.

Dick N&#65533;BK

2126. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-29 20:07:28 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A75CD80.9A58C1BC@uci.edu>
Source record: 2425

W1RFI wrote:
>
> >From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
>
> >> I don't believe that Larry is going through all of the work of serving on
> >> the NCI Board because he feels that doing so is easier than learning the
> >> code.
>
> >No, it's an inflated sense of selfpity.
>
> And why do you feel that Bill Sohl and Carl Stevenson are serving on the NCI
> Board?

Is it a big fish/small pond kinda thing?

73, Jim AC6XG

2127. Re: I will no longer tolerate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-29 20:39:35 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nospam.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.g7xqcy0.pminews@ca.news.verio.net>
Source record: 2427
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On Mon, 29 Jan 2001 19:18:50 GMT, JR wrote:

>> : And what would you call a "real OS"?
>>
>> Almost anything other than the buggy, unstable product Microsoft has chosen
>> to call "Windows."
>
>Amen, Windows is a piece of crap. IBM OS/2 was much more stable, too bad they
>could not market it properly.

You are so right - but they are pulling the plug on further
development in the "small user" market.

But fortunately there is a White Knight.... Serenity Systems is
OEM-ing OS/2 client as a product called eComStation. Users of
that product say it continues where Big Blue left off at FP 15
and are very enthusiastic about it. It's bundled with updated
application suites and drivers, installs from CD, and is available
from Indelible Blue on a special upgrade deal for present OS/2
users.

Serenity Systems - <www.serenity-systems.com>
Indelible Blue - <www.indelibleblue.com>

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP
Team OS/2 (Warp 4 FP 15)

2128. Re: ARRL Life Membership - Don't buy one!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-29 21:01:18 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A75DA1E.63B0A375@IEEE.org>
Source record: 2428

W4JLE wrote:
> ... I dam well object to the snot nosed kids that think it
> should be removed because "they" think it is just being kept by the old
> (insert favorite expletive) who are standing in "their" way.

Maybe those snot nosed kids consider your attitude toward Morse
code testing to be an "I Want It!" attitude, the exact attitude
that you condemn in them.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2129. Re: I will no longer tolerate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-29 21:02:32 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A75DA68.A173C83A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 2429
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

JR wrote:
> Amen, Windows is a piece of crap. IBM OS/2 was much more stable, too bad they
> could not market it properly.

Linux may succeed where OS/2 failed.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2130. Re: Morse Code replacement? Bigtime flame war article!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-29 21:59:28 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccoll@radiks.net>
Message-ID: <kHld6.33$2Y.16757@nntp2.onemain.com>
Source record: 2430
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.antenna

"Ed Juge/NM" <ed_juge@zianet.com> wrote in message
news:3a75d123.0@oracle.zianet.com...
> I agree with Ed. This isn't the ng for code discussions.
>
> Ed, W5EJ
>

Just which of the four groups you posted to is the inappropriate one?

Dick N&#65533;BK

2131. Re: Top ten signs you're staying at a racist Hiram, GA hotel

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-29 22:09:21 UTC
From: DX405 <lightnin9@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <954q8d$7au$1@dagobah.blueriver.net>
Source record: 2433
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

You would know all about having to evolve wouldn't YOU Roger. That is right about you though because you are another one of the apes from West Virginia.

"KC8JBO" <roger_kc8jbo@my-deja.com> wrote in message news:953ss8ntq1@nnrp1.deja.com...
> In article <3A754C14.A0966BFB@dvol.com>,
> Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com> wrote:
> >
> >
> > Stagger Lee wrote:
> >
> > > Top ten signs you're staying at a racist, Hiram hotel
> > >
> > > 10. Their slogan is, "We'll leave the WHITE on for ya!"
> > >
> > > 9. First tip-off: Those Confederate Flag pillow cases.
> > >
> > > 8. Sign in the lobby announces: "Pat Buchanan Rally This
> Saturday!!!"
> > >
> > > 7. Sign behind the front desk reads: "You're damn right we're open
> on
> > > Martin Luther King Day!"
> > >
> > > 6. Sign above the beds reads: "Absolutely no HIP-HOPPING on the
> > > mattresses!!!"
> > >
> > > 5. Sheets and towels already have eye-holes cut in them.
> > >
> > > 4. No rating by the AAA. . . but 5-stars by the KKK.
> > >
> > > 3. Bible on the nightstand replaced with a copy of "Mien Kampf".
> > >
> > > 2. Instead of a "Presidential Suite" they have a "Grand Wizard
> Suite".
> > >
> > > And the Top Sign You're Staying at a racist, Hiram Hotel. . .
> > >
> > > 1. Every morning the front desk will give you a "wake-up slur".
> >
> > >
> > You're a mindless pile of trash to the core.
> > >

> > Brian Kelly w3rv
> > Secane, Pa.
> >
>
> He'd have to evolve for EONS just to get to *that* place!
>
> --
> 73 de Roger, KC8JBO
> EM99 |ARRL|VE [ARRL & W5YI]|ARES |RACES
> Yaesu FT-920 |Inverted Vee @ 40 ft.
> Yaesu FT-90R
>
>
> Sent via Deja.com
> http://www.deja.com/

2132. Re: Before responding to the Colt thread.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-29 22:15:42 UTC
From: RanHefner <ranhefner@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <954q25$k5f$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2432
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Well Steve, if you don't get it and refuse to ask your amateur friends,
you just will not understand.

In article <94uokv$sj0$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
Steven J Robeson, K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com> wrote:
> In article <94klf2bco1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
> RanHefner <ranhefner@my-deja.com> wrote:
>

--
Randy A. Hefner
http://talk.to/frs
http://go.to/qx3

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2133. Re: Morse Code replacement? Bigtime flame war article!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-29 22:16:25 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nospam.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.g7xu9w1.pminews@ca.news.verio.net>
Source record: 2431
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Sun, 28 Jan 2001 18:26:35 -0700, Ed Juge/NM wrote:

>I agree with Ed. This isn't the ng for code discussions.

Depends on where "this" is. I'm reading it and posting this
reply in rec.radio.amateur.policy which IS "the place".

It's too bad that the message headers don't indicate which
group the message being replied to was read from.

(This will be my last crosspost to the other groups about CW,
though.)

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

2134. Re: Top ten signs you're staying at a racist Hiram, GA hotel

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-29 23:33:34 UTC
From: KC8JBO <roger_kc8jbo@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <954ukeofk1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2434
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <954q8d$7au$1@dagobah.blueriver.net>,
"DX405" <lightnin9@hotmail.com> wrote:
> You would know all about having to evolve wouldn't YOU Roger.

BWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA!!! Yeah, I can compare your ill-educated writings to mine and see whre MINE is far superior. Now go get the sperm out of that comma key and quit downloading and masturbating to that kiddie porn.

> That is right

We know, Pissflap, we know!!!!

> about you though because you are another one of the MEN from West Virginia.

Yeah, but I still don't wet the bed like you do, fuckhead!

> "KC8JBO" <roger_kc8jbo@my-deja.com> wrote in message
> news:953ss8ntq1@nnrp1.deja.com...
> > In article <3A754C14.A0966BFB@dvol.com>,
> > Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com> wrote:
> > >
> > >
> > > Stagger Lee wrote:
> > >
> > > > Top ten signs you're staying at a racist, Hiram hotel
> > > >
> > > > 10. Their slogan is, "We'll leave the WHITE on for ya!"
> > > >
> > > > 9. First tip-off: Those Confederate Flag pillow cases.
> > > >
> > > > 8. Sign in the lobby announces: "Pat Buchanan Rally This
> > Saturday!!!"
> > > >
> > > > 7. Sign behind the front desk reads: "You're damn right we're
open
> > on
> > > > Martin Luther King Day!"
> > > >
> > > > 6. Sign above the beds reads: "Absolutely no HIP-HOPPING on the
> > > > mattresses!!!"
> > > >
> > > > 5. Sheets and towels already have eye-holes cut in them.
> > > >

> > > > 4. No rating by the AAA. . . but 5-stars by the KKK.
> > > >
> > > > 3. Bible on the nightstand replaced with a copy of "Mien
Kampf".
> > > >
> > > > 2. Instead of a "Presidential Suite" they have a "Grand Wizard
> > Suite".
> > > >
> > > > And the Top Sign You're Staying at a racist, Hiram Hotel. . .
> > > >
> > > > 1. Every morning the front desk will give you a "wake-up slur".
> > >
> > > >
> > > You're a mindless pile of trash to the core.
> > > >
> > > Brian Kelly w3rv
> > > Secane, Pa.
> > >
> >
> > He'd have to evolve for EONS just to get to *that* place!
> >
> > --
> > 73 de Roger, KC8JBO
> > EM99 |ARRL|VE [ARRL & W5YI]|ARES |RACES
> > Yaesu FT-920 |Inverted Vee @ 40 ft.
> > Yaesu FT-90R
> >
> >
> > Sent via Deja.com
> > http://www.deja.com/
>
>

--
73 de Roger, KC8JBO
EM99 |ARRL|VE [ARRL & W5YI]|ARES |RACES
Yaesu FT-920 |Inverted Vee @ 40 ft.
Yaesu FT-90R

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2135. Re: ARRL Life Membership - Don't buy one!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-29 23:35:36 UTC
From: "Steven J Robeson", K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <954uo7oih1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2436

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.g7xlvb6.pminews@ca.news.verio.net>,
"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nospam.spam> wrote:

> CELLULAR/WIRELESS technology is what's leveling the playing
> field for them, bypassing wired and conventional single-channel
> and multi-channel communications.

And how many of those countries have you seen from the inside out,
Phil?

How many Afghanii's or Tchadians have cellphones?

Just curious.

Steve, K4YZ
--
http://hometown.aol.com/k4yz/myhomepage/index.html

"The Measure Of A Man Is Not In How He Touches A Woman, But In How He
Touches A Woman's Heart"

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2136. Re: Before responding to the Colt thread.....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-29 23:41:52 UTC
From: "Steven J Robeson", K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <954v3vova1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2437
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <954q25$k5f$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
RanHefner <ranhefner@my-deja.com> wrote:

>Well Steve, if you don't get it and refuse to ask your amateur friends,
>you just will not understand.

I understand perfectly, Randy. The point was not about hobby
applications of AMATEUR radio, but of hobby applications of FRS.

QRM claimed that is was NOT a hobby service, nor was it used for
hobby applications. I differed with him.

No problem.

73

Steve, K4YZ
--
http://hometown.aol.com/k4yz/myhomepage/index.html

"The Measure Of A Man Is Not In How He Touches A Woman, But In How He
Touches A Woman's Heart"

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2137. Re: VHF history (long) (was: any ideas on HOw to learn Morse

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-29 23:44:59 UTC
From: "Steven J Robeson", K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <954v9p$p1u$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2435

In article <Rfid6.9$HH5.40127@news.ntplx.net>,
"Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net> wrote:

> It is no big deal, but please do forgive me if I forget to keep
> track of your special meaning of the word.

There's no special meaning, Ed. I simply refuse to re-label his
intentional misinformation and denigrations as anything but a lie.

If you don't tell the truth or "reconstruct" the truth to be
something OTHER than truth, you are lying. No big deal.

73

Steve, K4YZ
--
http://hometown.aol.com/k4yz/myhomepage/index.html

"The Measure Of A Man Is Not In How He Touches A Woman, But In How He
Touches A Woman's Heart"

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2138. Anonymous Creep Strikes Again

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-29 23:59:28 UTC
From: "Steven J Robeson", K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <95504r$pv5$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2438

Subj: Re: ARRL Life Membership - Don't buy one
Date: 01/29/01 3:29:37 PM Eastern Standard Time
From: w2dne@ziplip.com (w2dne)
Reply-to: w2dne@ziplip.com (w2dne)
To: Ham-Policy@ucsd.edu
CC: k4yz@aol.com

On Mon, 29 Jan 2001 18:00:54 GMT, Steven J Robeson wrote:

>>Because most of the third world countries who,
>>despite having NO internal communications
>>infrastracture in ANY mode, have the same vote
>>as those who have technology out the wazoo. Morse
>>Code levels the playing field for them.

>Nursie, there is no country, 3rd world or otherwise, which has any use
>for Morse Code telecommunications infrastructure. Technology is the
>cheapest thing in the world these days.

>You're a dumb sumabitch, and you're really good at it!

Well, just like the Kerchunkers and the occassional jammer on 2
meters, I know I shouldn't acknowledge these creeps, but I just can't
stand cowards....And this creep is a coward.

First of all...it's "Nursie-pooh". Please get it right.

Secondly, the rest is simply YOUR opinion. Unfortunately, you
demonstrate the typical Ugly American attitude that EVERYONE has waht
we have, and can't fathom anything EXCEPT the way we have it.

THAT'S dumb. There is still a large part of many countries that
still don't have cellphone forests in thier cities, and Amateur Radio
STILL plays an integral part of thier needs, if even as back-up for
commercial or military nets.

Let's hope your mother get's back in the mood for sex again. It
was nice while you were gone.

http://hometown.aol.com/k4yz/myhomepage/index.html

"The Measure Of A Man Is Not In How He Touches A Woman, But In How He
Touches A Woman's Heart"

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2139. Re: VHF history (long) (was: any ideas on HOw to learn Morse

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-30 00:34:43 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A760C23.8B08F6D6@IEEE.org>
Source record: 2439

Steven, J, Robeson, K4YZ wrote:
> If you don't tell the truth or "reconstruct" the truth to be
> something OTHER than truth, you are lying. No big deal.

So if you don't tell the truth about your latest BM, you are
lying? You must have a strange life. :-)
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2140. Re: I will no longer tolerate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-30 00:44:04 UTC
From: kg9qm@nomail.net
Message-ID: <o7od6.32$c5.25669@news1.iquest.net>
Source record: 2440
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Steve Ballmer may succeed where Bill Gates floundered. Linux is catching up to Windows but is far from having it "caught". Windows has always been "a piece of crap" in the eyes of some, but that's true for any O/S, too.

Having done punch cards on IBM 1620s and System/360 (when a "green card" was a programer reference card), I can tell you what "a piece of crap" REALLY is! (cringe)

;-) don

In article <3A75DA68.A173C83A@IEEE.org>, Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org was of the opinion...
>
>JR wrote:
>> Amen, Windows is a piece of crap. IBM OS/2 was much more stable, too bad they
>> could not market it properly.
>
>Linux may succeed where OS/2 failed.
>--
>http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2141. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-30 01:00:04 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A761214.CFF65CDA@uci.edu>
Source record: 2442

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> Five WPM isn't fast enough to approach the proficiency
> which would give a code learner the confidence to try out his skills
> on-the-air.

This was incorrect when you first wrote it, it was incorrect the next time you wrote it, and it was incorrect the time after that. It is now still incorrect, and will likely continue to be incorrect in the future, as it does not appear to become correct with either repetition or time.

73, Jim AC6XG

2142. Re: I will no longer tolerate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-30 01:00:12 UTC
From: JR <jr@some.net>
Message-ID: <3A7602D4.EB959880@some.net>
Source record: 2441
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

don wrote:

> Steve Ballmer may succeed where Bill Gates floundered. Linux is catching up to
> Windows but is far from having it "caught". Windows has always been "a piece
> of crap" in the eyes of some, but that's true for any O/S, too.

Lets hope so.

> Having done punch cards on IBM 1620s and System/360 (when a "green card" was a
> programer reference card), I can tell you what "a piece of crap" REALLY is!
> (cringe)
>
> ;-) don
>

Been there, done that. Just don't drop the CID deck of cards. The "green card"
eventually became a "yellow card".

2143. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-30 01:08:06 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A7613F6.882A1C23@IEEE.org>
Source record: 2446

Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > Five WPM isn't fast enough to approach the proficiency
> > which would give a code learner the confidence to try out his skills
> > on-the-air.
>
> This was incorrect when you first wrote it, it was incorrect the next
> time you wrote it, and it was incorrect the time after that. It is now
> still incorrect, and will likely continue to be incorrect in the future,
> as it does not appear to become correct with either repetition or time.

Yep, 5wpm was plenty fast enough for me and thousands of other Novices
in the 1950s. It is difficult for anyone to use Morse code at 5wpm
without automatically getting faster in the process. After a year as
a Novice, I could do 25wpm. The only difference now is that we have
5wpm Generals instead of 5wpm Novices.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2144. Re: Morse Code replacement? Bigtime flame war article!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-30 01:15:26 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9554je$f3a$0@208.207.71.178>
Source record: 2443

W1RFI wrote:
>
> >From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
>
> >Yes. And so I have stated on numerous occasions,though that fact seems
> >tohave been overlooked in their zeal to overpower it still, even though
> >it has already been killed.
>
> Morse code use on the bands has not been killed at all, Dick. Are you really
> trying to destroy is just to be "right" in this debate? If so, you are wrong.
>

Read a little closer, Ed. The subject was the code 'test', which has
indeed been killed. But you'd think that 5wpm was just as daunting as
20wpm to hear the whiners go at it.

> > the idea of persuading many of them to voluntarily become skilled to useful
> > Morse speeds doesn't seem to hold much realistic promise.
>
> If you really are giving up, perhaps you could stand back and let those with a
> more positive outlook take over from here.

Your positive outlook and a buck will get you a cup of coffee if you
stay out of the ritzt joints.

Your choice of words is really
> trying to hasten the demise of my favorite mode. I disagree with you that Morse
> code use is unable to stand on its own merits.

You lose.

2145. Re: ARRL Life Membership - Don't buy one!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-30 01:17:35 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9554nf$f3a$1@208.207.71.178>
Source record: 2444

K0HB wrote:
>
> In article <94vutn$fo1$0@208.206.142.105>,
> Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>
> > Marconi always considered himself a ham although he never held a ham
> > radio license.
>
> Lotsa guys like that hanging out just below 10 meters.
>

You equate Freebanders with Marconi? I am not the least surprised

2146. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-30 01:22:12 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <955504$f3a$2@208.207.71.178>
Source record: 2445

Brian wrote:
>
> In article <952sco$fo7$0@208.207.71.165>,
> Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
> >
> >
> > Bill Sohl wrote:
> > >
> > > On 28 Jan 2001 13:24:51 GMT, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:
> > >
> > > >From: billsohl@mindspring.com (Bill Sohl)
> > > >
> > > >I disagree with the possibile retention of a code test for USA,
> but that's far
> > > >
> > > >enough out that I am quite happy with the change regarding S25.5.
> > > >
> > > >The Board chose not to change the US policy at this time.
> > > >
> > > >As to my "Sohl" proposal ala QST some years back...I'd not
> > > >oppose having some questions along the lines of those
> > > >similar to the questions regarding knowledge of the phonetic
> alphabet.
> > > >
> > > >How would you feel about the test containing 5 minutes of Morse
> code at 5 wpm,
> > > >and a reasonable number of questions about its content?
> > >
> > > I'd have mixed opinion. It really isn't needed anymore and
> > > that's pretty much the bottom line.
> > >
> >
> > It's quite clear that Bill has no use for ham radio for anything
> other
> > than just a very occasional, causual passtime, and thus he truly
> > believes that no one else does or ever has had, either. He evidently
> > doesn't read much or just ignores the emergency columns in all the
> mags
> > that have published reams on such activity by hams for far longer than
> > he has had a license.
> > But I guess that would be the attitude one could expect from a fella
> > who has very little actual interest in the hobby, and being employed
> in
> > a commercial communications endeavor he surely wouldn't advocate hams

> > handling serious traffic in competition.
>
> Nevermind that even the professional emergency communicators have
> abandoned code long ago. If you like, I'll dig out the website where
> you can listen to the last holdout, the US Coast Guard's last CW
> transmission.
>
> If you want to get saved, you'll have to learn to use phone.

You babbling again, Magpie? Who even so much as mentioned code? Sohl
doesn't even know about emergency SSB nets.

2147. Re: ARRL Life Membership - Don't buy one!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-30 01:24:44 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <95554s$f3a$3@208.207.71.178>
Source record: 2447

W1RFI wrote:
>
> >From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
>
> >Oh, I don't know. He made a bunch of longrange CW contacts if you
> >recall. Also as has been belabored here so often, the code test early on
> >was at 5wpm.
>
> I didn't mean to imply that he didn't know the code. I don't know if he knew
> the code to 20 wpm when he did those early experminents. Seeing as this was
> before April 15, 2000, shouldn't he have done them above 50 MHz, where he
> belonged? :-)
>
> I have to wonder, if the 5 wpm code test was enough to get Amateur Radio off to
> such a flying start (looking at the resultant growth), why is it looked upon
> with such disdain by some today?
>

To answer a question with a question, why is it that 5wpm code test is
being fought just as hard by the codebashing lazies just as hard as the
20wpm was?

2148. Re: CA power crisis caused by internet

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-30 01:36:59 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9555rr$i78$0@208.207.71.178>
Source record: 2448

Phil Kane wrote:
>
> I consider myself a 1950s-style "liberal" which appears to be
> the inverse of what folks hang that label on today. In "my
> style" the gov'mint's job is to look out for the benefit
> of the consumer, both long-term and short-term.
>
> As I said, FDR must be spinning in his grave.
>

To repeat what other notables have said, "I didn't leave the Democratic
party, it left me".

2149. Re: ARRL Life Membership - Don't buy one!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-30 01:40:42 UTC
From: W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com>
Message-ID: <95563p$i6n$1@iac5.navix.net>
Source record: 2449

Cecil, go set in a corner and cut out some paperdolls or something. Leave
the big people alone.

"Cecil" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3A75DA1E.63B0A375@IEEE.org...
> W4JLE wrote:
> > ... I dam well object to the snot nosed kids that think it
> > should be removed because "they" think it is just being kept by the old
> > (insert favorite expletive) who are standing in "their" way.
>
> Maybe those snot nosed kids consider your attitude toward Morse
> code testing to be an "I Want It!" attitude, the exact attitude
> that you condemn in them.
> --
> http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2150. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-30 01:49:19 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9556iv$k02$0@208.207.71.178>
Source record: 2450

Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> W1RFI wrote:
> > why do you feel that Bill Sohl and Carl Stevenson are serving on the NCI
> > Board?
>
> Is it a big fish/small pond kinda thing?
>
> 73, Jim AC6XG

By Jove, I believe you've got it!

2151. Re: ARRL Life Membership - Don't buy one!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-30 01:51:15 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <9556mgvhi1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2501

In article <952shh$vt2$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org> wrote:
> In article <94vutn$fo1$0@208.206.142.105>,
> Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>
> > Marconi always considered himself a ham although he never held a ham
> > radio license.
>
> Lotsa guys like that hanging out just below 10 meters.
>
> 73, Hans, K0HB

You're not telling CB Dick anything new.

Gosh, I hope I'm not equating Dick with Marconi.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2152. Re: ARRL Life Membership - Don't buy one!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-30 01:52:46 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <9556pbvik1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2502

In article <20010128222026.04710.00000132@ng-ff1.aol.com>,
w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:
> >From: Brian brianburke@my-deja.com
>
> >I thought the idea was to be "equal" with the other modes.
>
> It is. The testing for the other modes is somewhat related to the
relative
> importance of the mode to amateur radio.
>
> If you think I was saying that all modes must be tested in equal
percentages,
> you misunderstood.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

Equitable?

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2153. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-30 01:58:35 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <955747$vu6$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2504

In article <953ur8$pg9$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org> wrote:
> In article <953l1c$i2j$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
> Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com> wrote:
>
> >
> > If you want to get saved, you'll have to learn to use phone.
> >
>
> Naw, that won't work. You have to get your sinful ass baptized,
> go to church often, and don't make fun of George Duh-bya Shrub.
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB

Is God authorized phone? Will he accept two outta three?

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2154. Re: CA power crisis caused by internet

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-30 02:04:14 UTC
From: Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com>
Message-ID: <3A76211E.70971D91@dvol.com>
Source record: 2503

Phil Kane wrote:

> On Mon, 29 Jan 2001 05:44:33 -0500, Brian Kelly wrote:
>
> >The 'lectric company here made money on excess capacity back
> >then thanks to the foibles of regulation and now they can't so
> >they took the excess capacity offline real quick but it's still
> >out there.
>
> Get them turbines spinnin'.....
>
> (My wife was one of the engineering types who did the Limerick
> expansion design some 30 years ago....)

>
Whatta monster project that thing was . . it's online and cranking. It
pretty much defines the state of the art as that art was frozen in time
back then. Ya can navigate by it's cooling tower plumes 20 miles out in
any direction.
>

>
> What ever happened to Electric Company bonds which guaranteed a
> regulated 6% income in good times and bad?

>
Beats me, now that he's out and duly pardoned Mikey Milken might tell
you wha hoppen to 'em.
>

> --
> 73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

>
w3rv

2155. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-30 02:07:19 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <9557kj$6t$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2506

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.g7xka02.pminews@ca.news.verio.net>,
"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nospam.spam> wrote:
> On Mon, 29 Jan 2001 11:43:41 GMT, Brian wrote:
>
> >Nevermind that even the professional emergency communicators have
> >abandoned code long ago. If you like, I'll dig out the website where
> >you can listen to the last holdout, the US Coast Guard's last CW
> >transmission.
>
> The last holdout was the closedown transmission from Marine
> Coast Station KFS, Bolinas/Point Reyes, CA, on July 12, 1999 at
> 2359 GMT:
>
> DE KFS = THIS IS THE FINAL CW TRANSMISSION FROM STATION KFS -
> THE LAST COMMERCIAL RADIOTELEGRAPH STATION IN NORTH AMERICA.
> APPROPRIATELY, WE CLOSE CW AND EMBARK ON A NEW ERA OF
> COMMUNICATION WITH SAMUEL F.B. MORSE'S WORDS OF 155 YER ?
> YEARS AGO = NW CL 73 = WHAT HATH GOD WROUGHT = DE KFS
>
> --
> 73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

Thank you Phil.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2156. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-30 02:11:56 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <9557t6ia1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2507

In article <955504$f3a$2@208.207.71.178>,
Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

> > If you want to get saved, you'll have to learn to use phone.
>
> You babbling again, Magpie? Who even so much as mentioned code? Sohl
> doesn't even know about emergency SSB nets.
>

Metamucel not working? How about a garden hose?

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2157. Re: CA power crisis caused by internet

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-30 02:14:19 UTC
From: Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com>
Message-ID: <3A76237A.E607C32C@dvol.com>
Source record: 2505

Richard McCollum wrote:

>
> Perhaps the biggest single mistake regulators and politicians make is to
> assume consumers are idiots. Unfortunately, it is true that most viewers
> are brighter than Barbie and Ken doing the local TV news.

>
I'm about as pro-nuke as they come and I agree with you as far as you took it.
But there are two additional problems involved. First is the radiation
exposure paranoia (it says here) held by the Greens which was the primary
reason nuke-building was stopped. They have Barbie and Ken in their back
pockets. Chernobyl hasn't helped. Huge obstacle.
>
The second is the outrageous upfront engineering charges. The engineering of
every one of the nukes in this country was essentially done on the basis of
completely reinventing the wheel every time a new one was built. My
recollection is that the tab for the engineering of the Limerick plant was one
BILLION dollars. Never mind that dozens of nukes had already been online for
years before Limerick ever got to the drawing board stage. I'm in the
industrial mechanical design & build biz, I know bullshit when I see it, a
billion dollars +/- for a stack of drawings times however many nukes we have
is nothing short of one of the most monumental scams ever foisted on the
populace.
>
Of course my simplifcations can be argued over the horizon at the nit-picking
level.
>
The French did it right. They developed and locked down a complete design
package for a decent national-standard nuke and replicated the design
cookie-cutter style all over their map and buttered the one-time and done
engineering costs over the entire fleet. Today 60% of the power consumed in
France is provided by those cookie-cutter nukes.
>

> Dick Nï¿½BK

>
w3rv

2158. Re: ARRL Life Membership

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-30 02:28:56 UTC
From: Rick Tannehill <rickw7rt@firstinter.net>
Message-ID: <3A7626E8.10D2F285@firstinter.net>
Source record: 2508

National Geographic begins sending me renewal notices in July, and sends at least one a month until I renew. I call that harrassment, way beyond bother :)

Rick T.
W7RT

W1RFI wrote:

> >From: GAR GARIGUE garigue@home.com
>
> >You don't get bothered 4 months before your subcription is up.
>
> What would bother me is if they didn't ask me to renew until 4 months AFTER my
> subscription was up. :-)
>
> Actually, the other magazines to which I subscribe have about the same time
> frame. If everybody else gave you 4 months to pay a bill, would you call it a
> bother? :-)
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

2159. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-30 02:29:24 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <9558ts$1et$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2509

In article <952rmabjp0@208.207.71.165>,
Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>
>
> Phil Kane wrote:
> >
> > On 28 Jan 2001 13:31:30 GMT, W1RFI wrote:
> >
> > >>From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
> > >
> > >>QFU isn't on my Q-signal list. I've never heard it on the air.
> > >
> > >I have heard it on the air and I didn't need a list to know exactly
what it
> > >meant.
> >
> > QFU is in the series assigned to the Aeronautical Services -
> > that series does not appear in the ITU Radio Regs so I don't
> > know its exact (legal) meaning.
> >
>
> See, Ed? I told you it was legal! You can't depend on a codefree ham
> like Brian for dependable information about radiotelegraph
operations.

Poor CB Dick. That's the real problem with lies. There's no basis in fact, thus they're not worth remembering. And Dick can't remember what he says from one moment to the next.

Here's what he said:

"I dunno. QFU isn't on my Q-signal list. I've never heard it on the air. Maybe he's coining a new one. Maybe that's another urban legend."

He goes all the way from "I don't know" and "Its not on my list" to "See Ed? I told you it was legal."

And of course he knows I've always been coded.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2160. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-30 02:42:30 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <9559mk$21s$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2510

In article <952pmo$87t$1@208.207.71.165>,
Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>
>
> W1RFI wrote:
> >
> > >From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
> >
> > >QFU isn't on my Q-signal list. I've never heard it on the air.
> >
> > I have heard it on the air and I didn't need a list to know exactly
what it
> > meant.
>
> No, you assumed you knew what it meant.

Hey Dick, your sense of loyalty to the Morse Myth is QFUBAR. Nobody's
buying it.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2161. Re: Amateur license renewals lost by FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-30 03:17:51 UTC
From: DX405 <lightnin9@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <955caq$8dt$1@dagobah.blueriver.net>
Source record: 2511
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Shut up moron. Go back to your mommy and get your welfare check.

"KC8JBO" <roger_kc8jbo@my-deja.com> wrote in message
news:954hoabqp1@nnrp1.deja.com...
> In article <3A75B0F7.7FA98CEA@some.net>,
> Sheep fucker JR <jr@some.net> wrote:
> > We all know you really want to become a wit, well keep trying, you're
> half
> > way there.
>
> And that's still WAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAY above what you could ever acheive,
> kiddie porn merchant.
>
> > KC8JBO wrote:
> >
> > > In article <3A750150.26BB6EA1@some.net>,
> > > JR <jr@some.net> wrote:
> > > > Oh you hurt my widdle feelings!!
> > >
> > > Good. Now go back down to the street corner and sell crack coaciane
> to
> > > the kids, which is what you do for a living.
> >
> >
>
> --
> 73 de Roger, KC8JBO
> EM99 |ARRL|VE [ARRL & W5YI]|ARES |RACES
> Yaesu FT-920 |Inverted Vee @ 40 ft.
> Yaesu FT-90R
>
>
> Sent via Deja.com
> http://www.deja.com/

2162. Re: Morse Code replacement? Bigtime flame war article!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-30 04:28:59 UTC
From: kh2d@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <3a7642c6.385656@news.guam.net>
Source record: 2512

On Mon, 29 Jan 2001 22:16:25 GMT, "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nospam.spam>
wrote:

>On Sun, 28 Jan 2001 18:26:35 -0700, Ed Juge/NM wrote:
>
>>I agree with Ed. This isn't the ng for code discussions.
>
> Depends on where "this" is. I'm reading it and posting this
> reply in rec.radio.amateur.policy which IS "the place".
>
> It's too bad that the message headers don't indicate which
> group the message being replied to was read from.
>
> (This will be my last crosspost to the other groups about CW,
> though.)
>
>--
> 73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP
>

Thanks, Phil. That's good, cuz some of us just don't care
anymore. We are hiding in other newsgroups :-)

73, Jim KH2D

2163. Re: VHF history (long) (was: any ideas on HOw to learn Morse

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-30 04:50:42 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010129235042.22631.00001491@nso-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 2514

In article <Rfid6.9$HH5.40127@news.ntplx.net>, "Ed Hare, W1RFI"
<w1rfi@arrl.net> writes:

>I have found the incorrect useage of the term liar to be confusing. It
>appears you do not want to change your belief in what the word means, or at
>least you do not feel it necessary to use the word correctly, so I will
>simply assume you mean "incorrect" or "wrong" when you use the term "liar"
>or "lie." It is no big deal, but please do forgive me if I forget to keep
>track of your special meaning of the word.

"1984" is alive and well in Tennessee, complete with "Truthspeak"
(or whatever it was called).

In reality this "incorrect" label of a "lie" is merely a statement of
a Belief System so strong that it becomes the center of the
known world for a Believer. Such a Believer probably uses an
Icon radio rather than an Icom. :-)

If anyone gave him a signal report lower than "599" this Believer
would hop up and down screaming "LIAR! LIAR!" :-)

didit

2164. Re: CA power crisis caused by internet

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-30 04:50:44 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010129235044.22631.00001492@nso-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 2513

In article <3A76237A.E607C32C@dvol.com>, Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com> writes:

>The French did it right. They developed and locked down a complete design
>package for a decent national-standard nuke and replicated the design
>cookie-cutter style all over their map and buttered the one-time and done
>engineering costs over the entire fleet. Today 60% of the power consumed in
>France is provided by those cookie-cutter nukes.

More like 75 percent. [Source: World Almanac 2001, 59 reactors
producing 63,105 MWe, 1999] France is also the center for Europe's
nuclear fuel reprocessing.

Paris is often spoken of as "the city of lights." Maybe nowadays
it glows in the dark from another cause? :-)

Interesting part is that the USA has 104 reactors producing 97,145
MWe which is only 19.54% of total USA electric power in 1999.

didit

2165. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-30 05:23:44 UTC
From: JR <jr@some.net>
Message-ID: <3A764063.82DB25C8@some.net>
Source record: 2515

And that means?

Cecil wrote:

> The only difference now is that we have
> 5wpm Generals instead of 5wpm Novices.
> --
> http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2166. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-30 05:48:07 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A765597.823F0781@IEEE.org>
Source record: 2516

JR wrote:
> And that means?

It means that Generals can do now exactly what Novices did in the
1950s - start out at 5wpm and speed up over time. For some reason
known only to Larry, he says over and over that it can't be done
even though hundreds of thousands of hams have done exactly that.

> Cecil wrote:
> > The only difference now is that we have
> > 5wpm Generals instead of 5wpm Novices.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2167. Re: CA power crisis caused by internet

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-30 05:51:16 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A765654.9E1CB3F5@IEEE.org>
Source record: 2517

Dick Carroll wrote:
> To repeat what other notables have said, "I didn't leave the Democratic
> party, it left me".

Did you hear about the china plates disappearing from Air Force One
during/after Clinton's flight to New York, and now appearing for
sale on EBAY?
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2168. Re: ARRL Life Membership - Don't buy one!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-30 06:03:49 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A765945.CD526FD6@IEEE.org>
Source record: 2519

Dick Carroll wrote:
> To answer a question with a question, why is it that 5wpm code test is
> being fought just as hard by the codebashing lazies just as hard as the
> 20wpm was?

Why should reducing the required speed make an outmoded requirement
any more acceptable? It's like a hazing ritual being reduced from
four licks to one lick.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2169. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-30 06:12:45 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <955m0t$t40$0@208.207.71.178>
Source record: 2518

It means we also have 5wpm pseudoExtras.

JR wrote:
>
> And that means?
>
> Cecil wrote:
>
> > The only difference now is that we have
> > 5wpm Generals instead of 5wpm Novices.
> > --
> > http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2170. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-30 06:18:06 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A765C9E.92749B54@IEEE.org>
Source record: 2521

Dick Carroll wrote:
> It means we also have 5wpm pseudoExtras.

It means that any HF ham who wants to, can start out on the air
at 5wpm and increase his code speed over time to the extent
of his/her capabilities, just like I (and probably you) did.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2171. Re: CA power crisis caused by internet

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-30 06:18:17 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <955mb9$124$0@208.207.71.178>
Source record: 2520

Cecil wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > To repeat what other notables have said, "I didn't leave the Democratic
> > party, it left me".
>
> Did you hear about the china plates disappearing from Air Force One
> during/after Clinton's flight to New York, and now appearing for
> sale on EBAY?

Yep, Fox News reports that Clintoon's squad stripped it clean of all linen, dishes, silverware, everything that wasn't nailed down too tight to move, once it landed in New York. But they are NOT crooks, you unnerstand.
I think the people of Arkansas understand, too.

Once it becomes clear just what he sold to China he will have some sereious answering to do that can't be brushed aside with "depends on what the definition of 'is' is".

2172. Re: CA power crisis caused by internet

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-30 08:32:31 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccoll@radiks.net>
Message-ID: <5Zud6.180$vk.173196@nntp1.onemain.com>
Source record: 2522

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:3A76237A.E607C32C@dvol.com...
>
> Richard McCollum wrote:
>
> >
> > Perhaps the biggest single mistake regulators and politicians make is
to
> > assume consumers are idiots. Unfortunately, it is true that most
viewers
> > are brighter than Barbie and Ken doing the local TV news.
>
> >
> I'm about as pro-nuke as they come and I agree with you as far as you
took it.
> But there are two additional problems involved. First is the radiation
> exposure paranoia (it says here) held by the Greens which was the
primary
> reason nuke-building was stopped. They have Barbie and Ken in their back
> pockets. Chernobyl hasn't helped. Huge obstacle.
> >
> The second is the outrageous upfront engineering charges. The
engineering of
> every one of the nukes in this country was essentially done on the basis
of
> completely reinventing the wheel every time a new one was built. My
> recollection is that the tab for the engineering of the Limerick plant
was one
> BILLION dollars. Never mind that dozens of nukes had already been online
for
> years before Limerick ever got to the drawing board stage. I'm in the
> industrial mechanical design & build biz, I know bullshit when I see it,
a
> billion dollars +/- for a stack of drawings times however many nukes we
have
> is nothing short of one of the most monumental scams ever foisted on the
> populace.
> >
> Of course my simplifcations can be argued over the horizon at the
nit-picking
> level.
> >
> The French did it right. They developed and locked down a complete

design
> package for a decent national-standard nuke and replicated the design
> cookie-cutter style all over their map and buttered the one-time and
done
> engineering costs over the entire fleet. Today 60% of the power consumed
in
> France is provided by those cookie-cutter nukes.
> >
>
> > Dick N&#65533;BK
>
> >
> w3rv
>

There were several standard designs outside the US, remember the Candu? A certain amount of that is power company people: coal installations had the same problem. Kind of like OTR tractors, some like Cummins, some like Cat. Probably some need to make everything fit the company theme but you are 100% correct.

Construction unions tended to view a nuke as an opportunity to cut a melon as well. Bruno and Guido even got into the act. When things are built in remoter areas the local sheriff is buyable for no better reason that he don't stand a prayer anyway.

Dick

2173. Re: I will no longer tolerate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-30 09:05:56 UTC
From: Train <cbmods@optonline.net>
Message-ID: <Utvd6.398$zZ.433905@news02.optonline.net>
Source record: 2523
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

You're giving me nightmares just thinking back to sitting at the "console"
of the 360 system. Ran one of those puppies back in about 1980 (or was it
1890) when they cost so damn much money that they were timeshared.....My
how things have changed!
Train
don <kg9qm@nomail.net> wrote in message
news:o7od6.32$c5.25669@news1.iquest.net...
> Steve Ballmer may succeed where Bill Gates floundered. Linux is catching
up to
> Windows but is far from having it "caught". Windows has always been "a
piece
> of crap" in the eyes of some, but that's true for any O/S, too.
>
> Having done punch cards on IBM 1620s and System/360 (when a "green card"
was a
> programer reference card), I can tell you what "a piece of crap" REALLY
is!
> (cringe)
>
> ;-) don
>
>
> In article <3A75DA68.A173C83A@IEEE.org>, Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org was of the
> opinion...
> >
> >JR wrote:
> >> Amen, Windows is a piece of crap. IBM OS/2 was much more stable, too
bad
> they
> >> could not market it properly.
> >
> >Linux may succeed where OS/2 failed.
> >--
> >http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca
>

2174. Re: I will no longer tolerate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-30 09:17:38 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccoll@radiks.net>
Message-ID: <5Dvd6.197$2Y.154696@nntp2.onemain.com>
Source record: 2524
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"don" <kg9qm@nomail.net> wrote in message
news:o7od6.32$c5.25669@news1.iquest.net...
> Steve Ballmer may succeed where Bill Gates floundered. Linux is
catching up to
> Windows but is far from having it "caught". Windows has always been "a
piece
> of crap" in the eyes of some, but that's true for any O/S, too.
>
> Having done punch cards on IBM 1620s and System/360 (when a "green card"
was a
> programer reference card), I can tell you what "a piece of crap" REALLY
is!
> (cringe)
>
> ;-) don
>

Check stop!

If you had the single RAMAC disk on a 1620 it was a 1710.

OS360 came out when the Kingston Trio was big. Became known as the
operating system that never returned. Spent so much time housekeeping
that it only rarely came around to do any useful work. Now that was
bloatware.

2175. Re: CA power crisis caused by internet

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-30 09:31:00 UTC
From: Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com>
Message-ID: <3A7689D4.D690B38F@dvol.com>
Source record: 2525

Richard McCollum wrote:

>
> Perhaps the biggest single mistake regulators and politicians make is to
> assume consumers are idiots. Unfortunately, it is true that most viewers
> are brighter than Barbie and Ken doing the local TV news.

>
I'm about as pro-nuke as they come and I agree with you as far as you took it. But there are two additional problems involved. First is the radiation exposure paranoia (it says here) held by the Greens which was the primary reason nuke-building was stopped. They have Barbie and Ken in their back pockets. Chernobyl hasn't helped. Huge obstacle.
>
The second is the outrageous upfront engineering charges. The engineering of every one of the nukes in this country was essentially done on the basis of just about completely reinventing the wheel every time a new one was built. My recollection is that the tab for the engineering of the Limerick plant was one BILLION dollars. Never mind that dozens of nukes had already been online for years before Limerick ever got to the drawing board stage. I'm in the industrial mechanical design & build biz, I know bullshit when I see it, a billion dollars +/- for a stack of drawings times however many nukes we have is nothing short of one of the most monumental scams ever foisted on the populace.
>
The French did it right. They developed and locked down a complete design package for a decent nuke and replicated the design cookie-cutter style all over their map. Today 60% of the power consumed in France is provided by those nukes .
>

> Dick Nï¿½BK

2176. Re: Amateur license renewals lost by FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-30 09:50:40 UTC
From: KC8JBO <roger_kc8jbo@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <9562pelbp1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2526
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Bucktoothed CHOAD "DX405" <lightnin9@hotmail.com> assslurped in message
news:955caq$8dt$1@dagobah.blueriver.net...
> Shut up moron.

Make me shut up, anonymous, sqwats to take a piss COWARD.

If stupidity were contagious, you'd be sitting bare-ass naked in a petri
dish, deep-frozen in liquid nitrogen, in a nuke-proof room with
seventeen foot
concrete walls buried three miles under the Mojave Desert. And I still
wouldn't feel entirely safe.

>Go back to your mommy and get your welfare check.

Ack! Oof! Another yo mama flame! Oh no, things are looking grim for
me,
folks! BWAHAHAHAHA!

I guess I'll have to indulge you so here's mine:
Go back to sucking your Mommy's hairy dick and get your FOOD STAMPS,
kiddie porn collector.

It must be because you're living on that old landfill that you're
already dead.
So FUCK off and ROT!!!!

> "KC8JBO" <roger_kc8jbo@my-deja.com> wrote in message
> news:954hoabqp1@nnrp1.deja.com...
> > In article <3A75B0F7.7FA98CEA@some.net>,
> > Sheep fucker JR <jr@some.net> wrote:
> > > We all know you really want to become a wit, well keep trying,
you're half
> > > way there.
> >
> > And that's still WAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAY above what you could ever
acheive,
> > kiddie porn merchant.
> >
> > > KC8JBO wrote:
> > >
> > > > In article <3A750150.26BB6EA1@some.net>,
> > > > JR <jr@some.net> wrote:
> > > > > Oh you hurt my widdle feelings!!
> > > >
> > > > Good. Now go back down to the street corner and sell crack

cocaine to
> > > > the kids, which is what you do for a living.

--
73 de Roger, KC8JBO
EM99 |ARRL|VE [ARRL & W5YI]|ARES |RACES
Yaesu FT-920 |Inverted Vee @ 40 ft.
Yaesu FT-90R

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2177. Re: Morse Code replacement? Bigtime flame war article!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-30 10:51:03 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <9566amntb1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2527

In article <9554je$f3a$0@208.207.71.178>,
Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>
>
> W1RFI wrote:

> > I disagree with you
> > that Morse code use is unable to stand on its own merits.
>
> You lose.

Dick, I think you just implied that Morse code use is unable to stand on its own merits, and requires a government support system to keep it alive. How sad that you have wasted years of your life on the Morse argument and you came to the same conclusion that anyone with even half a brain could see. Could it be that you have less than half a brain?

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2178. Re: VHF history (long) (was: any ideas on HOw to learn Morse

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-30 12:11:59 UTC
From: "Steven J Robeson", K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <956b2brac1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2528

In article <3A760C23.8B08F6D6@IEEE.org>,
Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:

> So if you don't tell the truth about your latest BM, you are
> lying? You must have a strange life. :-)

If you'd really like to know, I will tell you via private e mail,
Cecil, but I think that wanting to know about someone's
gaastrointestinal functions (or dysfunction as the case may be)outside
of clinical interest is even STRANGER!
--
http://hometown.aol.com/k4yz/myhomepage/index.html

"The Measure Of A Man Is Not In How He Touches A Woman, But In How He
Touches A Woman's Heart"

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2179. Re: VHF history (long) (was: any ideas on HOw to learn Morse

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-30 12:15:46 UTC
From: "Steven J Robeson", K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <956b9e$rk7$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2529

In article <20010129235042.22631.00001491@nso-fz.aol.com>,
lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:

> "1984" is alive and well in Tennessee, complete with "Truthspeak"
> (or whatever it was called).

If you were well read, you'd know what it was. Personally, I
think George Orwell was a genius.

As for "1984" being alive and well in Tennessee, I think you are
into the pot/kettle/black mode again, Lennie. You are The Master of
the re-worked word and you revel in it. Without it, you'd have nothing
to sling in this forum.

Your "Creep Mode" is only at 4.3 this morning Lennie. Try again.
You have done better.
--
http://hometown.aol.com/k4yz/myhomepage/index.html

"The Measure Of A Man Is Not In How He Touches A Woman, But In How He
Touches A Woman's Heart"

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2180. Re: VHF history (long) (was: any ideas on HOw to learn Morse

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-30 14:07:21 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A76CA99.5BF7B206@IEEE.org>
Source record: 2530

Steven, J, Robeson, K4YZ wrote:
>
> Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> > So if you don't tell the truth about your latest BM, you are
> > lying? You must have a strange life. :-)
>
> If you'd really like to know, I will tell you via private e mail,
> Cecil, but I think that wanting to know about someone's
> gaastrointestinal functions (or dysfunction as the case may be)outside
> of clinical interest is even STRANGER!

Point is, Steve, that you don't tell the truth about your latest BM.
Being silent on a subject does NOT mean that one is lying.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2181. Re: I will no longer tolerate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-30 14:12:47 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A76CBDF.3E69EEB9@IEEE.org>
Source record: 2531
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Train wrote:
> You're giving me nightmares just thinking back to sitting at the "console"
> of the 360 system. Ran one of those puppies back in about 1980 (or was it
> 1890) when they cost so damn much money that they were timeshared.....My
> how things have changed!

You guys are still wet behind the ears. Did you ever use an IBM650?
Magnetic drum with thousands of vacuum tubes and tons of air-conditioning.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2182. Re: Morse Code replacement? Bigtime flame war article!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-30 14:17:42 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A76CD06.FC0FCEF@IEEE.org>
Source record: 2532

Dick Carroll wrote:
> > I disagree with you that Morse code use is unable to stand on its own merits.
>
> You lose.

Things succeed or fail because they possess merits or lack merits. You have
just implied that CW cannot stand on its own merits. If that is true, CW
doesn't deserve to survive. I think that you are absolutely wrong. I believe
that CW does indeed have merits.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2183. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-30 15:07:17 UTC
From: JR <jr@some.net>
Message-ID: <3A76C92A.93B05F99@some.net>
Source record: 2533

I take it from your comment that anyone who upgrades under the new 5 wpm rule is somehow not as good as someone who upgraded under the old code rules?

Dick Carroll wrote:

> It means we also have 5wpm pseudoExtras.
>

2184. Re: QCWA TELLS FCC TO END INCENTIVE LICENSING

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-30 15:57:55 UTC
From: Bob Wex w2ilp <w2ilp@juno.com>
Message-ID: <956o9t$74g$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2535

In article <bjid6.10$HH5.40276@news.ntplx.net>,
"Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net> wrote:
> Bob Wex w2ilp <w2ilp@juno.com> wrote:
>
> > > It is too bad; the things you are choosing to say to tear down
> > amateur radio to
> > > be "right" are undermining the very principles you stand for.
>
> > Ed..I'm sorry if you think that my intention is to "tear down" ham
> > radio.
>
> I didn't say that it is your intention to tear down ham radio. That
is just
> a byproduct of the things you say about ham radio.
>
> Sorry, the rest of your post was a bit long; I don't have time to
respond to
> much of it. It does seem like a rehash of things we have been through
a few
> times before.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
Hi Ed...
Thanks again for your response. The only "byproduct" of my
suggestions would be the survival of ham radio in keeping with its true
tradition, its basis and purpose, its technological and economic value
to the USA, and the legacy of the silent key hams, who have done so
much to contribute to the technical growth of our hobby in the past.
It is sad that our nation's leaders, both Democrats and Republicans,
as well as most Ham leaders are taking paths that are not in agreement
with most intellectuals or with people who have firm technical and
scientific backgrounds. Our national leadership problems are evident
by recent editorials to be found in many reliable newspapers. The fact
is our leadership does not seem to be capable of making the kind of
logical decisions that are needed for future economic growth, power
management, overpopulation control, disease control, etc. The leaders
who evolve from liberal artists, lawyers, and religious leaders can not
blaze any path of success through the world's scientific industrial
competition and the serious problems that the future is sure to bring.
They can talk;
They can judge; They can pray...BUT they are not equipped to make
decisions based on scientific facts, which can only be accepted when

the proper logic is applied to the proper research.
New findings show that cancerous melenomas of the eye's cornea and
retina can be caused by the use of cell phones. The effect can be
explained to anyone who understands the basic principles by which
microwave ovens work. The near microwave frequencies can cause damage
to the moist areas of human eyes...but the extent of this effect would
not be caused by the longer waves used by ham's HTs on VHF (two meters).
The resonance effect of the entire human body and the penetration into
the human skull were the main things being considered when the
ANSI/IEEE safety levels were established. You can correct me if I am
wrong, but it seems that the ARRL as well as the FCC has accepted the
[probably] biased opinions of the ANSI/IEEE, which IMHO were made
solely to protect the cell-phone industries.

Please keep thinking.
Hams need more license classes.

73,
Bob Wex w2ilp (Insure Lighting Power)...don't get caught in the dark.

If men think that a ruler is religious and
has a reverence for the gods, they are less
afraid of suffering injustice in their hands.
--Aristotle (343 B.C.)--

It does me no injury for my neighbor to say
there are twenty gods, or no G-d. It neither
picks my pocket nor breaks my leg.
--Thomas Jefferson (1782)--

Our jails are filled by people who claim to
be religious.
--w2ilp--

Prayer alone can never solve scientific problems.
We must support more scientific education and let
religious education, like abortion, and ham radio,
be a matter of individual choice.
--w2ilp (2001)--

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2185. Re: ARRL Life Membership - Don't buy one!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-30 15:58:08 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <956oaa$74j$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2534

In article <954uo7oih1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
Steven J Robeson, K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com> wrote:

> How many Afghanii's or Tchadians have cellphones?

Many, many more than have amateur radio! Amateur radio transmissions
are banned by the current government of Afghanistan, and there is only
one active licensee in Chad.

73, Hans, K0HB
--
"We are fellow travelers on a journey between two
eternities, and it's a trip far too brief for me
to be concerned about your speed at the Code of
Morse."

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2186. Re: Morse Code replacement? Bigtime flame war article!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-30 16:14:43 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <956p9j$29v$0@208.206.142.82>
Source record: 2536

W1RFI wrote:
>
> >From: "Richard McCollum"
>
> > providing a path for the 5wpm contingent to get to journeyman levels is
> > far more important to the hobby than defending the medium from
> > bleating cattle.
>
> If those of us who enjoy Morse code want to see newcomers use and enjoy the
> mode, too, you are quite right -- ways of getting people from 5 wpm to higher
> speeds are pretty important.
>
> I am NOT impressed with the methods being used. To the contrary, I believe
> that the anger, the bitterness and the name calling that is being done by some
> to "defend" the mode is setting the stage for failure.

Then have misperceived the entire controversy. I for one came on board
here a few years ago with the sole intent and purpose of offering a
little friendly insight on the fact that Morse on ham radio does indeed
have a velue. I was immediately set upon by a howling pack of jackels,
some of whom persist to this day. If you think I intend to just roll
over and hand the game to them you're dreaming. They can expect to get
in return what they give.
Why is it that you like to ignore all their BS and concentrate on what
code supporters do? There's no help for those people - their minds are
made up. To
quote the famous Brain Burke "I don't want to take no more code tests"
and
"I want, I want, I want" ad naseum. They're the "gimmie" set if ever
there was one.
Most of us code test supporters willingly accepted a 5wpm General
class license, but NO! We want it *ALL* gone, macht scnell! Bullshit!
They can eat cake. It'll be gone when it's gone, and they can go ahead
and stew meantine. And when it's gone ham radio will be a very much
dimninished affair, whatever remains.

Dick W0EX

2187. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-30 16:15:32 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A76E8A4.CD47059E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 2537

JR wrote:
> I take it from your comment that anyone who upgrades under the new 5 wpm
> rule is somehow not as good as someone who upgraded under the old code
> rules?

Yep, when my three year old grandson grows up and becomes an Extra,
Dick will still be calling him a pseudoExtra.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2188. Re: Morse Code replacement? Bigtime flame war article!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-30 16:23:16 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A76EA74.8C59FEF0@IEEE.org>
Source record: 2538

Dick Carroll wrote:
> "I want, I want, I want" ad naseum.

Yep, "I want a code test, I want a code test, I want a code test"
ad nauseam.

> They can eat cake.

Remember what happened to the first person who said that, Dick.
The commoners are storming the Bastille again. Better cover
your Royal Highnee.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2189. Re: ARRL Life Membership - Don't buy one!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-30 17:09:56 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <956sgpbai1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2539

In article <9554nf$f3a$1@208.207.71.178>,
Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

>
> You equate Freebanders with Marconi?
>

All the early non-licensed radio experimenters (Marconi included) were,
by definition, freebanders. All reality is aspect dependent.

73, de Hans, K0HB
--
"We are fellow travelers on a journey between two
eternities, and it's a trip far too brief for me
to be concerned about your speed at the Code of
Morse."

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2190. Re: ARRL Life Membership - Don't buy one!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-30 17:38:13 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nospam.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.g7z4f80.pminews@ca.news.verio.net>
Source record: 2540

On Mon, 29 Jan 2001 23:35:36 GMT, Steven J Robeson wrote:

>> CELLULAR/WIRELESS technology is what's leveling the playing
>> field for them, bypassing wired and conventional single-channel
>> and multi-channel communications.
>
> And how many of those countries have you seen from the inside out,
>Phil?
>
>
My own experience -- I haven't been off N. America since 1967.

For examples, though, lets's start with China and several
countriez of the Middle East where 10 years ago there was
almost no copper.....nobody is stringing new copper, it's all
wireless.

Teh let's go on to Central and South America, where a former
chief of the FCC's OET (Dick Smith) has been heading up a
consortium to spread wireless telephony (cellular) in countries
like Venezuela, Peru, and Chile.

A good friend and professional colleague in SillyCon Valley -
Dewayne Hendricks, WA8DZP - is the founder and head technologist
of a consultancy that has already signed about a dozen
"third-world" countries to do the same. He's one of the more
vocal gurus of UWB technology.

Just for kicks he convinced the King of Tonga to let him be
the Domain Name czar (to mix pickles) and sell/assign domain
names ending in ".to" on the open market. Folks who can't get
".com" and ".org" names from InterNIC because they are taken can
now get the counterpart ".com.to" and ".org.to" from Dewayne....
when he's not attending meetings of the FCC's Technology Advisory
Council (or whatever they call it now) or playing upscale digital/packet
on the 5 GHz ham band with several of his cohorts.

> How many Afghanii's or Tchadians have cellphones?

A lot more than one would imagine but who said anything about
"the common folk" getting service? First come the politicows
and village/tribal chiefs.....

> Just curious.

Aren't we all....

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

2191. Re: QCWA TELLS FCC TO END INCENTIVE LICENSING

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-30 18:15:26 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <3A7704BE.E71F049F@arrl.org>
Source record: 2541

Bob Wex w2ilp wrote:
>
> The resonance effect of the entire human body and the penetration into
> the human skull were the main things being considered when the
> ANSI/IEEE safety levels were established.

You might want to read N9GL's latest article at:
http://www.arrl.org/rfsafety/lapin/2001/01/30/1/
in which he points out that the exposure standards were established on the basis of observed effects of RF, without regard to the mechanisms that may cause those effects. That doesn't preclude those working in the field from trying to determine the mechanisms and to understand why the observed effects exist.

Jon

2192. Re: Morse Code replacement? Bigtime flame war article!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-30 18:20:47 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <7e1e7t4vk2mes6qh36pupde942rir0nl5s@4ax.com>
Source record: 2542

Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>If you [Ed] think I intend to just roll
>over and hand the game to them you're dreaming.

Don't say the word "game" to Ed. He will use it as an excuse to leave
the discussion when his arguments have been defrocked... :-)

2193. Re: CA power crisis caused by internet

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-30 18:44:28 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nospam.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.g7zea92.pminews@ca.news.verio.net>
Source record: 2545

On Tue, 30 Jan 2001 04:31:00 -0500, Brian Kelly wrote:

>The second is the outrageous upfront engineering charges. The
>engineering of every one of the nukes in this country was
>essentially done on the basis of just about completely
>reinventing the wheel every time a new one was built. My
>recollection is that the tab for the engineering of the Limerick
>plant was one BILLION dollars.

But explain why Three Mile Island and Rancho Seco (Sacramento
M.U.D., CA) were identical and they looked awfully much like
Limerick.

Hey, remember that my now-wife and her then-husband (and the
4 kids and two ex-spouses they had between them) ate from that
project as she and he were employees of Bechtel on that famous
cost-plus contract.

Ah, the magic name. That was just after Bechtel made a
super-bundle misdesigning and misconstructing San Francisco's
BART subway system.

One could do that in those days . Cost-Plus now exists only as
the name of a chain store selling overpriced junk.

They really killed the goose that laid the golden egg...

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

2194. Re: CA power crisis caused by internet

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-30 18:44:31 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nospam.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.g7zee33.pminews@ca.news.verio.net>
Source record: 2543

On 30 Jan 2001 04:50:44 GMT, Len Over 21 wrote:

>More like 75 percent. [Source: World Almanac 2001, 59 reactors
>producing 63,105 MWe, 1999] France is also the center for Europe's
>nuclear fuel reprocessing.
>
>Paris is often spoken of as "the city of lights." Maybe nowadays
>it glows in the dark from another cause? :-)
>
>Interesting part is that the USA has 104 reactors producing 97,145
>MWe which is only 19.54% of total USA electric power in 1999.

Crunch your numbers again and tell us the comparison in terms
of population, land mass, and GNP.

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

2195. Re: CA power crisis caused by internet

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-30 18:44:31 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nospam.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.g7zejs4.pminews@ca.news.verio.net>
Source record: 2544

On 30 Jan 2001 06:18:17 GMT, Dick Carroll wrote:

> Yep, Fox News reports that Clintoon's squad stripped it clean of all
>linen, dishes, silverware, everything that wasn't nailed down too tight
>to move, once it landed in New York. But they are NOT crooks, you
>unnerstand.
>I think the people of Arkansas understand, too.

There's a difference between a Nixonian "I am not a crook" and
plain ol' Lightfinger Louie.

Amazing that Nixon and Clinton fit into the same mold.

> Once it becomes clear just what he sold to China he will have some
>sereious answering to do that can't be brushed aside with "depends on
>what the definition of 'is' is".

By the time it gets to that point the question will be about
"was". not "is".

But he was "our" Bozo......

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

2196. Re: I will no longer tolerate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-30 18:44:32 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nospam.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.g7zf875.pminews@ca.news.verio.net>
Source record: 2546
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On Tue, 30 Jan 2001 08:12:47 -0600, Cecil wrote:

>You guys are still wet behind the ears. Did you ever use an IBM650?
>Magnetic drum with thousands of vacuum tubes and tons of air-conditioning.

You missed the joys of the state-of-the-art AN/FSQ-31 which
was 2 IBM 7090s back-to-back .... with a 2-ft diameter disk
holding 128K that took 21 KW of manufacturer-required air
conditioning to make 75 degree +/- 2 degree air, while the
device operated in a computer room where the air was closely
held at 75 degrees +/- 1 degree per IBM specs.

The air handling system for the 'Q-31 had a 2-minute capacity
and a backup generator rated at 750 KW which could only make 2
starts in that time. Prime power had 4 - 375 KW rotary no-break
machines but SoCal Ed in their infinite wisdom only provided a
300 KVA transformer for patch-around when one of the no-breaks
were down for maintenance.

Ah the good old days of "Peace is Our Profession" (SAC - 1960s)

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

2197. Re: ARRL Life Membership - Don't buy one!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-30 19:03:20 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <95735opth0@208.206.142.82>
Source record: 2547

K0HB wrote:
>
> In article <9554nf$f3a$1@208.207.71.178>,
> Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>
> >
> > You equate Freebanders with Marconi?
> >
>
> All the early non-licensed radio experimenters (Marconi included) were,
> by definition, freebanders. All reality is aspect dependent.

Could we then consider this an example of the Hans Definition?

Freebanders are, by definition, outlaws. In the early days of radio
there were no controlling laws. 'Nuff said.

2198. Re: Code Quick RULEZ!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-30 19:04:30 UTC
From: David Snyder Hale <david@isi9.mtwilson.edu>
Message-ID: <95737u$a2f$1@agate.berkeley.edu>
Source record: 2548
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

In rec.radio.amateur.misc Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com> wrote:

> Dog did it. Hmmm, starts with the word dog, and dog starts with the
> letter "D" so it must be a d. Heck of a look up table you have to carry
> around in your head.

Yes, *IF* it worked as a lookup table, but I don't think it does.
I learned Morse with CodeQuick about 14 months ago, and I was explaining it to someone, and I found that I can't actually remember all the silly phrases and pictures, but I certainly have an association of the sound with the letter.

I don't mean to sound like a late-nite TV infomercial, ;-) but after about 2-3 years of frustration, trying everything, I went from 0-13 wpm with codequick. (I don't recall offhand how long it took, but it was pretty quick-- whatever about 1/2 the program is. maybe a month.)

Hey, everybody is different. It may not work for everyone, but it seems like a really good system to me, (because it worked wonders for me). I wouldn't guarantee it for anyone just because of how different folks can learn in different ways; But, I would suggest to someone that if they really wanted to learn Morse, and were about to give up because they couldn't, to try CodeQuick before giving up for good.

--
Dave * N3WTK (DM04xf) * http://isi.mtwilson.edu * n3wtk@arrl.net

2199. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-30 19:39:18 UTC
From: billsohl@mindspring.com
Message-ID: <3a7592f7.7073243@news.mindspring.com>
Source record: 2549

On 29 Jan 2001 04:38:41 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

>Bill Sohl wrote:
>>
>> The fact still remains that there is NOT any set freuency where
>> a ham can be reasonably sure that other hams are monitoring.
>> That is the bottom line. Ironic too that CBers maintain channel 9
>> as an exclsuive safety/emergency channel.
>
> No, Bull, the "fact" is that in an emergency situation, it is normal
>procedure for anyone involved or interested in the emergency to repair
>to the State emergency net frequency.

Strange, that has never been suggested or stated in any of the RACES
or other emergency mgmt activities I've been involved in.

>I wouldn't expect you to know
>that, given that you don't actually have that much experience in ham
>radio.

Thanks Dick, as usual you revert to personal, unsubstantiated
bull when you have nothing else to say.

> There are other frequencies generally active on a routine basis that
>are available for emergency service on an ongoing basis. The Eastcars
>and Westcars mobile service SSB nets on 7255, and Midcars on 72587258
>are still active, at least Midcars is, as I sometimes monitor there.
>Most any repeater can be used as emergency comms, if only you can get
>anyone to answer your call. Then there is the Maritime Mobile Service
>Net on 14.313, if there's anything left of it these days after the
>trashing it got by thugs a few years ago and since.

All this simply underscores the lack of any truly universal
agreement amongst the ham community for specific
emergency frequencies which, if ever agreed to,
could be routinely monitored by any/all hams.

> But, of course, you're right - there is no "frequency" that is
>singularly monitored for emergency purposes.

Thank you for acknowledging that.

>Instead, there are many.
>But you've got to know enough about it to know where to look.

Which is a basic and fundamental weakness of current practices.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2200. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-30 19:39:20 UTC
From: billsohl@mindspring.com
Message-ID: <3a7594ab.7509362@news.mindspring.com>
Source record: 2550

On 29 Jan 2001 03:24:29 GMT, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:

>>From: billsohl@mindspring.com (Bill Sohl)
>
>>>How would you feel about the test containing 5 minutes of Morse
>>> code at 5 wpm, and a reasonable number of questions about its content?
>
>>I'd have mixed opinion. It really isn't needed anymore and
>>that's pretty much the bottom line.
>
>Morse code is still in widespread use in the Amateur Radio Service, Bill; that
>alone is, IMHO, sufficient reason to have some testing related to its use. A
>decoding test is a long-time traditional way of accomplishing just that.

That is a SKILL test rather than a knowledge test. Ask questions
about the mode, there's no reason to validate ability to use. That
is no different than not testing ability to type to be able to use
keyboard modes (RTTY, packet, etc.).

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2201. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-30 22:53:45 UTC
From: Jeff Goodspeed <cmsx42@email.mot.com>
Message-ID: <3A7745F8.F67C0C23@email.mot.com>
Source record: 2353

Cecil wrote:

> JR wrote:
> > And that means?
>
> It means that Generals can do now exactly what Novices did in the
> 1950s - start out at 5wpm and speed up over time. For some reason
> known only to Larry, he says over and over that it can't be done
> even though hundreds of thousands of hams have done exactly that.
>
> > Cecil wrote:
> > > The only difference now is that we have
> > > 5wpm Generals instead of 5wpm Novices.
> --
> http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> Five WPM isn't fast enough to approach the proficiency
> which would give a code learner the confidence to try out his skills
? on-the-air.

What I think Larry may be trying to say is what I call the ï¿½fun ï¿½ factorï¿½. CW communications can be conducted at any speed, low or high. The unfortunate truth is that the amount of fun you have conversing with CW is proportional to the speed you can comfortably clip along at. When incentive licensing was based on stepped CW proficiency requirements, there were two forms of inspiration for a new 5 wpm Ham. There was some level of fun (and frustration) obtained by using the code, but also there was the carrot hanging in front of him to upgrade to higher class of license. Now that the ï¿½upgradeï¿½ carrot is gone, there is less incentive for a 5 wpm Ham to stick with using CW long enough to reach a speed where the fun ï¿½ factor can really kick in.

A second problem will be the loss of the ï¿½kiddy poolï¿½, otherwise known as the novice band. The Novice CW band allocations are essentially empty now and will soon go away. During their hay-day, they were chuck full of hams pounding away in the 5-13 wpm range, all working hard to improve their CW skills. It was easy to find someone to talk with and it was only respectful for accomplished CW operators to slow down when visiting there. The new CW operator today does not have this warm shallow water to splash around in. He is thrown into the deep end of the pool and told to start swimming with the big fish. Would anybody be surprised if the percentage of new hams that grow to love CW is significantly less compared to when there were support mechanisms built in to help him along?

I look to specialty clubs to step up and save the day for CW. It is clear that the code haters have won the day and regulated CW mandates are soon to be history. Clubs like FISTS should set aside frequencies in the CW sub-band via gentlemenï¿½s agreements as protected waters for new CW operators. They should slow down and help the new CW Hams along. If it were generally known that the new CW operator could find personal support on the bands, then CW would have a brighter future.

Jeff - KA9S

2202. Re: I will no longer tolerate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-30 22:54:27 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <957gmt$va9$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2351
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.g7zf875.pminews@ca.news.verio.net>,
"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nospam.spam> wrote:
> On Tue, 30 Jan 2001 08:12:47 -0600, Cecil wrote:
>
> >You guys are still wet behind the ears. Did you ever use an IBM650?
> >Magnetic drum with thousands of vacuum tubes and tons of
air-conditioning.
>
> You missed the joys of the state-of-the-art AN/FSQ-31 which
> was 2 IBM 7090s back-to-back .... with a 2-ft diameter disk
> holding 128K that took 21 KW of manufacturer-required air
> conditioning to make 75 degree +/- 2 degree air, while the
> device operated in a computer room where the air was closely
> held at 75 degrees +/- 1 degree per IBM specs.

> The air handling system for the 'Q-31 had a 2-minute capacity
> and a backup generator rated at 750 KW which could only make 2
> starts in that time. Prime power had 4 - 375 KW rotary no-break
> machines but SoCal Ed in their infinite wisdom only provided a
> 300 KVA transformer for patch-around when one of the no-breaks
> were down for maintenance.
>
> Ah the good old days of "Peace is Our Profession" (SAC - 1960s)
>
> --
> 73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

Sounds like the antiques in the old 20th Air Division, Air Defense
Command, SAGE Blockhouse at Ft Lee AFS, VA. I had to forecast
probability of lightning so we knew when to switch off the commercial
power and start up the diesels. Couldn't let the AC stop or we would
burn baby burn!

Bombs on Target!

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2203. Re: I will no longer tolerate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-30 22:59:12 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <957gvq$vm6$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2352
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <5Dvd6.197$2Y.154696@nntp2.onemain.com>,
"Richard McCollum" <rmccoll@radiks.net> wrote:

> Became known as the
> operating system that never returned. Spent so much time housekeeping
> that it only rarely came around to do any useful work. Now that was
> bloatware.

Sounds like some of the old telegraph operators around here. ;)

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2204. Re: Morse Code replacement? Bigtime flame war article!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-30 23:27:37 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <957iku$19j$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2354

In article <956p9j$29v$0@208.206.142.82>,
Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>
> Then (they?) have misperceived the entire controversy.

As has the FCC, right?

> I for one came on board
> here a few years ago with the sole intent and purpose of offering a
> little friendly insight

Dick, your sense of humor is greatly underestimated.

> on the fact that Morse on ham radio does indeed
> have a velue.

I'm sure it does. I just don't agree on the amount.

> I was immediately set upon by a howling pack of jackels,
> some of whom persist to this day. If you think I intend to just roll
> over and hand the game to them you're dreaming.

Roll over? No Dick, we expect to see you throw yourself down on the
floor and spin in circles all the while kicking and screaming. Every
once in a while, you'll check to see if anyone is still watching.

I've just stopped watching.

See you all tomorrow.

73, Brian

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2205. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-31 00:11:42 UTC
From: Vincent Biancomano <103520.355@CompuServe.COM>
Message-ID: <957l7u$gu2$1@sshuraaa-i-1.production.compuserve.com>
Source record: 2355

>When incentive licensing was based on stepped CW proficiency
>requirements, there were two forms of inspiration for a new 5
>wpm Ham.

Incentive Licensing was never _based_ on stepped CW proficiency requirements. The purpose of Incentive Licensing was raising technical proficiency (see Docket 15928). The stepped CW requirements that were a part of the existing license structure were a byproduct of the Incentive Licensing idea, not the basis for it.

Regards,
Vince, WB2EZG

2206. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-31 00:41:10 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A775F26.7F24DA0D@uci.edu>
Source record: 2356

Jeff Goodspeed wrote:
> What I think Larry may be trying to say is what I call the ï¿½fun ï¿½
> factorï¿½. CW communications can be conducted at any speed, low or high.
> The unfortunate truth is that the amount of fun you have conversing with
> CW is proportional to the speed you can comfortably clip along at. When
> incentive licensing was based on stepped CW proficiency requirements,
> there were two forms of inspiration for a new 5 wpm Ham. There was some
> level of fun (and frustration) obtained by using the code, but also
> there was the carrot hanging in front of him to upgrade to higher class
> of license. Now that the ï¿½upgradeï¿½ carrot is gone, there is less
> incentive for a 5 wpm Ham to stick with using CW long enough to reach a
> speed where the fun ï¿½ factor can really kick in.

A very well reasoned viewpoint, Jeff. For me, I don't think the fun factor was really related to any absolute value of speed. The frustration factor was more related to how many mistakes I made, or how well I could copy the other station. This is true at any speed I think. My change in speed as I learned was almost imperceptable to me. The sense of speed was and is a relative thing. If the other station is sending faster than the speed at which I can copy, it seems fast to me. But as long as he's sending at a speed that I can copy, then I'm comfortable and happy with it. It's fun. If I can't copy it, it's not so much fun. I've never felt that I had to get out so many words per minute or it wasn't worth my time. The fun was just in doing it. For those who feel they have a time constraint on their operating, then one of the other modes would probably be better suited to their needs.

I think your point about the "kiddy pool" (for lack of a better expression) is well taken. I've noticed that QSO's on the FISTS frequencies are generally at a more leisurely pace. I like your idea about perhaps expanding on that.

Nice post, Jeff.

73, Jim AC6XG

2207. Re: Code Quick RULEZ!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-31 00:54:31 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010130195431.02315.00004614@nso-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 2357

In article <20010128145802.21648.00001999@ng-mj1.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>
>To those whose primary reason for learning the code is to get their HF
>priveleges, Code Quick is as good a way as any.
>
>73,
>Ed Hare, W1RFI

Ah HAH!!! The truth comes out! The ARRL (through their Usenet spokesman, W1RFI) supports the concept of using inefficient, speed-limiting methods of learning the Morse Code strictly for the purpose of expiditing the granting of HF (phone) privileges! More "dumbing-down" from Newington! What else did we expect?

73 de Larry, K3LT

2208. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-31 00:54:31 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010130195431.02315.00004613@nso-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 2359

In article <3A761214.CFF65CDA@uci.edu>, Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> writes:

>
>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>> Five WPM isn't fast enough to approach the proficiency
>> which would give a code learner the confidence to try out his skills
>> on-the-air.
>
>This was incorrect when you first wrote it, it was incorrect the next
>time you wrote it, and it was incorrect the time after that. It is now
>still incorrect, and will likely continue to be incorrect in the future,
>as it does not appear to become correct with either repetition or time.

Jim:

Why did people with a 5 WPM Novice/Tech ticket get on-the-air?
Did the fact that they were also staring a 13- and 20-WPM code
tests in the face have anything to do with it? It sure did for me,
and everyone else I know -- except those who find it easy to deny
reality here on Usenet! Keep deluding yourself, OM -- you're
getting good at it, and I'm sure it brings you some comfort!

73 de Larry, K3LT

2209. Re: Morse Code replacement? Bigtime flame war article!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-31 00:54:32 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010130195432.02315.00004615@nso-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 2358

In article <3A744AFB.140BB694@IEEE.org>, Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>W1RFI wrote:
>> If you really are giving up, perhaps you could stand back and let those
>with a
>> more positive outlook take over from here. Your choice of words is really
>> trying to hasten the demise of my favorite mode. I disagree with you that
>Morse
>> code use is unable to stand on its own merits.

My choice of words is telling the truth, as it always has. If you are
so adamantly "Pro-Code," why didn't you support it by insisting on
retaining the status quo in testing requirements?

>Ditto for me. QRP interest is on the rise.

Is that among currently licensed, already CW-using hams, or
among new hams, recently licensed, and who just learned CW
for the sake of accessing the benefits of QRP operation? I'm sure
that if the truth could be known, it would support my arguments,
not yours. Mine are based on reality; yours are based on
dreamy, politically correct wishful thinking!

73 de Larry, K3LT

2210. Re: Code Quick RULEZ!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-31 00:58:32 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <957nvohhn0@208.206.142.67>
Source record: 2360
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

David Snyder Hale wrote:
>
> In rec.radio.amateur.misc Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com> wrote:
>
> > Dog did it. Hmmm, starts with the word dog, and dog starts with the
> > letter "D" so it must be a d. Heck of a look up table you have to carry
> > around in your head.
>
> Yes, *IF* it worked as a lookup table, but I don't think it does.
> I learned Morse with CodeQuick about 14 months ago, and I was explaining it
> to someone, and I found that I can't actually remember all the silly
> phrases and pictures, but I certainly have an association of the sound with
> the letter.

That's promising and encouraging. It indicates that Code Quick isn't
just teaching something that you have to unlearn to progress to higher
speeds.

> I don't mean to sound like a late-nite TV infomercial, ;-) but after about
> 2-3 years of frustration, trying everything, I went from 0-13 wpm with
> codequick. (I don't recall offhand how long it took, but it was pretty
> quick-- whatever about 1/2 the program is. maybe a month.)
>
> Hey, everybody is different. It may not work for everyone, but it seems
> like a really good system to me, (because it worked wonders for me). I
> wouldn't guarantee it for anyone just because of how different folks can
> learn in different ways;

Yes, but it it worked for you in that way it will do so for many others
as well.

Dick

2211. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-31 01:04:23 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <957oan$ii3$0@208.206.142.67>
Source record: 2361

Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> All this simply underscores the lack of any truly universal
> agreement amongst the ham community for specific
> emergency frequencies which, if ever agreed to,
> could be routinely monitored by any/all hams.

Lets see, now, there are hams in the USA numbering near 3/4 million, scatttered from coast to coast, border to border, and that ignores an equal or greater number scattered 'round the world. If you really think it might to be possible to gather them on a single frequency or to even agree on what frequency they might gather on, you're dreaming. I've been active virtually continuously for 44 years and never had to wonder where to go when an emergency struck. Done it a number of times. Have participated in lots of emergency and earthquake simulation drills overthe years on some of those frequencies.
Just what DO you discuss in your RACES planning?

2212. Re: Morse Code replacement? Bigtime flame war article!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-31 01:10:18 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010130201018.18765.00002188@ng-da1.aol.com>
Source record: 2362

>From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

>> If you really are giving up, perhaps you could stand back and let those
>with a
>> more positive outlook take over from here.

> Your positive outlook and a buck will get you a cup of coffee if you
>stay out of the ritzt joints.

Dick, in many areas of my life, a positive outlook has accomplished things I would not have believed possible.

>> I disagree with you that Morse code use is unable to stand on its own merits.

> You lose.

What does this mean? Are you saying that you don't think that I believe that Morse code is able to stand on its own merits, or you affirming that you believe that it is not able to stand in its own merits?

I truly don't understand what you are trying to say with "you lose." Can you explain what it means to you so I will know what it means if you say it again?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

>
>
>
>
>
>

2213. Re: ARRL Life Membership - Don't buy one!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-31 01:14:19 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010130201419.18765.00002189@ng-da1.aol.com>
Source record: 2363

>From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

>To answer a question with a question, why is it that 5wpm code test is
>being fought just as hard by the codebashing lazies just as hard as the
>20wpm was?

I assume that you don't intend that I answer this question because I am neither
code bashing or lazy.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2214. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-31 01:14:53 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A77670D.475F36E6@uci.edu>
Source record: 2366

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> Why did people with a 5 WPM Novice/Tech ticket get on-the-air?

I think probably for the same reason that any other ham radio operator gets on the air.

> Did the fact that they were also staring a 13- and 20-WPM code
> tests in the face have anything to do with it? It sure did for me,
> and everyone else I know -- except those who find it easy to deny
> reality here on Usenet!

That's not the point you made in the previous post, or the one to which I responded, Larry. Here it is again so you can keep your thoughts straight about it:

"Five WPM isn't fast enough to approach the proficiency
which would give a code learner the confidence to try out his skills
on-the-air."

I disagree that a lack of upgrade incentive makes the above a true statement.

> Keep deluding yourself, OM -- you're
> getting good at it, and I'm sure it brings you some comfort!

I was thinking the same thing about you, OM.

73, Jim AC6XG

2215. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-31 01:18:37 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010130201837.18765.00002190@ng-da1.aol.com>
Source record: 2364

>From: Jim Kelley jwkelley@uci.edu

>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

>> Five WPM isn't fast enough to approach the proficiency
>> which would give a code learner the confidence to try out his skills
>> on-the-air.

>This was incorrect when you first wrote it, it was incorrect the next
>time you wrote it, and it was incorrect the time after that. It is now
>still incorrect, and will likely continue to be incorrect in the future,
>as it does not appear to become correct with either repetition or time.

Another example of a pro-code-test advocate feeling a need to tear down the
mode in order to defend it. :-)

I made a world of 5 wpm QSOs when I first started, then 6 wpm QSOs and 10 wpm
QSOs and kept on going.

The QRPers are doing some really cool things with their "fox" hunt events, with
a slow-speed HF foxhunt once a week.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

>
>73, Jim AC6XG
>
>
>
>
>
>

2216. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-31 01:20:40 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010130202040.18765.00002191@ng-da1.aol.com>
Source record: 2365

I think Cecil was telling us that he believes that some of the 5 wpm Generals will advance their code speed past the speed at which they were tested, like Cecil did with his 5 wpm Novice, or like I did with my 13 wpm General.

Some people don't think Morse code is good enough to attract users.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

>From: JR jr@some.net

>And that means?

>Cecil wrote:

>> The only difference now is that we have
>> 5wpm Generals instead of 5wpm Novices.
>> --
>> http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca
>
>
>
>
>
>
>

2217. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-31 01:25:13 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010130202513.18765.00002192@ng-da1.aol.com>
Source record: 2367

>From: Jeff Goodspeed cmsx42@email.mot.com

>I look to specialty clubs to step up and save the day for CW.

Some of the specialty clubs, like the QRPers, are doing just that. The ARRL Board has just issued a mandate to HQ staff to identify ways to promote Morse code use on the air.

>It is clear that the code haters have won the day and regulated CW mandates >are soon to be history.

Some who believe that Morse code testing need not be a part of amateur testing are far from code haters.

>They should slow down and help the new CW Hams along.

This will be the number 1 way to encourage those who are being licensed today to try out those Morse code skills.

>If it were generally known that the new CW operator could find personal >support on the bands, then CW would have a brighter future.

Some here who may believe that they are "helping" the mode survive ad not making newcomers feel like they will find personal support on the bands. Unfortunately, there is not enough on the bands to really make that happen, either.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2218. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-31 01:27:40 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010130202740.18765.00002193@ng-da1.aol.com>
Source record: 2368

>From: Vincent Biancomano 103520.355@CompuServe.COM

>>When incentive licensing was based on stepped CW proficiency
>>requirements, there were two forms of inspiration for a new 5
>>wpm Ham.

>Incentive Licensing was never _based_ on stepped CW proficiency
>requirements. The purpose of Incentive Licensing was raising
>technical proficiency (see Docket 15928). The stepped CW
>requirements that were a part of the existing license structure
>were a byproduct of the Incentive Licensing idea, not the basis
>for it.

The step from Novice to General contained a code-speed incentive from Day 1.

In the days when a General had all amateur priveleges, the technical step you mention was just as much a part of the structure of the licensing of the day as was the code-speed step. Both were made part of the incentive.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2219. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-31 01:28:14 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010130202814.18765.00002194@ng-da1.aol.com>
Source record: 2369

>From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

>It means we also have 5wpm pseudoExtras.

Are you trying to make sure none of the new hams feel welcome enough to stay?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2220. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-31 01:33:58 UTC
From: Vincent Biancomano <103520.355@CompuServe.COM>
Message-ID: <957q26$4uf$1@sshuraab-i-1.production.compuserve.com>
Source record: 2371

>The step from Novice to General contained a code-speed incentive
>from Day 1.

>In the days when a General had all amateur priveleges, the
>technical step you mention was just as much a part of the
>structure of the licensing of the day as
>was the code-speed step. Both were made part of the incentive.

>73,
>Ed Hare, W1RFI

I don't see that you've disagreed with Docket 15928, Ed, which plainly indicates that Incentive Licensing had to do with addressing technical proficiency. Further, the reason IL failed is because hams weren't grandfathered to Extra from General. That was the complaint; not the difficulty of Morse.

Regards,
Vince, WB2EZG

2221. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-31 01:39:13 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A776CC1.DCD02D18@uci.edu>
Source record: 2372

W1RFI wrote:

> I made a world of 5 wpm QSOs when I first started, then 6 wpm QSOs and 10 wpm
> QSOs and kept on going.

So did I, and according to Larry, so did he. How he figures nobody would operate at that speed I'll never understand. Selective memory perhaps. My first CW QSOs were on my old 2 meter IC 211 - at sub-5WPM speed - when I was a Tech.

73, Jim AC6XG

2222. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-31 01:50:31 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A776F67.BEE29DA6@uci.edu>
Source record: 2373

W1RFI wrote:
> >They should slow down and help the new CW Hams along.

> This will be the number 1 way to encourage those who are being licensed today
> to try out those Morse code skills.

Having knowlege of the Morse letters and numbers when they are being
licensed is probably helpful in that way also. Am I wrong?

73, Jim AC6XG

2223. Re: Code Quick RULEZ!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-31 02:06:58 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <957rvt$94n$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2374
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

In article <957nvohhn0@208.206.142.67>,
Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

> Yes, but it it worked for you in that way it will do so for many
others
> as well.
>
> Dick

Sounds useful and has come up here before. I should try it. Does it
cost more than a pizza? More than a lobster dinner?

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2224. Re: Morse Code replacement? Bigtime flame war article!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-31 02:24:07 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <957t00$a3d$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2376

In article <20010130195432.02315.00004615@nso-fi.aol.com>,
yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote:
> In article <3A744AFB.140BB694@IEEE.org>, Cecil
<Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>
> >
> >W1RFI wrote:
> >> If you really are giving up, perhaps you could stand back and let
those
> >with a
> >> more positive outlook take over from here. Your choice of words is
really
> >> trying to hasten the demise of my favorite mode. I disagree with
you that
> >Morse
> >> code use is unable to stand on its own merits.
>
> My choice of words is telling the truth, as it always has. If you are
> so adamantly "Pro-Code," why didn't you support it by insisting on
> retaining the status quo in testing requirements?

I'm pro-national defense, pro-military, but I don't advocate
conscription at this time. Does that now make me anti-military?

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2225. Re: Top 10 Problems facing Amteur Radio? (was Re: ARRL code test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-31 02:27:27 UTC
From: Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com>
Message-ID: <3A77780F.67E8316B@dvol.com>
Source record: 2375

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

> Philly is close enough to me...let me know when it is, and if it's
> on a Saturday, I'll try to join you!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

>
Absolutely will do that Larry. 'Bout time us 3-land RRAPer denizens got together.
>
Brian

2226. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-31 04:28:21 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A779465.382E4EF7@IEEE.org>
Source record: 2377

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> Why did people with a 5 WPM Novice/Tech ticket get on-the-air?
> Did the fact that they were also staring a 13- and 20-WPM code
> tests in the face have anything to do with it?

I was very happy just being a Novice in 1951. I was having so much
fun as a Novice, I completely forgot about the expiration date.
The only reason I got a Conditional was to be able to continue to
use CW on the Novice bands. The increase in my CW speed happened
automatically without me really trying or thinking about it.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2227. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-31 04:30:16 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A7794D8.2F2C180D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 2378

Jim Kelley wrote:
> So did I, and according to Larry, so did he. How he figures nobody
> would operate at that speed I'll never understand. Selective memory
> perhaps.

Sour Grapes, perhaps.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2228. Re: Morse Code replacement? Bigtime flame war article!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-31 04:40:05 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A779725.45CF79F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 2379

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

> Cecil wrote:
> > QRP interest is on the rise.
>
> Is that among currently licensed, already CW-using hams, or
> among new hams, recently licensed, and who just learned CW
> for the sake of accessing the benefits of QRP operation? I'm sure
> that if the truth could be known, it would support my arguments,
> not yours. Mine are based on reality; yours are based on
> dreamy, politically correct wishful thinking!

How you can say yours are based on reality is beyond belief, Larry.
Hams are still learning the code. Probably a third or fourth of them
will use it a lot, including QRP, and develop proficiency. Human nature
has not changed in the last 50 years. I know you are hoping that CW
will cease to exist so you will be proven right but you are absolutely
wrong. CW has enough merits to survive your doomsday wishes for it.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2229. Re: Troll?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-31 04:47:02 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A7798C6.9C1D9563@IEEE.org>
Source record: 2380

Drink wrote:
> Help me here folks. What's a troll? It sounds profane and derogatory
> (which in & of itself makes it a pretty useful term when the time's
> right)...

Ever hear of trolling for fish? Well, some posters here on netnews
troll for suckers. "No Code = No Ham" is a troll designed to upset
all the nocode tech hams.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2230. Troll?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-31 05:31:40 UTC
From: Drink <NOSPAMdrink@coqui.net>
Message-ID: <OVJd6.331$j4.33074@e420r-atl2.usenetserver.com>
Source record: 2370

Help me here folks. What's a troll? It sounds profane and derogatory (which in & of itself makes it a pretty useful term when the time's right)...

Drink

2231. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-31 05:38:09 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9588c1$4l6$0@208.206.142.67>
Source record: 2381

W1RFI wrote:
>
> Some here who may believe that they are "helping" the mode survive ad not
> making newcomers feel like they will find personal support on the bands.
> Unfortunately, there is not enough on the bands to really make that happen,
> either.
>

Ed when you gonna get real? No one here is witholding any sort of
helping hand from anyone. The last thing the code bashers want is a
helping hand with it. You think Baby Brian Burke sat on his ass for 13
years in whining protest about the test because he wanted a helping hand
to learn code???
Yeah, I know...he claims to be "coded". Didn't say what "code". I think
I know. And it ain't Morse.

2232. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-31 05:45:09 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9588p5$619$0@208.206.142.67>
Source record: 2382

W1RFI wrote:
>
> >From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
>
> >It means we also have 5wpm pseudoExtras.
>
> Are you trying to make sure none of the new hams feel welcome enough to stay?

Oh, we have New Hams who are 5wpm Extras??? That may come as a
surprise to
the FCC database which shows virtually all new extras since April 15 to
be Extra Lites. Those very few who are that new to the hobby and also
grabbed off a 5wpm Extra at the same time probably won't stay anyway.
This can get to be a very boring hobby for the mildly interested and the
trivially involved. There's always the Internet with its instant
gratification.

2233. Re: Troll?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-31 05:45:45 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9588q9$619$1@208.206.142.67>
Source record: 2383

Drink wrote:
>
> Help me here folks. What's a troll? It sounds profane and derogatory
> (which in & of itself makes it a pretty useful term when the time's
> right)...
>
> Drink

I think you just did one.

2234. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-31 05:49:50 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <95891u$619$2@208.206.142.67>
Source record: 2384

Cecil wrote:
>
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > Why did people with a 5 WPM Novice/Tech ticket get on-the-air?
> > Did the fact that they were also staring a 13- and 20-WPM code
> > tests in the face have anything to do with it?
>
> I was very happy just being a Novice in 1951. I was having so much
> fun as a Novice, I completely forgot about the expiration date.
> The only reason I got a Conditional was to be able to continue to
> use CW on the Novice bands. The increase in my CW speed happened
> automatically without me really trying or thinking about it.

It is very easy to forget that Cecil is perfect, at least for the
story du moment.

2235. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-31 05:51:42 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A77A7EE.E0C859D7@IEEE.org>
Source record: 2386

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Those very few who are that new to the hobby and also
> grabbed off a 5wpm Extra at the same time probably won't stay anyway.

The sky is falling, the sky is falling. Dick, with your optimistic
attitude, you must be a dream to live with (a nightmare).
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2236. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-31 05:56:10 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A77A8FA.34884BA5@IEEE.org>
Source record: 2387

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> Cecil wrote:
> > I was very happy just being a Novice in 1951. I was having so much
> > fun as a Novice, I completely forgot about the expiration date.
> > The only reason I got a Conditional was to be able to continue to
> > use CW on the Novice bands. The increase in my CW speed happened
> > automatically without me really trying or thinking about it.
>
> It is very easy to forget that Cecil is perfect, at least for the
> story du moment.

That was a very common story in the early 50s. CW was king and 40w
AM sucked. If my Novice license had not expired, I doubt that I would
have upgraded for years. I was deliriously happy with my two 40m
CW Xtals for my Globe Scout.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2237. Re: Morse Code replacement? Bigtime flame war article!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-31 05:58:05 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9589hd$88c$0@208.206.142.67>
Source record: 2385

Cecil wrote:
>
> Hams are still learning the code.

Yep, it's still a qualification under the treaty.

Probably a third or fourth of them
> will use it a lot, including QRP, and develop proficiency.

Based on what statistical data?

Human nature
> has not changed in the last 50 years.

Yeah,we know....that's the very reason why darn few will ever bother to learn it at all when the code test requirement evaporates, and all the more reason why even fewer 5wpm types will even be interested in using it enough to develop faster skills. Sure, a few will be intrigued and spend a little time at it, at least until the new wears off and well before most ever gain sufficient skill to feel comfortable working higher speeds. THAT is human nature. And we already know your story line, you learned it in Cub Scouts well before you ever heard of ham radio. Or the Internet or any othe computer or radio or TV or or or or or.....Sorry those days are all gone.

2238. Re: Morse Code replacement? Bigtime flame war article!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-31 06:03:47 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A77AAC3.FD7763C3@IEEE.org>
Source record: 2388

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> Cecil wrote:
> > Probably a third or fourth of them
> > will use it a lot, including QRP, and develop proficiency.
>
> Based on what statistical data?

Based on historical data, Dick. About 1/3 of HF hams use CW.

> > Human nature
> > has not changed in the last 50 years.
>
> Yeah,we know....that's the very reason why darn few will ever bother to
> learn it at all when the code test requirement evaporates, and all the
> more reason why even fewer 5wpm types will even be interested in using
> it enough to develop faster skills.

If hams chose to improve their CW skills in the past, why won't they continue to improve their CW skills in the future? You have such a negative outlook, I don't see how you force yourself out of bed every morning. Instead of telling us how lazy hams are and that CW is going to disappear, how about promoting the CW mode for a change? CW is fun for a heck of a lot of hams but it sounds like it is a chore for you, something you wouldn't have done without being forced.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2239. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-31 06:38:00 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <958bs8epv0@208.206.142.67>
Source record: 2389

Cecil wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > Cecil wrote:
> > > I was very happy just being a Novice in 1951. I was having so much
> > > fun as a Novice, I completely forgot about the expiration date.
> > > The only reason I got a Conditional was to be able to continue to
> > > use CW on the Novice bands. The increase in my CW speed happened
> > > automatically without me really trying or thinking about it.
> >
> > It is very easy to forget that Cecil is perfect, at least for the
> > story du moment.
>
> That was a very common story in the early 50s. CW was king and 40w
> AM sucked. If my Novice license had not expired, I doubt that I would
> have upgraded for years. I was deliriously happy with my two 40m
> CW Xtals for my Globe Scout.

See what I mean???

2240. Re: Troll?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-31 11:54:51 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <958ue9$41r$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2390

In article <OVJd6.331$j4.33074@e420r-atl2.usenetserver.com>,
"Drink" <NOSPAMdrink@coqui.net> wrote:
> Help me here folks. What's a troll? It sounds profane and
derogatory
> (which in & of itself makes it a pretty useful term when the time's
> right)...
>
> Drink

Someone with NOSPAM in their address is probably well versed in trollism, but just in case I'm wrong: Its a mythical creature that lives beneath bridges in English fairy tales.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2241. Re: VHF history (long) (was: any ideas on HOw to learn Morse

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-31 12:51:45 UTC
From: "Steven J Robeson", K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <9591ov$6cv$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2391

In article <3A76CA99.5BF7B206@IEEE.org>,
Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:

> Point is, Steve, that you don't tell the truth about your latest BM.
> Being silent on a subject does NOT mean that one is lying.

No one said anything about "being silent" as "lying", Cecil.

At best, "being silent" is prudent, especially when one does not
have all the facts or can make an informed opinion. Or in the case of
your "example" above, it is in good taste since it's hardly a topic of
civil conversation.

At worst, it's evasive, however, as the saying goes, "Better to be
silent and thought a fool than to open your mouth and be proven one"

73
de K4YZ

"The Measure Of A Man Is Not In How He Touches A Woman, But In How He
Touches A Woman's Heart"

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2242. Re: CA power crisis caused by internet

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-31 13:39:02 UTC
From: Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com>
Message-ID: <3A781576.694B98F7@dvol.com>
Source record: 2392

Phil Kane wrote:

> >. . .
> >recollection is that the tab for the engineering of the Limerick
> >plant was one BILLION dollars.
>
> But explain why Three Mile Island and Rancho Seco (Sacramento
> M.U.D., CA) were identical and they looked awfully much like
> Limerick.

>
They made one set of drawings and two sets of sepias, retiltled the
sepias and charged two more billion?
>

> Hey, remember that my now-wife and her then-husband (and the
> 4 kids and two ex-spouses they had between them) ate from that
> project as she and he were employees of Bechtel on that famous
> cost-plus contract.

>
Good for them. If it's out there ya hafta be a complete idiot if you
don't jump on a gravy train if it's out there. Nobody cares if you shoot
yerself in the foot.
>

> Ah, the magic name. That was just after Bechtel made a
> super-bundle misdesigning and misconstructing San Francisco's
> BART subway system.

>
?? I missed that one, I tought BART was pretty decent.
>
A classmate of mine spent years working for Bechtel in the Near East
building refineries and petro-chem plants, has Bechtel stories which
would curl your toes.
>

> One could do that in those days . Cost-Plus now exists only as
> the name of a chain store selling overpriced junk.
>
> They really killed the goose that laid the golden egg.

>
Ayup. Problem is that the next nuke will be put together by the low
bidder as determined by a committee of MBAs.
>

> --
> 73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

>
w3rv

2243. Re: I will no longer tolerate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-31 14:33:05 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nospam.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.g80yof0.pminews@ca.news.verio.net>
Source record: 2393
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On Tue, 30 Jan 2001 22:54:27 GMT, Brian wrote:

>Sounds like the antiques in the old 20th Air Division, Air Defense
>Command, SAGE Blockhouse at Ft Lee AFS, VA.

SAGE used the FSQ-7, a forerunner of the FSQ-31.

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

2244. Re: VHF history (long) (was: any ideas on HOw to learn Morse

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-31 15:44:18 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A7832D2.B6170774@IEEE.org>
Source record: 2394

Steven, J, Robeson, K4YZ wrote:
> No one said anything about "being silent" as "lying", Cecil.

You said if one doesn't tell the truth, one is lying. Being silent
is not telling the truth.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2245. Re: VHF history (long) (was: any ideas on HOw to learn Morse

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-31 17:53:00 UTC
From: "Steven J Robeson", K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <959jdn$n2p$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2396

In article <3A7832D2.B6170774@IEEE.org>,
Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:

> You said if one doesn't tell the truth, one is lying. Being silent
> is not telling the truth.

By anyone's definition, THAT was a stretch.

--
http://hometown.aol.com/k4yz/myhomepage/index.html

"The Measure Of A Man Is Not In How He Touches A Woman, But In How He
Touches A Woman's Heart"

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2246. Re: CA power crisis caused by internet

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-31 18:03:27 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nospam.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.g818e21.pminews@ca.news.verio.net>
Source record: 2397

On Wed, 31 Jan 2001 08:39:02 -0500, Brian Kelly wrote:

>Phil Kane wrote:
>
>> >. . .
>> >recollection is that the tab for the engineering of the Limerick
>> >plant was one BILLION dollars.
>>
>> But explain why Three Mile Island and Rancho Seco (Sacramento
>> M.U.D., CA) were identical and they looked awfully much like
>> Limerick.
>
>>
>They made one set of drawings and two sets of sepias, retiltled the
>sepias and charged two more billion?

Yup...that's about what my wife's department did...(she was a
drafter in those days). <ggg>

>> Ah, the magic name. That was just after Bechtel made a
>> super-bundle misdesigning and misconstructing San Francisco's
>> BART subway system.

>?? I missed that one, I tought BART was pretty decent.

You've gotto be kidding. Engineering screw-ups all the way
down the line. The propulsion system, signalling system, and
communication system had to be completely redone, and they made
design decisions that locked them into very expensive non-standard
specifications and technology. The management team was almost
exclusively recent Pakistani immigrants who had a blank checkbook
to work with.

>A classmate of mine spent years working for Bechtel in the Near East
>building refineries and petro-chem plants, has Bechtel stories which
>would curl your toes.

Probably similar to the ones that my wife has. That's one
company that she would never work for again.

>Problem is that the next nuke will be put together by the low
>bidder as determined by a committee of MBAs.

<Shudder>

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

2247. The FCC's WARC 2003 Web site

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-31 18:03:41 UTC
From: "Leland C. Scott" <no-spam@junk-mail.net>
Message-ID: <t7gkrti3qpu401@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 2398
Cross-posted to:
alt.ham-radio.packet,alt.ham-radio.vhf-uhf,alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.space,rec.radio.cb

http://www.fcc.gov/wrc-03/

--
Leland C. Scott
KC8LDO

2248. Re: CA power crisis caused by internet

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-31 18:30:33 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010131133033.22779.00001256@nso-fa.aol.com>
Source record: 2399

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.g7zee33.pminews@ca.news.verio.net>, "Phil Kane"
<Phil.Kane@nospam.spam> writes:

>>More like 75 percent. [Source: World Almanac 2001, 59 reactors
>>producing 63,105 MWe, 1999] France is also the center for Europe's
>>nuclear fuel reprocessing.
>>
>>Paris is often spoken of as "the city of lights." Maybe nowadays
>>it glows in the dark from another cause? :-)
>>
>>Interesting part is that the USA has 104 reactors producing 97,145
>>MWe which is only 19.54% of total USA electric power in 1999.
>
> Crunch your numbers again and tell us the comparison in terms
> of population, land mass, and GNP.

Why? :-)

Brian Kelly remarked that France had a single reactor electric
power plant design. I'm only pointing out that the USA has
45 more nuclear plants than France.

I'm wondering what the nucleus of this whole thread is...back
in 17 January 1994 a third of California was suddenly without
any electric power. [Northridge earthquake toppled one of the
intertie towers] Were any of the Southern California amateur
disaster nets activated then? Were amateurs prepared for
this? The professionals were prepared.

Just wondering... :-)

didit

2249. Re: The FCC's WARC 2003 Web site

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-31 18:40:21 UTC
From: "Mr. Aaron H. Voobner" <aaronvoobner@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <959m6jpvd1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2400
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.packet,alt.ham-radio.vhf-uhf,alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <t7gkrti3qpu401@corp.supernews.com>,
"Leland C. Scott" <no-spam@junk-mail.net> wrote:
> http://www.fcc.gov/wrc-03/
>
> --
> Leland C. Scott
> KC8LDO
>
>

Leland,

My apologies in advance. Permit me a moment of poignant satire here.

I don't think you'll find ANY interest in WARC 2003 here in
rec.radio.cb. The ONLY thing of interest to this NG is:

1. Amps
2. Bigger Amps
3. Loud Radios
4. Big Radios
5. Lotsa "channels"
6. Coax Length

-Aaron-

--
.
.
.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2250. Re: Troll?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-31 19:21:17 UTC
From: K0HB@USWEST.NET
Message-ID: <959ojd$dd6$1@news.netmar.com>
Source record: 2395

In article <958ue9$41r$1@nnrp1.deja.com>, Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
writes:
>In article <OVJd6.331$j4.33074@e420r-atl2.usenetserver.com>,
> "Drink" <NOSPAMdrink@coqui.net> wrote:
>> Help me here folks. What's a troll?

In my Funk and Wagnalls it says "see N0IMD".

----- Posted via NewsOne.Net: Free (anonymous) Usenet News via the Web -----
http://newsone.net/ -- Free reading and anonymous posting to 60,000+ groups
NewsOne.Net prohibits users from posting spam. If this or other posts
made through NewsOne.Net violate posting guidelines, email abuse@newsone.net

2251. Re: The FCC's WARC 2003 Web site

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-31 22:02:30 UTC
From: "Leland C. Scott" <no-spam@junk-mail.net>
Message-ID: <t7h2rq8k1gsqff@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 2452
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.packet,alt.ham-radio.vhf-uhf,alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Mr. Aaron H. Voobner" <aaronvoobner@my-deja.com> wrote in message
news:959m6jpvd1@nnrp1.deja.com...
> In article <t7gkrti3qpu401@corp.supernews.com>,
> "Leland C. Scott" <no-spam@junk-mail.net> wrote:
> > http://www.fcc.gov/wrc-03/
> >
> > --
> > Leland C. Scott
> > KC8LDO
> >
> >
>
> Leland,
>
> My apologies in advance. Permit me a moment of poignant satire here.
>
> I don't think you'll find ANY interest in WARC 2003 here in
> rec.radio.cb. The ONLY thing of interest to this NG is:

But then again you don't know. I would think anyone interested in radio as a
hobby would want to stay informed, even if it is just "educational". Of
course the conference is at least two years off, so the agenda could change
between now and then, and something of interest could appear on the radar
scope for somebody.

--
Leland C. Scott
KC8LDO

2252. Re: ARRL Life Membership - Don't buy one!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-31 22:41:15 UTC
From: K0HB@USWEST.NET
Message-ID: <95a4ab$n08$1@news.netmar.com>
Source record: 2451

In article <95735opth0@208.206.142.82>, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
writes:

>
> Could we then consider this an example of the Hans Definition?
>

Cosider away, my dear friend. It's a free country. All reality is aspect
dependent.

73, de Hans, K0HB

--
"As far as the laws of mathematics refer to reality, they are not
certain, as far as they are certain, they do not refer to reality."
- Albert Einstein

----- Posted via NewsOne.Net: Free (anonymous) Usenet News via the Web -----
http://newsone.net/ -- Free reading and anonymous posting to 60,000+ groups
NewsOne.Net prohibits users from posting spam. If this or other posts
made through NewsOne.Net violate posting guidelines, email abuse@newsone.net

2253. Re: Troll?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-31 23:07:12 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <95a5qq$9ae$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2454

In article <959ojd$dd6$1@news.netmar.com>,
K0HB@USWEST.NET wrote:
> In article <958ue9$41r$1@nnrp1.deja.com>, Brian
<brianburke@my-deja.com>
> writes:
> >In article <OVJd6.331$j4.33074@e420r-atl2.usenetserver.com>,
> > "Drink" <NOSPAMdrink@coqui.net> wrote:
> >> Help me here folks. What's a troll?
>
> In my Funk and Wagnalls it says "see N0IMD".

Who does it say under "Guisippee?"

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2254. Re: I will no longer tolerate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-01-31 23:09:44 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <95a5vh$9bu$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2453
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.g80yof0.pminews@ca.news.verio.net>,
"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nospam.spam> wrote:
> On Tue, 30 Jan 2001 22:54:27 GMT, Brian wrote:
>
> >Sounds like the antiques in the old 20th Air Division, Air Defense
> >Command, SAGE Blockhouse at Ft Lee AFS, VA.
>
> SAGE used the FSQ-7, a forerunner of the FSQ-31.
>
> --
> 73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

Can you tell me what SAGE meant?

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2255. Re: The FCC's WARC 2003 Web site

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-01 00:00:30 UTC
From: "Mr. Aaron H. Voobner" <aaronvoobner@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <95a8up$c2d$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2458
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.packet,alt.ham-radio.vhf-uhf,alt.radio.family,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <t7h2rq8k1gsqff@corp.supernews.com>,
"Leland C. Scott" <no-spam@junk-mail.net> wrote:
>
> "Mr. Aaron H. Voobner" <aaronvoobner@my-deja.com> wrote in message
> news:959m6jpvd1@nnrp1.deja.com...
> > In article <t7gkrti3qpu401@corp.supernews.com>,
> > "Leland C. Scott" <no-spam@junk-mail.net> wrote:
> > > http://www.fcc.gov/wrc-03/
> > >
> > > --
> > > Leland C. Scott
> > > KC8LDO
> > >
> > >
> >
> > Leland,
> >
> > My apologies in advance. Permit me a moment of poignant satire here.
> >
> > I don't think you'll find ANY interest in WARC 2003 here in
> > rec.radio.cb. The ONLY thing of interest to this NG is:
>
> But then again you don't know. I would think anyone interested in
radio as a
> hobby would want to stay informed, even if it is just "educational".
Of
> course the conference is at least two years off, so the agenda could
change
> between now and then, and something of interest could appear on the
radar
> scope for somebody.
>
> --
> Leland C. Scott
> KC8LDO
>
>

Sorry, I didn't see the cross-post headers to the other newsgroups, I
thought you were posting ONLY to rec.radio.cb.

-Aaron-

--
.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2256. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-01 00:02:21 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010131190221.15160.00000152@ng-fc1.aol.com>
Source record: 2455

>From: Jim Kelley jwkelley@uci.edu

>> This will be the number 1 way to encourage those who are being licensed
>> today to try out those Morse code skills.

>Having knowlege of the Morse letters and numbers when they are being
>licensed is probably helpful in that way also. Am I wrong?

Many of those being licensed today do indeed demostrate knowledge of Morse letters and numbers.

But without our being willing to slow down a bit for the newcomers, we cannot expect that many will want to use the mode.

73,
Ed

2257. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-01 00:04:04 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010131190404.15160.00000155@ng-fc1.aol.com>
Source record: 2456

>From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

>> Some here who may believe that they are "helping" the mode survive ad not
>> making newcomers feel like they will find personal support on the bands.
>> Unfortunately, there is not enough on the bands to really make that happen,
>> either.

> Ed when you gonna get real? No one here is witholding any sort of
>helping hand from anyone. The last thing the code bashers want is a
>helping hand with it. You think Baby Brian Burke sat on his ass for 13
>years in whining protest about the test because he wanted a helping hand
>to learn code???

Your idea of the helping hand? Sounds more like that helping hand just slapped
Brian in the face.

Are you trying to make your prediction that the use of Morse code is doomed
come true?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2258. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-01 00:07:32 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010131190732.15160.00000157@ng-fc1.aol.com>
Source record: 2457

>From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

>Cecil wrote:

>> I was very happy just being a Novice in 1951. I was having so much
>> fun as a Novice, I completely forgot about the expiration date.

> It is very easy to forget that Cecil is perfect, at least for the
>story du moment.

And Cecil proved he thinks he is perfect by telling us that he forgot his
Novice was going to expire?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2259. Re: Morse Code replacement? Bigtime flame war article!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-01 00:09:37 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010131190937.15160.00000159@ng-fc1.aol.com>
Source record: 2459

>From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

>>Ditto for me. QRP interest is on the rise.

>Mine are based on reality; yours are based on
>dreamy, politically correct wishful thinking!

Oh, is QRP now "politically correct?" You sure are getting a lot of mileage out
of your various interpretations of that term.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2260. Re: Code Quick RULEZ!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-01 00:11:27 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010131191127.15160.00000161@ng-fc1.aol.com>
Source record: 2460

>From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

>The ARRL (through their Usenet spokesman, W1RFI)

The sad part, Larry, is that you really do know better. All the pity; I thought you had integrity...

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2261. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-01 00:19:51 UTC
From: Bob Wex w2ilp <w2ilp@juno.com>
Message-ID: <95aa2v$d1e$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2461

In article <957l7u$gu2$1@sshuraaa-i-1.production.compuserve.com>,
Vincent Biancomano <103520.355@CompuServe.COM> wrote:
> >When incentive licensing was based on stepped CW proficiency
> >requirements, there were two forms of inspiration for a new 5
> >wpm Ham.
>
> Incentive Licensing was never _based_ on stepped CW proficiency
> requirements. The purpose of Incentive Licensing was raising
> technical proficiency (see Docket 15928). The stepped CW
> requirements that were a part of the existing license structure
> were a byproduct of the Incentive Licensing idea, not the basis
> for it.
>
> Regards,
> Vince, WB2EZG

ATTA BOY VINCE!!!

You tell it like it was, is, and should be. Any license exams are
given with the INCENTIVE to study something...Even if it is dummed down
fixed Q &As, BUT for Ham Radio to have any real basis and purpose it
must act as an incentive to motivate more people to advance the state
of the art by advancing their own technical knowledge as HAMS.. If
people just want to communicate internationally they can use the
Internet or e-mail. If people want mobile communication they can buy
cellular telephones....
BUT
If people want to socialize with others who have technical and
scientific knowledge and learn more about what is in their equipment
then they just might want to be HAMS. If there are to be no such
people...then there can be no Ham Radio!....only Citizen's Multi-Band
(CMB).

Hams need more license classes and/or official FCC technical
endorsements.

73,
Bob Wex w2ilp (Incentive Licensing Proponent)

I don't want to belong to any club that would
want to accept me as a member.
--Groucho Marx--

The Quarter Century Wireless Association is
thinking about increasing their membership by
accepting as members Hams who have been licensed

less than twenty five years. I guess they
might want to change their name to the
Micro-Century Wireless Association or maybe
the Less than Two-Bit Interconnected Modem
Association.
As of July 2001, I'll be a Ham
for Half a Century. OH Well...$49.99 always
sold better than 50 bucks....but I don't think
you can sell more Ham Licenses For $9.99 than
you can for ten bucks....I could be wrong
because the kind of Hams they are now loooking
for are not supposed to be wise to any penny antics.
--w2ilp--

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2262. Re: Morse Code replacement? Bigtime flame war article!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-01 00:23:35 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A78AC87.5C551855@IEEE.org>
Source record: 2462

W1RFI wrote:
>
> >Mine are based on reality; yours are based on
> >dreamy, politically correct wishful thinking!
>
> Oh, is QRP now "politically correct?" You sure are getting a lot of mileage out
> of your various interpretations of that term.

Well, wouldn't QRP be politically correct? It doesn't pull much power
off the grid so it cuts down on pollution and can easily be run off the
grid from solar power. Not much TVI/RFI either.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2263. Re: QCWA TELLS FCC TO END INCENTIVE LICENSING

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-01 01:18:29 UTC
From: Bob Wex w2ilp <w2ilp@juno.com>
Message-ID: <95adgt$g4a$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2463

In article <3A7704BE.E71F049F@arrl.org>,
Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote:
> Bob Wex w2ilp wrote:
> >
> > The resonance effect of the entire human body and the penetration
into
> > the human skull were the main things being considered when the
> > ANSI/IEEE safety levels were established.
>
> You might want to read N9GL's latest article at:
> http://www.arrl.org/rfsafety/lapin/2001/01/30/1/
> in which he points out that the exposure standards were established on
> the basis of observed effects of RF, without regard to the mechanisms
> that may cause those effects. That doesn't preclude those working in
the
> field from trying to determine the mechanisms and to understand why
the
> observed effects exist.
>
> Jon

Yes and this is one time I won't say "Speak for yourself Jon". You and
N9GL had better read the very latest research on the cancerous eye
damage attributed to cellular telephone RF. I should have saved the
references that I had read. The research was done in UK.
The mechanism and the effects are known and established.

Anyone who professes to be an RF hazard expert had better keep up with
the latest research. I'm just a ham. The education and the ham exam
knowledge that I have attained have not qualified me to call myself an
RF Safety expert....
BUT
I read a lot of medical newsletters because I am interested in a lot of
medical problems that I have...and I saw this very recent research,
which reinforces my opinion that cell phones use can be dangerous to
our health...or at least our eyes' inate ability to inhibit cancer.
The IEEE/ANSI specs, I am convinced, were made to give a clean bill of
health to cell-phones...but not Ham Radio VHF gear. Unfortunately it
might take time, more research, and sadly some blind cancer victims
(and their lawyers) for me to be able to say "I told you so".

When the sun is too bright...BLINK!
When you want to use a cell-phone, that won't make you blink
automatically...THINK!
Maybe cell-phone users need RF filtering sun glasses. I dunno. I

don't generally start by seeing the world with rose colored glasses myself...but odds are I'm not wrong.

Other recent researchers say that they have been able to increase or decrease the speed of light. I say that they are not talking properly about group photon velocity. They have not changed the speed of any light. They have just been able to demonstrate the control of its group velocity in such a way that they appear to have changed its speed but the speed of light, in media of constant density, is a constant of physics that can not be changed, in spite of the fact that light energy can be controlled in a manner that apears to accelerate or delay it. Einsteins special theory of relativity would not be necessary if we could believe that the speed of livght is not a constant.
Now, as a student of physics I understand this, as well as I understand some of the ignorant press releases that attempt to describe superconductivity (which are misunderstoood even by many engineers). I could be wrong because I myself am not a researcher or a medical eye specialist... but from what I understand the MECHANISM is certainly there to cause eye damage at 900 MHz RF... but not a 144 MHz RF.

Hams need more license classes. Maybe even an RF hazard specialist class.

73,
Bob Wex w2ilp (Inhibit Leaking Photons?)

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2264. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-01 02:10:09 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <95agi1$1a2$2@208.207.71.139>
Source record: 2464

W1RFI wrote:
>
> >From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
>
> >Cecil wrote:
>
> >> I was very happy just being a Novice in 1951. I was having so much
> >> fun as a Novice, I completely forgot about the expiration date.
>
> > It is very easy to forget that Cecil is perfect, at least for the
> >story du moment.
>
> And Cecil proved he thinks he is perfect by telling us that he forgot his
> Novice was going to expire?

No, Ed, it's Cecil's *story* that is always perfect.(ly formulated for
the situation)

2265. Re: FCC Proposal for New Novice Class License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-01 03:58:09 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net>
Message-ID: <3A78DED1.54329F@ovis.net>
Source record: 2466

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3A6FD87E.404055D1@ovis.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net> writes:
>
> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >>
> >> In article <3A6E560F.6F7E7E4A@ovis.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net> writes:
> >>
> >> >> You have done more than that, especially when not receiving
> >> >> any praise over the "clever" use of CW as an order-wire for
> >> >> a State Department FSK TTY circuit. :-)
> >> >
> >> >I don't know whether you are not being forthright or are just forgetful
> >> >in your old age. I did not seek any praise.
> >>
> >> Sure you sought praise. You thought it was a clever idea...of yours.
> >
> >Now you may be providing some ammunition for Steve's claims regarding
> >truthfulness. I never made the claim that it was my idea nor did I seek
> >praise. I pointed to it to U.S. Government use of morse. You as much
> >as called me a liar over the issue.
>
> Ahem...you pointed a finger back at yourself and then at the
> State Department for "cleverness."

I "pointed a finger back at myself"? Prove it. While you're at it,
come up with proof that I sought praise over the issue.

> To switch over to CW for an order-wire or command context
> from FSK is a *dumb* idea. Dumb technically, dumb
> operationally.

No "switching over" was done. Two circuits were maintained--all of the
time.

> >I made no such claim regarding my expertise. Do you know what a person
> >who tells untruths is called?
>
> Now, now, you are starting to sound like your buddy, the
> USMC reject.

When you write something which is not true and you know it or suspect it
to be an untruth, you are offering falsehoods or *lies*.

> Dave, I called the procedure DUMB. Other folks in
> communications have already established the methods

> decades before you. You are free to call their methods
> "wrong" but it is up to you to show why in order to verify
> your claims.

...and where did I call the methods in use by others wrong?
I pointed out that State was, during the time discussed, using Morse.
It was and I stand by my statement.

> >> Technically, switching over to CW from FSK TTY should be
> >> possible but it is a most odd sort of thing to use as an
> >> order-wire (a command circuit for radio circuit purposes).
> >
> >We didn't switch back and forth, Len. We used CW on one frequency and
> >ran the TTY circuit on a different pair.
>
> Ah, so the story CHANGES! Now, looking at it all in operation
> and considering the methods, why does this CW-on-a-different-
> frequency for an order-wire have more advantages than having
> the circuit commands sent over the TTY circuit?

The story hasn't changed one iota. You didn't bother to ask the why of
State's use of Morse.

Picture a scenario in which propagation changes cause a loss of path.
Picture an op using one of several CW guard frequencies to coordinate
the reestablishment of RTTY communication. Picture the necessity of a
crypto key change each time operation began. Opening of business,
call-ins for Night Action traffic, etc.

> >I stated that CW was used to arrange QSYs, openings and closings of the
> >TTY circuit. It was also necessary to confirm crypto used if that is
> >the "synchronization" to which you refer.
>
> I have to admit you might have me there, Dave. I've only been
> involved with three different crypto methods of TTY, all over
> military circuits, between 1953 and 1989. Without revealing
> anything like a state secret or violating national defense, it is
> safe to reveal that all of those military circuits self-synchronized.
>
> No doubt State had another crypto system.
>
> I might mention that secure Army field communications using
> crypto digital voice do synchronization in real-time. There is
> no need for any auxilliary "second channel" to "confirm" any
> crypto settings. Such has been operational as the SINCGARS
> family since 1988. It's also capable of frequency hopping.

State does not use digital voice to send and receive daily message
traffic. State is not the Army. State does not use SINCGARS. State
now uses no HF at all for daily message traffic.
>
> >> I said it was a dumb idea if you did it that way. I still think so.

> >
> >It is obvious that you did not and do not understand what was stated.
>
> Given a lot of text it is possible to "read between the lines" of
> what a person writes. In the above case there seems to have
> been some omissions of details. It's very hard to fill in details
> by trying to read between lines there...

It is possible to read between the lines though if you decide to do so,
you should know that you'll be wrong about fifty per cent of the time.

> >I'll leave it to you to figure out the necessity for such operation.
> >You were not a State Department communicator any more than you're a
> >radio amateur.
>
> Sorry, Dave, you will either have to explain your activity or just
> drop the subject. While my only contact with State was a
> quick time on RCA's RACES machine (State had two of them
> for message storage-retrieval), you ignore that I've had some
> thorough experience with HF communications and did it with
> operating methods well worked out by others. Also on VLF,
> LF, MF, VHF, UHF, and a few microwave bands.

I've explained about as much as I can or will. I believe that whatever
you did was worked out by others.

> I make no claims of expertise in communications methods,
> technically or operationally. I can analyze and reason the
> why and wherefore of how things are done and observe that
> methodology of operation in communications done by others
> before me.

Bully for you.

> There are few US radio amateurs who have any direct
> experience with either State Department methods or crypto
> communications. While I can understand your mentioning
> such items in close proximity in the same message, they
> are bogus for trying to make your case. [US radio amateurs
> are forbidden to use systems which obscure their
> communications...it's in the regulations]

You drift. You brought up this material in response to something else.
I made no statement regarding radio amateurs using crypto.

> The FCC issues US amateur radio licenses, Dave, not the
> US Department of State. You let me know if that
> changes, okay? Oh, and the FCC does not require any
> Commissioners or staff to hold amateur radio licenses in
> order to regulate US amateur radio or issue amateur
> licenses. Let me know if that changes, too, please?
>
> didit

I know. I have one. If you take an exam, you can have one too.
You don't have one? Let me know if that changes.

Dave K8MN

2266. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-01 05:06:52 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <0lrh7t08jk6ovvgf2rk94tc5i1hdve4jd4@4ax.com>
Source record: 2465

w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:
>But without our being willing to slow down a bit for the newcomers, we cannot
>expect that many will want to use the mode.

What we need is an easy to get license that allows novice CW ops to
practice with each other on the air by using a small band segment set
aside for just this purpose...

2267. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-01 06:45:06 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <95b0g1du1@news.service.uci.edu>
Source record: 2467

Bob Wex w2ilp <w2ilp@juno.com> wrote in message

> Hams need more license classes and/or official FCC technical
> endorsements.

In order to do what? I don't find myself feeling limited by the number of license classes in the ARS. Necessity is the mother of invention, not wallpaper. Interest and curiosity must provide motivation. Without that I think you'd have to convince the US Treasury to issue their certificates rather than the kind the FCC offers.

73, Jim AC6XG

2268. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-01 07:00:46 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <95b1de$p2$1@news.service.uci.edu>
Source record: 2468

Ed Hare, W1RFI wrote:

> >From: Jim Kelley jwkelley@uci.edu

> >> This will be the number 1 way to encourage those who are being licensed
> >> today to try out those Morse code skills.

> >Having knowlege of the Morse letters and numbers when they are being
> >licensed is probably helpful in that way also. Am I wrong?

> Many of those being licensed today do indeed demostrate knowledge of Morse
> letters and numbers.

My thought was that that isn't really something that you support. It seems a lot of the discussion around here centers around the fact that there isn't any longer a reason to test for this kind of thing, and I just thought this might be one reason that it's not entirely without merit.

> But without our being willing to slow down a bit for the newcomers, we
cannot
> expect that many will want to use the mode.

It's a good point. I was fortunate that there were folks like that who weren't in a big hurry when I was learning.

73, Jim AC6XG

2269. Re: ARRL Life Membership

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-01 09:40:30 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010201044030.13655.00001884@nso-mq.aol.com>
Source record: 2470

In article <3A7626E8.10D2F285@firstinter.net>, Rick Tannehill
<rickw7rt@firstinter.net> writes:

>
>National Geographic begins sending me renewal notices in July, and sends at
>least
>one a month until I renew. I call that harrassment, way beyond bother :)
>
>Rick T.
>W7RT

Rick:

If you call THAT "harrassment," then take my advice -- NEVER
subscribe to Reader's Digest! You'll get renewal notices at least
semi-weekly! Nice magazine, always an interesting read -- but
when they started stuffing my mailbox with incessant renewal
notices, advertising, sweepstakes, etc. etc. ad infinitum, I went
back to reading it at the doctor's office!

73 de Larry, K3LT

2270. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-01 09:40:31 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010201044031.13655.00001886@nso-mq.aol.com>
Source record: 2469

In article <3A76C92A.93B05F99@some.net>, JR <jr@some.net> writes:

>
>I take it from your comment that anyone who upgrades under the new 5 wpm
>rule is somehow not as good as someone who upgraded under the old code
>rules?
>
>Dick Carroll wrote:
>
>> It means we also have 5wpm pseudoExtras.

HR:

Just in case Dick didn't mean that, *I'll* say it -- and mean it! So
there! What are you going to do about it?

73 de Larry, K3LT

2271. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-01 09:40:31 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010201044031.13655.00001885@nso-mq.aol.com>
Source record: 2471

In article <3A76E8A4.CD47059E@IEEE.org>, Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>JR wrote:
>> I take it from your comment that anyone who upgrades under the new 5 wpm
>> rule is somehow not as good as someone who upgraded under the old code
>> rules?
>
>Yep, when my three year old grandson grows up and becomes an Extra,
>Dick will still be calling him a pseudoExtra.

Cecil:

I'll call him a "dumbed-down Nickle-Extra" myself. However,
PseudoExtra does have a nice ring to it! Kinda grows on you,
doesn't it?

73 de Larry, K3LT
A Real Extra! Wanna make something of it?

2272. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-01 11:20:35 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010201062035.15050.00000239@ng-ff1.aol.com>
Source record: 2472

>From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

>I'll call him a "dumbed-down Nickle-Extra" myself. However,
>PseudoExtra does have a nice ring to it! Kinda grows on you,
>doesn't it?

Another one trying to tear down ham radio to be "right" in a debate.

We knew the type in grammar school; they are apparently still with us.

Don't be surprised if not many people want to follow you as you try to drag Amateur Radio down to your level, Larry. Many of us still believe in the values you used to attribute to the Service.

If you really feel this way, perhaps we would all be better off if you let your license expire and found something you can believe in to do.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2273. Re: ARRL Life Membership

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-01 11:24:55 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010201062455.15050.00000242@ng-ff1.aol.com>
Source record: 2473

>From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

>If you call THAT "harrassment," then take my advice -- NEVER
>subscribe to Reader's Digest! You'll get renewal notices at least
>semi-weekly! Nice magazine, always an interesting read -- but
>when they started stuffing my mailbox with incessant renewal
>notices, advertising, sweepstakes, etc. etc. ad infinitum, I went
>back to reading it at the doctor's office!

Now, does Readers Digest rank right up there with "Extra Lite" as one of your pet peeves, Larry? Gosh, there is sure a lot wrong with the world, eh?

Is there anything important that bothers you?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2274. Re: QCWA TELLS FCC TO END INCENTIVE LICENSING

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-01 11:30:27 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010201063027.15050.00000243@ng-ff1.aol.com>
Source record: 2474

>From: Bob Wex w2ilp w2ilp@juno.com

>Yes and this is one time I won't say "Speak for yourself Jon". You and
>N9GL had better read the very latest research on the cancerous eye
>damage attributed to cellular telephone RF.

Once again, Bob, your assumptions are incorrect. N9GL is very much aware of that research. Now, what did N9GL say to you when you asked him about this before you chose to post your criticism of his knowledge on rec.radio.amateur.policy?

>Anyone who professes to be an RF hazard expert had better keep up with
>the latest research. I'm just a ham.

You may be "just a ham," but that doesn't seem to be stopping you from knowing all about it...

>The IEEE/ANSI specs, I am convinced, were made to give a clean bill of
>health to cell-phones...

You are convinced about a lot of things.

>and sadly some blind cancer victims (and their lawyers)
>for me to be able to say "I told you so".

Is that your goal?

>Maybe cell-phone users need RF filtering sun glasses.

Right up there with copper beanies?

>but from what I understand the MECHANISM is certainly
>there to cause eye damage at 900 MHz RF... but not a 144 MHz RF.

Please explain the mechanism to us all, Bob.

>Hams need more license classes. Maybe even an RF hazard specialist
>class.

A subject you are clearly not qualified to teach. I prefer my science to be based on science, not speculation, supposition and fear.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2275. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-01 11:31:48 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010201063148.15050.00000244@ng-ff1.aol.com>
Source record: 2475

>From: Bob Wex w2ilp w2ilp@juno.com

>Hams need more license classes and/or official FCC technical
>endorsements.

Ham need more technical knowlege. Adding another layer of government
bureaucratic control will be a hindrance, not a help.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2276. Re: Morse Code replacement? Bigtime flame war article!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-01 11:32:48 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010201063248.15050.00000245@ng-ff1.aol.com>
Source record: 2476

>From: Cecil Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>Well, wouldn't QRP be politically correct?

Larry has a special meaning to the term.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2277. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-01 11:36:20 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010201063620.15050.00000246@ng-ff1.aol.com>
Source record: 2477

>From: Aaron Jones nomail@nomail.com

>What we need is an easy to get license that allows novice CW ops to
>practice with each other on the air by using a small band segment set
>aside for just this purpose...

When that license is available, very few hams wanted to obtain it, so the FCC chose to drop it.

Any ham license allows prospective CW ops to practice with each other on the air.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2278. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-01 12:57:14 UTC
From: Vincent Biancomano <103520.355@CompuServe.COM>
Message-ID: <95bmfaput1@sshuraab-i-1.production.compuserve.com>
Source record: 2478

>If people just want to communicate internationally they can use
>the Internet or e-mail.

Absolutely. In one sentence, Bob, I think you've said it all.

>Hams need more license classes and/or official FCC technical
>endorsements.

>73,
>Bob Wex w2ilp (Incentive Licensing Proponent)

A very key word there is "official." There's no question in my
mind that without true government support and encouragement,
there is no Ham Radio.

Regards,
Vince, WB2EZG

2279. Re: Code Quick RULEZ!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-01 14:01:57 UTC
From: jason_hsu@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <95bq8f$ja4$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2479

In article <20010130195431.02315.00004614@nso-fi.aol.com>,
yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote:
>
> Ah HAH!!! The truth comes out! The ARRL (through their Usenet
> spokesman, W1RFI) supports the concept of using inefficient,
> speed-limiting methods of learning the Morse Code strictly for
> the purpose of expiditing the granting of HF (phone) privileges!
> More "dumbing-down" from Newington! What else did we expect?
>
You amuse me, Larry. First, you keep insisting that Morse Code all-important to all of ham radio and that the Morse Code testing requirements are sacred.

So I decide to bring Code Quick to the attention of everyone on USENET. Unlike more conventional methods, Code Quick works, and people ACTUALLY follow through. So what do you do? You try to knock it down!

I can tell from personal experience that Code Quick works. Because it takes the drudgery (memorization of dits and dahs, listening to CW and waiting for divine inspiration, etc.) out of learning CW, it seems that everyone who tries Code Quick sticks to it. You CANNOT say the same about other methods.

I challenge you to find anyone who tried Code Quick but failed.

I will agree with you that Code Quick alone isn't enough for 20+ wpm. Well, at some point, the Code Quick user has to start copying in his/her head. But at least there's nothing to unlearn.

Larry, you obviously do NOT need Code Quick. But the "lazy No Code" crowd certainly does. Show me someone from this group, and I'll show you someone who didn't use Code Quick.

--
Jason Hsu, AG4DG
jason_hsu@@@@@@@@@@planetmail.com
http://www.bigfoot.com/~jason_hsu/

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2280. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-01 15:16:36 UTC
From: W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com>
Message-ID: <95bum8$hc4$1@iac5.navix.net>
Source record: 2480

I think you are way over the top here Ed. Larry is upset because the standards have been lowered by people who felt they "deserved" rather than earn an amateur radio license.

You then tell him he should let his ticket expire because he disagrees with it! As much as I respect your efforts in ham radio, I despise the attitude you are displaying towards older hams.

I have to look at you as a representative of ARRL, and by extension infer this is the current attitude in Newington. As such, I will not be renewing my League membership and will be resigning my positions as Technical coordinator, Official Observer and County EC.

Fred Hambrecht W4JLE

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20010201062035.15050.00000239@ng-ff1.aol.com...
> >From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
>
> >I'll call him a "dumbed-down Nickle-Extra" myself. However,
> >PseudoExtra does have a nice ring to it! Kinda grows on you,
> >doesn't it?
>
> Another one trying to tear down ham radio to be "right" in a debate.
>
> We knew the type in grammar school; they are apparently still with us.
>
> Don't be surprised if not many people want to follow you as you try to
drag
> Amateur Radio down to your level, Larry. Many of us still believe in the
> values you used to attribute to the Service.
>
> If you really feel this way, perhaps we would all be better off if you let
your
> license expire and found something you can believe in to do.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>

2281. Re: QCWA TELLS FCC TO END INCENTIVE LICENSING

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-01 15:17:45 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <3A797E19.5F1D7E26@arrl.org>
Source record: 2481

Bob Wex w2ilp wrote:
>
> Yes and this is one time I won't say "Speak for yourself Jon". You and
> N9GL had better read the very latest research on the cancerous eye
> damage attributed to cellular telephone RF. I should have saved the
> references that I had read. The research was done in UK.
> The mechanism and the effects are known and established.

I didn't say they weren't. I only said that according to N9GL, the standards are not derived from the mechanisms but from the known effects. Which makes sense. For the purpose of determining safe levels, the mechanisms are unimportant -- only the effects matter. (Again, that's not to say the mechanisms aren't of interest in their own right.) I think they do extrapolate animal tests to the human body since I doubt anyone has yet volunteered to be slowly cooked by RF for scientific purposes.

> The IEEE/ANSI specs, I am convinced, were made to give a clean bill of
> health to cell-phones...but not Ham Radio VHF gear. Unfortunately it
> might take time, more research, and sadly some blind cancer victims
> (and their lawyers) for me to be able to say "I told you so".
...
In an earlier message you said:
> The leaders
> who evolve from liberal artists, lawyers, and religious leaders can not
> blaze any path of success through the world's scientific industrial
> competition and the serious problems that the future is sure to bring.
> They can talk;
> They can judge; They can pray...BUT they are not equipped to make
> decisions based on scientific facts, which can only be accepted when
> the proper logic is applied to the proper research.

Apparently you don't hold yourself to the same high standard since you are convinced of a conclusion that you admit cannot be supported by present scientific evidence. Hopefully, those non-scientist leaders will refrain from making scientific judgements on topics they are unqualified to evaluate. Maybe you should, too. And particularly, you should refrain from denigrating the professional abilities of people like N9GL when you clearly know nothing about them. You frequently proclaim that your views are based on science, but it's pretty clear in this case that prejudice is playing the bigger role in forming your opinion.

Jon

2282. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-01 15:44:33 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A798461.CD3C8F1F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 2482

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> >Yep, when my three year old grandson grows up and becomes an Extra,
> >Dick will still be calling him a pseudoExtra.
>
> I'll call him a "dumbed-down Nickle-Extra" myself. However,
> PseudoExtra does have a nice ring to it! Kinda grows on you,
> doesn't it?

Here's a little guy who doesn't even know what amateur radio is
and you are going to call him a "dumbed-down Nickle-Extra" in
15 years when he gets the only Extra class license available
to him???? Are you trying to get him to hate older hams?
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2283. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-01 15:47:10 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A7984FE.A7FB5D05@IEEE.org>
Source record: 2483

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> Just in case Dick didn't mean that, *I'll* say it -- and mean it! So
> there! What are you going to do about it?

So anyone who obtains the only Extra license available is a pseudoExtra?
What if he has a PhD in EE and can do 50wpm Morse code? Is he still a
pseudoExtra?
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2284. Long Delay Echos

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-01 15:49:53 UTC
From: "Steven J Robeson", K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <95c0is$p9k$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2484

Anyone have any experience with them?

73

Steve, K4YZ

--
http://www.qrz.com/k4yz

"The Measure Of A Man Is Not In How He Touches A Woman, But In How He Touches A Woman's Heart"

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2285. Re: Long Delay Echos

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-01 16:00:09 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <95c162ptv1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2485

In article <95c0is$p9k$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
Steven J Robeson, K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com> wrote:

> Anyone have any experience with them?

Good topic, but probably will reach more likely respondents in
rec.radio.amateur.misc or rec.radio.amateur.dx.

K0TO and I observed a persistent LDE (on and off over a period of >30
minutes) on 12 meters several years ago.

73, Hans
--
"We are fellow travelers on a journey between two
eternities, and it's a trip far too brief for me
to be concerned about your speed at the Code of
Morse."

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2286. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-01 18:17:48 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <ti9j7tcbnp0pcj3kjrufai018qmaqv1tbt@4ax.com>
Source record: 2487

w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:
>When that [Novice] license is available, very few hams
>wanted to obtain it, so the FCC chose to drop it.

Of course my comment was a tongue in cheek view of the present state of the CW mode. When the Novice license was created, it was a very popular license indeed. It allowed thousands of beginning hams to practice with *each other* while having the fun of being on the air. You did not have to beg old timers to slow down just to nursemaid the few and far between CW recruits that we have today...

2287. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-01 18:17:49 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <k0aj7tgb7bc2jk8bvesqh3rm8vc37rifgt@4ax.com>
Source record: 2488

w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:
>We knew the type in grammar school; they are apparently still with us.

Translation: Larry is a bully.

>Don't be surprised if not many people want to follow you as you try to drag
>Amateur Radio down to your level, Larry.

Translation: Larry is a low level person.

>If you really feel this way, perhaps we would all be better off if you let your
>license expire and found something you can believe in to do.

Translation: Ham radio would be better off without Larry.

Gosh Ed, you didn't used to fight your battles by using personal
attacks. Why don't you just rebut with the facts...

2288. Re: ARRL Life Membership

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-01 18:17:52 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <el9j7tke9624ru6peg3fdkpkhc3pffs2rk@4ax.com>
Source record: 2489

w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:

>>From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
>
>>If you call THAT "harrassment," then take my advice -- NEVER
>>subscribe to Reader's Digest! You'll get renewal notices at least
>>semi-weekly! Nice magazine, always an interesting read -- but
>>when they started stuffing my mailbox with incessant renewal
>>notices, advertising, sweepstakes, etc. etc. ad infinitum, I went
>>back to reading it at the doctor's office!
>
>Now, does Readers Digest rank right up there with "Extra Lite" as one of your
>pet peeves, Larry? Gosh, there is sure a lot wrong with the world, eh?

Baiting Larry on his Extra views Ed? A form of trolling? This post of
Larry's talks about magazine renewals and appears to have nothing to
do with the Extra argument...

>Is there anything important that bothers you?

Baiting Larry again?? Has Larry gotten so far under your skin that
you have abandoned all your professional posting habits?? For heavens
sakes remember your position... :-)

2289. Re: Long Delay Echos

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-01 18:17:57 UTC
From: "Steven J Robeson", K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <95c989$277$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2491

In article <95c162ptv1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org> wrote:

> Good topic, but probably will reach more likely respondents in
> rec.radio.amateur.misc or rec.radio.amateur.dx.

Thanks, Hans, and I will give them a whirl.

> K0TO and I observed a persistent LDE (on and off over a period of >30
> minutes) on 12 meters several years ago.

I am not even sure that what I heard WAS one, however I was
hearing the last one or two dit's or dah's on 80 meters with signals
about S-3. I listened on 40 but couldn't hear anything. I am not up
on 160 at the moment so couldn't try that one.

I was hearing the return "dit" almost simultaneously as I go off
the paddle (in full break-in).

Fun stuff.

73 and thanks, Hans.

Steve, K4YZ
>
> 73, Hans
> --
> "We are fellow travelers on a journey between two
> eternities, and it's a trip far too brief for me
> to be concerned about your speed at the Code of
> Morse."
>
> Sent via Deja.com
> http://www.deja.com/
>

--
http://hometown.aol.com/k4yz/myhomepage/index.html

"The Measure Of A Man Is Not In How He Touches A Woman, But In How He
Touches A Woman's Heart"

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2290. Re: I will no longer tolerate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-01 18:26:12 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nospam.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.g8346j0.pminews@ca.news.verio.net>
Source record: 2490
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

On Wed, 31 Jan 2001 23:09:44 GMT, Brian wrote:

>> >Sounds like the antiques in the old 20th Air Division, Air Defense
>> >Command, SAGE Blockhouse at Ft Lee AFS, VA.
>>
>> SAGE used the FSQ-7, a forerunner of the FSQ-31.
>>
>> --
>> 73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP
>
>Can you tell me what SAGE meant?

SAGE stood for "Semi-Automatic Ground Environment".

For those here under the age of 60, SAGE was an Air Defense
Radar and Tracking system of the 1950s era using lots of vaccum
tubes and defense budget money to make the Systems Development
Corporation very wealthy -- SDC was the "darling child" of the
Air Force in those days who had the contract for the programming
and data analysis on that system and others.

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

2291. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-01 18:56:59 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A79B17B.80A8A649@IEEE.org>
Source record: 2496

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Ed: No one is trying to tear anything down - it's already down!

Oh? I haven't noticed a lot of difference besides upgrades. Are
hoards of CBers and freebanders still going to invade the ARS?
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2292. Good learning website

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-01 18:57:56 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <95cbjkojp0@208.206.142.95>
Source record: 2492

Hey all you Novices and other Extras out there who might want to
upgrade your
knowledge, if not your license - check this one out...

http://tpub.com/neets/index.htm

Dick

2293. Re: The FCC's WARC 2003 Web site

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-01 18:59:03 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A79B1F7.CFF11577@uci.edu>
Source record: 2495

"Leland C. Scott" wrote:

> I would think anyone interested in radio as a
> hobby would want to stay informed, even if it is just "educational".

The point is, Leland, when you crosspost these things to a list of discussion groups, the responses to your 'spam' then also go out to all of the groups you listed. Since these are discussion groups, people will respond to your posts, and in many cases unknowingly spam the same list of groups you did. What happens is we end up with hams posting to CB groups, and CB enthusiasts posting to ham groups, and each of the groups ends up with four times the normal amount of posts in a given thread, and FRS users get to find out how big an Ahole joe ham is. So if you feel you absolutely must post to all of these groups, then it would be more considerate to everyone for you to take 5 minutes of extra time and post to each of the groups individually.

Thanks,

AC6XG

2294. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-01 18:59:26 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <95cbmeojp1@208.206.142.95>
Source record: 2493

W1RFI wrote:
>
> >From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
>
> >I'll call him a "dumbed-down Nickle-Extra" myself. However,
> >PseudoExtra does have a nice ring to it! Kinda grows on you,
> >doesn't it?
>
> Another one trying to tear down ham radio to be "right" in a debate.

Ed: No one is trying to tear anything down - it's already down!

2295. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-01 19:01:16 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <95cbpsojp2@208.206.142.95>
Source record: 2494

Cecil wrote:
>
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > Just in case Dick didn't mean that, *I'll* say it -- and mean it! So
> > there! What are you going to do about it?
>
> So anyone who obtains the only Extra license available is a pseudoExtra?
> What if he has a PhD in EE and can do 50wpm Morse code? Is he still a
> pseudoExtra?

Cecil fits the data to the circumstances, yet again.

Find one then we'll discuss it. Dare ya.

2296. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-01 19:03:22 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A79B2FA.F1D3194D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 2497

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> Cecil wrote:
> >
> > Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > > Just in case Dick didn't mean that, *I'll* say it -- and mean it! So
> > > there! What are you going to do about it?
> >
> > So anyone who obtains the only Extra license available is a pseudoExtra?
> > What if he has a PhD in EE and can do 50wpm Morse code? Is he still a
> > pseudoExtra?
>
> Cecil fits the data to the circumstances, yet again.
> Find one then we'll discuss it. Dare ya.

I know a few pre-2000 Extras who are also PhDs. It doesn't take much
imagination to conceive of some post-2000 Extras with PhDs who know
Morse code. So would you please answer the question instead of evading
it? I'm sure there are Generals who can do 20+ wpm and are upgrading
to Extra as we speak. Exactly how can these "pseudoExtras" prove to
you that they are faster at Morse code than you are?
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2297. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-01 19:06:12 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A79B3A4.28503A64@IEEE.org>
Source record: 2498

K0HB@USWEST.NET wrote:
>
> In article <3A7984FE.A7FB5D05@IEEE.org>, Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
>
> >What if he has a PhD in EE and can do 50wpm Morse code....
>
> Typical Cecilian troll -- sigh.
>
> What does a PhD in EE have to do with amateur radio? (Keyword "amateur")

I suspect PhDs in EE know a lot more about "amateur" radios than you do.

> Besides, I thought your mythical Dr. Williamson didn't do Morse very well?

I know a few PhDs who are Extras. Why is it such a stretch to conceive of
a General who does 20+ wpm upgrading to Extra in 2001?
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2298. Re: Good learning website

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-01 19:13:01 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A79B53D.36B35CF7@IEEE.org>
Source record: 2499

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> Hey all you Novices and other Extras out there who might want to
> upgrade your knowledge, if not your license - check this one out...
>
> http://tpub.com/neets/index.htm

Hey Dick, I thought you (and others) said Electrical Engineering
has nothing to do with "Amateur" Radio.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2299. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-01 19:22:04 UTC
From: K0HB@USWEST.NET
Message-ID: <95cd0s$9n2$1@news.netmar.com>
Source record: 2486

In article <3A7984FE.A7FB5D05@IEEE.org>, Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>

>What if he has a PhD in EE and can do 50wpm Morse code....

Typical Cecilian troll -- sigh.

What does a PhD in EE have to do with amateur radio? (Keyword "amateur")

Besides, I thought your mythical Dr. Williamson didn't do Morse very well?

73, Hans, K0HB

----- Posted via NewsOne.Net: Free (anonymous) Usenet News via the Web -----
http://newsone.net/ -- Free reading and anonymous posting to 60,000+ groups
NewsOne.Net prohibits users from posting spam. If this or other posts
made through NewsOne.Net violate posting guidelines, email abuse@newsone.net

2300. Re: QCWA TELLS FCC TO END INCENTIVE LICENSING

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-01 19:33:34 UTC
From: "R.L. Tannehill, P.E." <rickw7rt@firstinter.net>
Message-ID: <3A79BA0E.B464A27E@firstinter.net>
Source record: 2500

Jon Bloom wrote:
>
> Bob Wex w2ilp wrote:
> >
> > Yes and this is one time I won't say "Speak for yourself Jon". You and
> > N9GL had better read the very latest research on the cancerous eye
> > damage attributed to cellular telephone RF. I should have saved the
> > references that I had read. The research was done in UK.
> > The mechanism and the effects are known and established.
>
> I didn't say they weren't. I only said that according to N9GL, the
> standards are not derived from the mechanisms but from the known
> effects. Which makes sense. For the purpose of determining safe levels,
> the mechanisms are unimportant -- only the effects matter. (Again,
> that's not to say the mechanisms aren't of interest in their own right.)
> I think they do extrapolate animal tests to the human body since I doubt
> anyone has yet volunteered to be slowly cooked by RF for scientific
> purposes.
>
> > The IEEE/ANSI specs, I am convinced, were made to give a clean bill of
> > health to cell-phones...but not Ham Radio VHF gear. Unfortunately it
> > might take time, more research, and sadly some blind cancer victims
> > (and their lawyers) for me to be able to say "I told you so".
> ...
> In an earlier message you said:
> > The leaders
> > who evolve from liberal artists, lawyers, and religious leaders can not
> > blaze any path of success through the world's scientific industrial
> > competition and the serious problems that the future is sure to bring.
> > They can talk;
> > They can judge; They can pray...BUT they are not equipped to make
> > decisions based on scientific facts, which can only be accepted when
> > the proper logic is applied to the proper research.
>
> Apparently you don't hold yourself to the same high standard since you
> are convinced of a conclusion that you admit cannot be supported by
> present scientific evidence. Hopefully, those non-scientist leaders will
> refrain from making scientific judgements on topics they are unqualified
> to evaluate. Maybe you should, too. And particularly, you should refrain
> from denigrating the professional abilities of people like N9GL when you
> clearly know nothing about them. You frequently proclaim that your views
> are based on science, but it's pretty clear in this case that prejudice
> is playing the bigger role in forming your opinion.
>

> Jon

In defense of the ANSI/IEEE standard, it was promulgated in 1992, based upon research over the previous four years. A lot of new research has emerged in the past 9-10 years in this field, that may yield a new iteration of the standard in a few years. The old standard was based upon a number of criteria, including whole-body resonance frequencies, and particularly human head resonance for optimal SAR. There are a lot of variables as to which organs are the most vulnerable of course, and the researchers tried to include all these in the standard, which is generally considered somewhere between a factor of 2, and a factor of 10 below the threshold of tissue damage. If new research on the eyes contradicts these earlier findings, so be it. We can adjust the standard a bit as we go to ensure (almost) total safety. There are web sites out there that list the power densities from the most common cell/pcs phones on the market. A person might be well advised to review those before making their next purchase.

Summary: This is still not an exact science; we are still learning. Even if we erred, we thought, on the conservative side, we may find other effects that we overlooked before that will have to be taken into account in the future, including non-thermal effects.

Rick Tannehill - W7RT

2301. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-01 19:38:53 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <95ce0c$6tl$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2551

In article <3A79B3A4.28503A64@IEEE.org>,
Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:

> I suspect PhDs in EE know a lot more about "amateur"
> radios than you do.

Your suspicion is inaccurate.

73, Hans, K0HB

--
"We are fellow travelers on a journey between two
eternities, and it's a trip far too brief for me
to be concerned about your speed at the Code of
Morse."

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2302. Re: Good learning website

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-01 20:02:46 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <95cfcv$88a$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2552

In article <3A79B53D.36B35CF7@IEEE.org>,
Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:

> Hey Dick, I thought you (and others) said Electrical Engineering
> has nothing to do with "Amateur" Radio.

--

0 2 4 6 8 10
. /. <boink!>
/
/
/
/
/
/
/
TROLL-O-METER

--
"We are fellow travelers on a journey between two
eternities, and it's a trip far too brief for me
to be concerned about your speed at the Code of
Morse."

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2303. Re: Code Quick RULEZ!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-01 21:43:48 UTC
From: David Snyder Hale <david@isi9.mtwilson.edu>
Message-ID: <95clakcjr1@agate.berkeley.edu>
Source record: 2553
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

In rec.radio.amateur.misc Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com> wrote:

> Sounds useful and has come up here before. I should try it. Does it
> cost more than a pizza? More than a lobster dinner?

hum, I think closer to lobster than pizza; I think I paid around $35 a
little over a year ago.

--
Dave * N3WTK (DM04xf) * http://isi.mtwilson.edu * n3wtk@arrl.net

2304. Re: Good learning website

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-01 21:46:11 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <EPke6.42$HH5.342001@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 2554

Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:95cbjkojp0@208.206.142.95...

> Hey all you Novices and other Extras out there who might want to
> upgrade your
> knowledge, if not your license - check this one out...

> http://tpub.com/neets/index.htm

Nice reference, Dick; thanks!

73, Ed Hare, W1RFI

2305. Re: Good learning website

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-01 21:55:47 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <EYke6.43$HH5.343063@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 2555

Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3A79B53D.36B35CF7@IEEE.org...

> Dick Carroll wrote:

> > Hey all you Novices and other Extras out there who might want to
> > upgrade your knowledge, if not your license - check this one out...

> > http://tpub.com/neets/index.htm

> Hey Dick, I thought you (and others) said Electrical Engineering
> has nothing to do with "Amateur" Radio.

Cecil,

It looks to me like Dick wanted to post a pretty decent site that will help
hams learn. I would save the digs for another thread.

Thanks again, Dick.

73,
Ed, W1RFI

2306. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-01 22:25:49 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A79E26D.CCE91EB0@IEEE.org>
Source record: 2556

W4JLE wrote:
> I have to look at you as a representative of ARRL, and by extension infer
> this is the current attitude in Newington. As such, I will not be renewing
> my League membership and will be resigning my positions as Technical
> coordinator, Official Observer and County EC.

Translation: I don't like the new rules so I am identifying a scapegoat,
being a quitter, taking my marbles, and going home. Fred, the radical
fringe always reacts that way. Why not join the mainstream? Amateur Radio
is evolving. Dinosaurs loved to beep. Mammals learned to talk. :-)
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2307. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-01 22:28:48 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A79E320.64206815@IEEE.org>
Source record: 2557

K0HB wrote:
>
> In article <3A79B3A4.28503A64@IEEE.org>,
> Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
>
> > I suspect PhDs in EE know a lot more about "amateur"
> > radios than you do.
>
> Your suspicion is inaccurate.

So you claim to know as much about radios as PhDs in EE?
Got any proof? What sampling rate does it require to
reproduce 455 kHz IF information?
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2308. Re: Long Delay Echos

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-01 22:31:55 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A79E3DB.B1F0D00A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 2560

Steven, J, Robeson, K4YZ wrote:
> I was hearing the return "dit" almost simultaneously as I go off
> the paddle (in full break-in).

At the height of the best sunspot cycle of all time, we hams at
Texas A&M could send a 'didit' on 10m and hear it coming back
from around the world. It was smeared but it was there.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2309. Re: Good learning website

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-01 22:32:56 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A79E418.89597C6A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 2561

K0HB wrote:
>
> In article <3A79B53D.36B35CF7@IEEE.org>,
> Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
>
> > Hey Dick, I thought you (and others) said Electrical Engineering
> > has nothing to do with "Amateur" Radio.
>
> 0 2 4 6 8 10
> . /. <boink!>
> /

Is that a record?
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2310. Re: Good learning website

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-01 22:33:51 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A79E44F.35D9ACFA@IEEE.org>
Source record: 2562

"Ed Hare, W1RFI" wrote:
> It looks to me like Dick wanted to post a pretty decent site that will help
> hams learn. I would save the digs for another thread.

Sorry, the Devil made me do it.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2311. Re: Morse Code replacement? Bigtime flame war article!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-01 22:34:59 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <95coaihan1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2559

In article <9589hd$88c$0@208.206.142.67>,
Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

> Yeah,we know....that's the very reason why darn few will ever bother
to
> learn it at all when the code test requirement evaporates, and all the
> more reason why even fewer 5wpm types will even be interested in using
> it enough to develop faster skills. Sure, a few will be intrigued and
> spend a little time at it, at least until the new wears off and well
> before most ever gain sufficient skill to feel comfortable working
> higher speeds. THAT is human nature. And we already know your story
> line, you learned it in Cub Scouts well before you ever heard of ham
> radio. Or the Internet or any othe computer or radio or TV or or or or
> or........Sorry those days are all gone.

Dick, if those days are gone then its time you picked up the pieces of
your shattered life and move on. To think that you and Larry have been
lying to me about how PEEU the code is and now you say its only worth
learning if the gubmn't puts a gun to your head.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2312. Re: Long Delay Echos

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-01 22:38:08 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <lAle6.44$HH5.345926@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 2558

Steve,

From the QST/QEX search database:

Items 1 to 12 of 12
Issue Page Title Author
Sep 1992 QST 89 Long Long-Delayed Echo (Technical Correspondence) Cannon, Scott, N7LMO

Jan 1981 QST 42-43 More 28-MHz Long-Delayed Echos (Technical Correspondence)
Keywords: 10 METER LDE Goodacre, Alan, VE2AEJ/3

Oct 1980 QST 11-14 Magnetospheric Echo Box--A Type Of Long-Delayed Echo Explained, The Waxham, Jr., F. W., K7DS

Oct 1980 QST 11-14 Magnetospheric Echo Box--A Type Of Long-Delayed Echo Explained, The
Keywords: ECHO LDE Villard, Jr., O. G., W6QYT

Oct 1980 QST 11-14 Magnetospheric Echo Box--A Type Of Long-Delayed Echo Explained, The Muldrew, D. B.

Feb 1978 QST 17-18 Long-Delayed Echo Revisited, A Davis, Jonathan, WA1TCL

Feb 1978 QST 17-18 Long-Delayed Echo Revisited, A Davis, Franklin, WA1TCK

Feb 1978 QST 17-18 Long-Delayed Echo Revisited, A
Keywords: LDE Cohen, Nathaniel, N1IR

Feb 1970 QST 30-36 Long-Delayed Echo AR, A
Keywords: LDE Villard, Jr., O.G., W6QYT

Feb 1970 QST 30-36 Long-Delayed Echo AR, A Lomasney, J.M., WA6NIL

Feb 1970 QST 30-36 Long-Delayed Echo AR, A Graf, C.R., W5LFM

Jul 1956 QST 35 "long delayed echo" phnomenon (Strays) Holcomb, Maj Bill, W9SDP

<Steven J Robeson>; K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com> wrote in message news:95c989$277$1@nnrp1.deja.com...
> In article <95c162ptv1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
> K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org> wrote:
>
> > Good topic, but probably will reach more likely respondents in
> > rec.radio.amateur.misc or rec.radio.amateur.dx.
>
> Thanks, Hans, and I will give them a whirl.

>
> > K0TO and I observed a persistent LDE (on and off over a period of >30
> > minutes) on 12 meters several years ago.
>
> I am not even sure that what I heard WAS one, however I was
> hearing the last one or two dit's or dah's on 80 meters with signals
> about S-3. I listened on 40 but couldn't hear anything. I am not up
> on 160 at the moment so couldn't try that one.
>
> I was hearing the return "dit" almost simultaneously as I go off
> the paddle (in full break-in).
>
> Fun stuff.
>
> 73 and thanks, Hans.
>
> Steve, K4YZ
> >
> > 73, Hans
> > --
> > "We are fellow travelers on a journey between two
> > eternities, and it's a trip far too brief for me
> > to be concerned about your speed at the Code of
> > Morse."
> >
> > Sent via Deja.com
> > http://www.deja.com/
> >
>
> --
> http://hometown.aol.com/k4yz/myhomepage/index.html
>
> "The Measure Of A Man Is Not In How He Touches A Woman, But In How He
> Touches A Woman's Heart"
>
>
> Sent via Deja.com
> http://www.deja.com/

2313. Re: Good learning website

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-01 22:52:31 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <95cpb9ide1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2563

In article <3A79B53D.36B35CF7@IEEE.org>,
Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > Hey all you Novices and other Extras out there who might want to
> > upgrade your knowledge, if not your license - check this one out...
> >
> > http://tpub.com/neets/index.htm
>
> Hey Dick, I thought you (and others) said Electrical Engineering
> has nothing to do with "Amateur" Radio.

Oh my God. I hope Len doesn't see this.

Can we get Deja Blows to pull it before all hell breaks loose? ;)

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2314. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-01 23:07:06 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <w%le6.45$HH5.348256@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 2564

W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com> wrote:

> I think you are way over the top here Ed. Larry is upset because the
> standards have been lowered by people who felt they "deserved" rather than
> earn an amateur radio license.

That is no excuse for name calling.

> You then tell him he should let his ticket expire because he disagrees
with
> it! As much as I respect your efforts in ham radio, I despise the attitude
> you are displaying towards older hams.

That was not the reason I gave him for my belief that he and we would be
better off if he let his ticket expire. I don't think that Amateur Radio
benefits from name calling.

> I have to look at you as a representative of ARRL, and by extension infer
> this is the current attitude in Newington. As such, I will not be renewing
> my League membership and will be resigning my positions as Technical
> coordinator, Official Observer and County EC.

Because someone who works at ARRL HQ takes offense at someone calling other
hams names in a public forum?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2315. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-01 23:08:51 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <91me6.46$HH5.348388@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 2565

Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:95cbmeojp1@208.206.142.95...

> W1RFI wrote:

> > >From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
> >
> > >I'll call him a "dumbed-down Nickle-Extra" myself. However,
> > >PseudoExtra does have a nice ring to it! Kinda grows on you,
> > >doesn't it?

> > Another one trying to tear down ham radio to be "right" in a debate.

> Ed: No one is trying to tear anything down - it's already down!

Not for most of us, Dick; most of us are still having a good time. I am
trulyu sorry that you are not.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2316. West Virginia farm boy comes of age

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-01 23:22:54 UTC
From: Stagger Lee <SLee@houston.net>
Message-ID: <3A79EFCE.2A8C8D9E@houston.net>
Source record: 2566
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

There is a story about a kid from a farm just outside of Glendale, WV and one of the local bars there.

The kid's name was Roger.

It seems that he had just turned 21 and his father let him go into town alone to buy supplies and feed. Since it was his first trip to town as a man, his dad told Roger to go ahead and buy himself a beer while he was there.

Roger finished up at the feed store and went to the bar to do as his dad said he could. He ordered a beer and the bartender asked if he was new around town. As he was telling the bartender his history, a stunningly beautiful young woman came into the bar and sat down beside Roger. Roger was so powerfully affected by her presence that he began to lose track of his conversation with the bartender and to stammer just a bit.

He turned to the girl and attempted to start up a conversation with her, but she seemed to be distracted. She always answered him politely, but acted as if she didn't really want to talk to him.

A few minutes later, a second beautiful girl entered the bar. She immediately struck up a conversation with the first girl, and eventually they left the bar together.

"Don't worry" said the bartender "she wouldn't ever have gotten interested in you. She's a lesbian."

"What's a lesbian?" asked Roger.

"Well see, it's this way: Lesbians only think about girls. They want to hang out with girls, they want to kiss girls, and they want to sleep with girls."

"Get it?"

"Um, yeah" Roger said, and then left to bring his supplies home.

A few weeks later, Roger was back in Glendale and he stopped at the same bar again. After he'd ordered a beer and was sitting there drinking it, a talkative stranger entered the bar. He was a salesman and told Roger all about how wonderful his job was. Eventually he said to Roger, "Yep, I'm a salesman and proud of it. What are you?"

Roger blushed, looked at the floor, and said "I'm a lesbian."

2317. STAGGER LEE, OUTED SPERM_GARGLING HOMOSEXUAL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-02 00:13:35 UTC
From: KC8JBO <roger_kc8jbo@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <95cu39mqh1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2567
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <3A79EFCE.2A8C8D9E@houston.net>,
AIDS CARRYING HOMOSEXUAL Stagger "FUCKWIT" Lee <SLee@houston.net>
slobbered:

> There is a story about a kid from a farm just outside of Glendale, WV

I live IN town..not on a farm, FUCKWIT SPERMGARGLER. Even though you
live in a tarpapered shack outside of town,
mainly because the TOWN issued a petition forcing you out of town with
your depraved,
perverse sexual exploits with other men and farm animals.

<...>

> "Well see, it's this way: Lesbians only think about girls. They want
> to hang out with girls, they want to kiss girls, and they want to
sleep
> with girls."

Proof positive "Stagger Lee" here IS a HOMOSEXUAL. Stagger Lee here
thinks sleeping with girls is somehow unnatural. Yep, I ONLY want to
sleep with girls/women, Faggot Lee. Nice to see you finally come out of
the closet! Yep, I want to kiss "girls", which beats the men's schlongs
YOU like to kiss, Shithead Lee. Yep, I want to sleep with "girls/women"
again it beats the farmanimals you currently have sex with.

Your little "joke" kind of BACKFIRED, since you maintain I like to have
sex with women!!!!!!!!!!!!

> Roger blushed, looked at the floor, and said "I'm a lesbian."

Yep, using YOUR definition of a "lesbian", I perfer women.
I even ate out your whore momma's cunt...BWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA!!
The best $10.00 I ever spent! <peals of derisive laughter>

"Stagger Lee" <Koko Taylor>

2000, Xmas eve, with a full moon over town
Stagger Lee sucked off Billy DeLions
And he blew that poor boy's dick.
Do you know what he sucked him for?
What do you make of that?
Cause Billy DeLions threw the lucky dice
Won Stagger Lee's Stetson hat.

Bayo, Bayo, tell me how can this be?
You arrest the girls for turning tricks

But you're scared of Stagger Lee.
Stagger Lee is a madman and he sucked my Billy D.
Bayo go get him or give the job to me.

Delia DeLions, dear sweet Delia-D
How the hell can I arrest him? He's twice as big as me.
Well don't ask me to go downtown, I won't come back alive [no more].
Not only is that mother big but he packs a .45 [four].

Bayo, Delia said, just give me a gun
he sucked my Billy's cum now I'm gonna see him hung.
She went into the DeLion's club through Billy DeLions cum
Stepped up to Stagger Lee at the bar,
Said, "Buy me a gin fizz, love."

As Stagger Lee lit a cigarette she shot him in the balls
Blew the smoke off her revolver, had him dragged to city hall
Bayo, Bayo, see you hang him high
He sucked my Billy dry and now he's got to die.

Delia went a walking down on Singapore Street
A three-piece band on the corner played "Near My God to Thee"
But Delia whistled a different tune, what tune could it be?

The song that woman sung was "Look Out Stagger Lee".
The song that Delia sung was "Look Out Stagger Lee".

BWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA!!!!!
--
73 de Roger, KC8JBO
EM99 |ARRL|VE [ARRL & W5YI]|ARES |RACES
Yaesu FT-920 |Inverted Vee @ 40 ft.
Yaesu FT-90R

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2318. Re: Long Delay Echos

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-02 00:27:00 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <95cusc$nk8$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2568

In article <95c0is$p9k$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
Steven J Robeson, K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com> wrote:
> Anyone have any experience with them?
>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Anomolous propogation. Gave strange echoes on the scope.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2319. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-02 01:32:43 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A7A0E3B.3DFFA63E@uci.edu>
Source record: 2569

W4JLE wrote:

> As much as I respect your efforts in ham radio, I despise the attitude
> you are displaying towards older hams.

K3LT's Birthday (from QRZ): 31 Oct 1952

W1RFI's Birthday (from QRZ): 26 Aug 1950

ac6xg

2320. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-02 02:39:16 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <95d6kk$sr1$0@208.206.142.82>
Source record: 2570

Cecil wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Ed: No one is trying to tear anything down - it's already down!
>
> Oh? I haven't noticed a lot of difference besides upgrades. Are
> hoards of CBers and freebanders still going to invade the ARS?

Cecil I thought you were already here!

2321. Re: Good learning website

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-02 02:41:55 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <95d6pj$sr1$1@208.206.142.82>
Source record: 2571

Cecil wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > Hey all you Novices and other Extras out there who might want to
> > upgrade your knowledge, if not your license - check this one out...
> >
> > http://tpub.com/neets/index.htm
>
> Hey Dick, I thought you (and others) said Electrical Engineering
> has nothing to do with "Amateur" Radio.

We know you didn't,Cecil, but even engineers gotta start at the
beginning. That course starts at the beginning.

2322. Re: Morse Code replacement? Bigtime flame war article!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-02 02:50:32 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <95d79o$3bs$0@208.206.142.82>
Source record: 2572

Brian wrote:
>
> In article <9589hd$88c$0@208.206.142.67>,
> Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>
> > Yeah,we know....that's the very reason why darn few will ever bother
> to
> > learn it at all when the code test requirement evaporates, and all the
> > more reason why even fewer 5wpm types will even be interested in using
> > it enough to develop faster skills. Sure, a few will be intrigued and
> > spend a little time at it, at least until the new wears off and well
> > before most ever gain sufficient skill to feel comfortable working
> > higher speeds. THAT is human nature. And we already know your story
> > line, you learned it in Cub Scouts well before you ever heard of ham
> > radio. Or the Internet or any othe computer or radio or TV or or or or
> > or........Sorry those days are all gone.
>
> Dick, if those days are gone then its time you picked up the pieces of
> your shattered life and move on. To think that you and Larry have been
> lying to me about how PEEU the code is and now you say its only worth
> learning if the gubmn't puts a gun to your head.
>

So the gov't had a gun to your head for 13 years? Finally had mercy on
you and took it away?

2323. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-02 02:57:37 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <95d7n1$53h$0@208.206.142.82>
Source record: 2573

"Ed Hare, W1RFI" wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:95cbmeojp1@208.206.142.95...
>
> > W1RFI wrote:
>
> > > >From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
> > > >
> > > > >I'll call him a "dumbed-down Nickle-Extra" myself. However,
> > > > >PseudoExtra does have a nice ring to it! Kinda grows on you,
> > > > >doesn't it?
>
> > > > Another one trying to tear down ham radio to be "right" in a debate.
>
> > Ed: No one is trying to tear anything down - it's already down!
>
> Not for most of us, Dick; most of us are still having a good time. I am
> trulyu sorry that you are not.

Well Ed, you're not nearly as sorry as I am. It really used to be fun
to help younger folk learn, both theory and code, back in the days when
younger folk were actually interested in learning. I remember one winter
in the 70's the Vo-Tec electronics teacher and I spent months teaching a
ham radio class, and graduated a bunch of new hams. I truly am sorry
that times have changed so much, and more's the loss for ham radio.

2324. Re: Long Delay Echos

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-02 02:59:14 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <95d7q2$53h$1@208.206.142.82>
Source record: 2574

Brian wrote:
>
> In article <95c0is$p9k$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
> Steven J Robeson, K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com> wrote:
> > Anyone have any experience with them?
> >
> > 73
> >
> > Steve, K4YZ
>
> Anomolous propogation. Gave strange echoes on the scope.

Naw, it's just the allwave repeater on the Mother Ship.

2325. Re: Good learning website

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-02 03:33:22 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010201223322.15140.00000301@ng-fc1.aol.com>
Source record: 2575

>From: Cecil Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>"Ed Hare, W1RFI" wrote:

>> It looks to me like Dick wanted to post a pretty decent site that will help
>> hams learn. I would save the digs for another thread.

>Sorry, the Devil made me do it.

That's okay, Cecil; the Devil gets to me once in a while, too.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2326. Re: West Virginia farm boy comes of age

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-02 03:37:41 UTC
From: DX405 <lightnin9@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <95daju$m80$1@dagobah.blueriver.net>
Source record: 2579
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Hahaha! That is a really good one about Roger Wideman.

"Stagger Lee" <SLee@houston.net> wrote in message
news:3A79EFCE.2A8C8D9E@houston.net...
> There is a story about a kid from a farm just outside of Glendale, WV
> and one of the local bars there.
>
> The kid's name was Roger.
>
> It seems that he had just turned 21 and his father let him go into town
> alone to buy supplies and feed. Since it was his first trip to town as
> a man, his dad told Roger to go ahead and buy himself a beer while he
> was there.
>
> Roger finished up at the feed store and went to the bar to do as his dad
> said he could. He ordered a beer and the bartender asked if he was new
> around town. As he was telling the bartender his history, a stunningly
> beautiful young woman came into the bar and sat down beside Roger.
> Roger was so powerfully affected by her presence that he began to lose
> track of his conversation with the bartender and to stammer just a bit.
>
> He turned to the girl and attempted to start up a conversation with her,
> but she seemed to be distracted. She always answered him politely, but
> acted as if she didn't really want to talk to him.
>
> A few minutes later, a second beautiful girl entered the bar. She
> immediately struck up a conversation with the first girl, and eventually
> they left the bar together.
>
> "Don't worry" said the bartender "she wouldn't ever have gotten
> interested in you. She's a lesbian."
>
> "What's a lesbian?" asked Roger.
>
> "Well see, it's this way: Lesbians only think about girls. They want
> to hang out with girls, they want to kiss girls, and they want to sleep
> with girls."
>
> "Get it?"
>
> "Um, yeah" Roger said, and then left to bring his supplies home.
>
> A few weeks later, Roger was back in Glendale and he stopped at the same

> bar again. After he'd ordered a beer and was sitting there drinking it,
> a talkative stranger entered the bar. He was a salesman and told Roger
> all about how wonderful his job was. Eventually he said to Roger, "Yep,
> I'm a salesman and proud of it. What are you?"
>
> Roger blushed, looked at the floor, and said "I'm a lesbian."

2327. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-02 03:41:19 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010201224119.15140.00000302@ng-fc1.aol.com>
Source record: 2576

>From: "W4JLE" Fred@w4jle.com

>As much as I respect your efforts in ham radio, I despise the attitude
>you are displaying towards older hams.

It is not the older hams that I despise at all, Fred; it is the despicable way that a few of them are treating the newer hams.

>I have to look at you as a representative of ARRL, and by extension infer
>this is the current attitude in Newington.

If you want to know the position of ARRL, Fred, you can do so by reading QST or the ARRL web pages. If you want to know my personal views, you can read them on rrap.

>As such, I will not be renewing my League membership and will be
>resigning my positions as Technical coordinator, Official Observer
>and County EC.

Do you really feel that the work you have done is less important than forcing me to never post views contrary to yours? I feel that such work is important and it is unfortunate if you choose to abandon it.

If these discussions will result in the people on this forum holding such actions over my head, perhaps my usefulness here is coming to and end.

Would you like to reach an agreement that you will remain doing what you are doing and I will never again post a personal view that is contrary to yours? This seems to be what you are trying to accomplish. Have I read your intent correctly?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2328. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-02 03:45:05 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010201224505.15140.00000303@ng-fc1.aol.com>
Source record: 2577

>From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

> Well Ed, you're not nearly as sorry as I am. It really used to be fun
>to help younger folk learn, both theory and code, back in the days when
>younger folk were actually interested in learning.

In my experience, younger hams are very much interested in learning. I don't think I would find it so if I were to keep telling them how dumb and lazy I think they are.

> I truly am sorry that times have changed so much, and more's the
> loss for ham radio.

Maybe someday, times will change for me, but to date, I still see the ham radio you once did. Perhaps it is not the times that have changed, Dick.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2329. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-02 03:46:07 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010201224607.15140.00000304@ng-fc1.aol.com>
Source record: 2578

>From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

>Just in case Dick didn't mean that, *I'll* say it -- and mean it! So
>there! What are you going to do about it?

The last time I heard "What are you going to do about it" was in junior high school, Larry. Thanks for the blast from the past.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2330. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-02 03:49:59 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010201224959.15140.00000307@ng-fc1.aol.com>
Source record: 2580

>From: Cecil Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>So you claim to know as much about radios as PhDs in EE?
>Got any proof? What sampling rate does it require to
>reproduce 455 kHz IF information?

Is that really a doctorate-level question in your view, Cecil?

The ARRL Handbook chapter on DSP explains it handily.

You can also find the answer at:

http://www.arrl.org/tis/info/dsp.html

The premise of a doctorate is that the candidate has performed and documented a significant original work. It is unlikely that the question you posed would be asked of the applicant when the candidate defends his or her thesis.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2331. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-02 04:09:03 UTC
From: W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com>
Message-ID: <95dbup$e36$1@iac5.navix.net>
Source record: 2581

Cecil, I told you before, set in the corner and cut paper dolls and leave the big people alone.

Your nonsense and pot stirring gets really old. I know your bored, use some of that time to teach a youngster about ham radio.

"Cecil" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message news:3A79E26D.CCE91EB0@IEEE.org...
> W4JLE wrote:
> > I have to look at you as a representative of ARRL, and by extension infer
> > this is the current attitude in Newington. As such, I will not be renewing
> > my League membership and will be resigning my positions as Technical
> > coordinator, Official Observer and County EC.
>
> Translation: I don't like the new rules so I am identifying a scapegoat,
> being a quitter, taking my marbles, and going home. Fred, the radical
> fringe always reacts that way. Why not join the mainstream? Amateur Radio
> is evolving. Dinosaurs loved to beep. Mammals learned to talk. :-)
> --
> http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2332. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-02 04:13:29 UTC
From: W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com>
Message-ID: <95dc73eaj1@iac5.navix.net>
Source record: 2582

So, let me understand this... Larry calls people names, so Ed calls Larry names...

You are so busy towing the "party" line, you have no respect for anyone who disagrees with it. Is that the way to convince the old hams you are correct? Or do you only take that deferential position when referring to new 5 WPM hams?

"Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net> wrote in message news:w%le6.45$HH5.348256@news.ntplx.net...
> That was not the reason I gave him for my belief that he and we would be
> better off if he let his ticket expire. I don't think that Amateur Radio
> benefits from name calling.

2333. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-02 04:27:42 UTC
From: W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com>
Message-ID: <95dd1oenn1@iac5.navix.net>
Source record: 2583

Let me restate Jim, I can see how what I said could be confusing.

I meant by "older Hams", that group of amateurs who had obtained their licenses under the pre 4/00 rule changes.

There seems to be a one-way street working here, bend over backwards for the new guys (Which I have no problem with welcoming and helping anyone regardless of rule dates) while denigrating the efforts of the "old hams" as ego, pride, elitism, and other terms that imply that if you are not 100% in agreement, you are a less than desirable person. One who's opinions do not matter and are fair game for abuse.

Larry can be a bit of a hardnose, but he is equally correct in his beliefs as anyone else on here. To see him abused by a member of the ARRL staff is so far over the edge, I had to state my feelings. With the exception of Cecil, I think everyone on here has some level that once it is reached. they make a decision to do something else rather than be associated with the abusive group.

The code/nocode has gotten so far out of hand that I don't think we will ever see a resolution in any near future. Bad enough that those that disagree had to grudgingly go along with it, now all the nah nah na nah nah's from the no code folks that feel they have to dance around in glee. Cheered on by no less than Mr. politically correct.

Honest! this is my last word ever on the subject of Code/No Code.
"Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote in message
news:3A7A0E3B.3DFFA63E@uci.edu...
> W4JLE wrote:
>
> > As much as I respect your efforts in ham radio, I despise the attitude
> > you are displaying towards older hams.
>
> K3LT's Birthday (from QRZ): 31 Oct 1952
>
> W1RFI's Birthday (from QRZ): 26 Aug 1950
>
> ac6xg

2334. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-02 04:31:45 UTC
From: W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com>
Message-ID: <95dd9b$eu8$1@iac5.navix.net>
Source record: 2584

Ed, as a representative of the ARRL, I expect you to refrain from personal attacks on people you disagree with. Your message took PERSONAL potshots at Larry, and your excuse was "he did it first."

I have nothing further on the matter.

"W1RFI" <w1rfi@aol.com> wrote in message news:20010201224119.15140.00000302@ng-fc1.aol.com...
> >From: "W4JLE" Fred@w4jle.com
>
> >As much as I respect your efforts in ham radio, I despise the attitude
> >you are displaying towards older hams.
>
> It is not the older hams that I despise at all, Fred; it is the despicable way
> that a few of them are treating the newer hams.
>
> >I have to look at you as a representative of ARRL, and by extension infer
> >this is the current attitude in Newington.
>
> If you want to know the position of ARRL, Fred, you can do so by reading QST or
> the ARRL web pages. If you want to know my personal views, you can read them on
> rrap.
>
> >As such, I will not be renewing my League membership and will be
> >resigning my positions as Technical coordinator, Official Observer
> >and County EC.
>
> Do you really feel that the work you have done is less important than forcing
> me to never post views contrary to yours? I feel that such work is important
> and it is unfortunate if you choose to abandon it.
>
> If these discussions will result in the people on this forum holding such
> actions over my head, perhaps my usefulness here is coming to and end.
>
> Would you like to reach an agreement that you will remain doing what you are
> doing and I will never again post a personal view that is contrary to yours?
> This seems to be what you are trying to accomplish. Have I read your intent

> correctly?
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>

2335. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-02 04:52:23 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A7A3D07.8C0794FA@IEEE.org>
Source record: 2585

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> Cecil wrote:
> > Oh? I haven't noticed a lot of difference besides upgrades. Are
> > hoards of CBers and freebanders still going to invade the ARS?
>
> Cecil I thought you were already here!

Yep, been here for 50 years, ever since you were knee high to a
grasshopper, since before 27MHz was a CB band.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2336. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-02 04:55:30 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A7A3DC2.8D11EF67@IEEE.org>
Source record: 2586

W1RFI wrote:
>
> >From: Cecil Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>
> >So you claim to know as much about radios as PhDs in EE?
> >Got any proof? What sampling rate does it require to
> >reproduce 455 kHz IF information?
>
> Is that really a doctorate-level question in your view, Cecil?

Nope, but I'm not a PhD. :-) And I'll bet 99% of hams don't know
the answer.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2337. DX-405 SOLICITS NUTSACK SLURPING

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-02 06:13:32 UTC
From: KC8JBO <roger_kc8jbo@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <95dj6a$83e$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2587
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.test

LARDASS "DX405" <lightnin9@hotmail.com> jizzburped in message
news:95daju$m80$1@dagobah.blueriver.net...
> Hahaha! That is a really good one about Roger >Wideman.

Yep, that's what your momma said when I had sex with her. She said you
were an "itsy-bitsy" man with no dick. You grossly obese fuckers always
have small pricks, that's why you went into the gay lifestyle.

Has the POLICE been around to see you again, Lllllllloyd???
--
73 de Roger, KC8JBO
EM99 |ARRL|VE [ARRL & W5YI]|ARES |RACES
Yaesu FT-920 |Inverted Vee @ 40 ft.
Yaesu FT-90R

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2338. Re: Long Delay Echos

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-02 10:44:25 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <95e329$ke2$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2588

In article <95d7q2$53h$1@208.206.142.82>,
Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>
>
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > In article <95c0is$p9k$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
> > Steven J Robeson, K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com> wrote:
> > > Anyone have any experience with them?
> > >
> > > 73
> > >
> > > Steve, K4YZ
> >
> > Anomolous propogation. Gave strange echoes on the scope.
>
> Naw, it's just the allwave repeater on the Mother Ship.

The gubmn't wouldn't let us report stuff like that.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2339. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-02 14:25:14 UTC
From: billsohl@mindspring.com
Message-ID: <3a7ac0f1.5171347@news.mindspring.com>
Source record: 2589

On Thu, 1 Feb 2001 23:27:42 -0500, "W4JLE" <Fred@w4jle.com> wrote:

>Let me restate Jim, I can see how what I said could be confusing.
>
>I meant by "older Hams", that group of amateurs who had obtained their
>licenses under the pre 4/00 rule changes.

Many hams fit into both per and post 4/00 changes. I've been licensed
since before 1960 but only have been an Extra since June 00. Frankly,
I see this entire concern or focus on when someone was licensed as
just a waste of time.

>There seems to be a one-way street working here, bend over backwards for the
>new guys (Which I have no problem with welcoming and helping anyone
>regardless of rule dates) while denigrating the efforts of the "old hams" as
>ego, pride, elitism, and other terms that imply that if you are not 100% in
>agreement, you are a less than desirable person.

Personally, I think those that find a need to personally claim
they are better than others because they passed a test (pre 4/00
or whenever) are the ones with the ego problem. I see absolutely
no need for people to puff themselves up because they are
any particular license class. How good a ham someone is
has far more to do with what you do with the license you have rather
than the license itself.

>Larry can be a bit of a hardnose, but he is equally correct in his beliefs
>as anyone else on here. To see him abused by a member of the ARRL staff is
>so far over the edge, I had to state my feelings. With the exception of
>Cecil, I think everyone on here has some level that once it is reached. they
>make a decision to do something else rather than be associated with the
>abusive group.
>
>The code/nocode has gotten so far out of hand that I don't think we will
>ever see a resolution in any near future.

The code/nocode debate will be resolved with WRC-2003 and then
subsequent changes in eac individual administration's test
requirements. Remember, the issue is the code TEST, not
the use of or personal like/dislike of code as a mode.

>Bad enough that those that
>disagree had to grudgingly go along with it, now all the nah nah na nah
>nah's from the no code folks that feel they have to dance around in glee.
>Cheered on by no less than Mr. politically correct.

Who's dancing in glee. The requirements have been changed
and we move on. I see more grieving and complaining from those
that disagree with the new requirements than the converse.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK
ARRL LGL
NCI BOD

2340. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-02 14:28:19 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <95eg63kvf0@208.206.142.91>
Source record: 2590

Cecil wrote:
>
> K0HB wrote:
> >
> > In article <3A79B3A4.28503A64@IEEE.org>,
> > Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> >
> > > I suspect PhDs in EE know a lot more about "amateur"
> > > radios than you do.
> >
> > Your suspicion is inaccurate.
>
> So you claim to know as much about radios as PhDs in EE?
> Got any proof? What sampling rate does it require to
> reproduce 455 kHz IF information?

That little tidbit has absolutely nothing to do with amateur radio. The fact that some receivers use a 455 kHz IF might.

2341. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-02 14:31:09 UTC
From: billsohl@mindspring.com
Message-ID: <3a7ac39e.5857163@news.mindspring.com>
Source record: 2591

On 2 Feb 2001 02:57:37 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
> Ed Hare wrote:
>> Not for most of us, Dick; most of us are still having a good time. I am
>> trulyu sorry that you are not.
>
> Well Ed, you're not nearly as sorry as I am. It really used to be fun
>to help younger folk learn, both theory and code, back in the days when
>younger folk were actually interested in learning. I remember one winter
>in the 70's the Vo-Tec electronics teacher and I spent months teaching a
>ham radio class, and graduated a bunch of new hams. I truly am sorry
>that times have changed so much, and more's the loss for ham radio.

So here we have a total condemnation of all youth by Dick.
Are there truly no youth that have a desire to learn anything?
Me thinks ole Dick doth exaggerate a tad. The issues today as to
why youth don't gravitate to ham radio as much as in the past
has more to do with the alternatives youth have today and
the less "magical" aspect that radio plays in our lives in
general. WE, the already licensed, have the obligation to
pro-actively make ham radio known to as many youth as we
can. If we don't, then we have no one but ourselves to blame
for any lack of new hams.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2342. Re: Long Delay Echos

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-02 14:31:27 UTC
From: "Steven J Robeson", K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <95egc0$un8$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2592

In article <lAle6.44$HH5.345926@news.ntplx.net>,
"Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net> wrote:

> From the QST/QEX search database:

Printed and saved. Thanks, Ed!

73
Steve, K4YZ
--
http://www.qrz.com/k4yz

http://hometown.aol.com/missmytaterbug2/myhomepage/profile.html

"The Measure Of A Man Is Not In How He Touches A Woman, But In How He
Touches A Woman's Heart"

--
http://hometown.aol.com/k4yz/myhomepage/index.html

"The Measure Of A Man Is Not In How He Touches A Woman, But In How He
Touches A Woman's Heart"

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2343. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-02 14:50:28 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <95ehfkoii0@208.206.142.91>
Source record: 2593

W1RFI wrote:
>
> >From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
>
> > Well Ed, you're not nearly as sorry as I am. It really used to be fun
> >to help younger folk learn, both theory and code, back in the days when
> >younger folk were actually interested in learning.
>
> In my experience, younger hams are very much interested in learning.

Where on earth do you find any younger hams today???

I don't
> think I would find it so if I were to keep telling them how dumb and lazy I
> think they are.

It's not the non-existant younger hams who are dumb and lazy. It's the
TESTS that are *dumbed down*, and the 12-15 year or more *middleaged*
hams who have sat and whined about having to pass a code test to get a
HF ham license who are generally considered to be lazy. Got it?

>
> > I truly am sorry that times have changed so much, and more's the
> > loss for ham radio.
>
> Maybe someday, times will change for me, but to date, I still see the ham radio
> you once did. Perhaps it is not the times that have changed, Dick.

It's the times, Ed. I could be more comfortable with it if I had changed
more myself.

2344. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-02 15:21:42 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <3A7AD086.15CCE391@arrl.org>
Source record: 2594

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> Cecil wrote:
> >
> > Got any proof? What sampling rate does it require to
> > reproduce 455 kHz IF information?
>
> That little tidbit has absolutely nothing to do with amateur radio. The
> fact that some receivers use a 455 kHz IF might.

Sampling rates have nothing to do with amateur radio? Sez who?

Of course, Cecil's question lacks sufficient detail to give a numeric answer. And you don't have to be an EE to know that -- just read the Handbook.

Jon

2345. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-02 15:23:08 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <95ejcs$b3$0@208.206.142.91>
Source record: 2595

Cecil wrote:
>
> W1RFI wrote:
> >
> > >From: Cecil Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
> >
> > >So you claim to know as much about radios as PhDs in EE?
> > >Got any proof? What sampling rate does it require to
> > >reproduce 455 kHz IF information?
> >
> > Is that really a doctorate-level question in your view, Cecil?
>
> Nope, but I'm not a PhD. :-) And I'll bet 99% of hams don't know
> the answer.

But any one of them who found that he needed or wanted to know could easily come up with the answer.
And 100% of hams have no imperitive reason to research the answer, as might the small percentage of EEs who need to know that in their particular specialty line of work.
If one can be a complete, successful, *real* ham with nothing more than answering a few questions which have their answers provided in advance, why in the world would any serious number of them feel a need to even ask? Most have no idea what you're talking abouit.

Cecil will never get over it. His EE didn't qualify him for an Extra class ham radio license until the Big Dumb Down, and he still squirms because of it.

2346. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-02 16:20:48 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <95emje$t2v$1@news.service.uci.edu>
Source record: 2596

W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com> wrote in message news:95dd1oenn1@iac5.navix.net...
> Let me restate Jim, I can see how what I said could be confusing.
>
> I meant by "older Hams", that group of amateurs who had obtained their
> licenses under the pre 4/00 rule changes.

> There seems to be a one-way street working here, bend over backwards for
the
> new guys (Which I have no problem with welcoming and helping anyone
> regardless of rule dates) while denigrating the efforts of the "old hams"
as
> ego, pride, elitism, and other terms that imply that if you are not 100%
in
> agreement, you are a less than desirable person. One who's opinions do not
> matter and are fair game for abuse.

Fine business, Fred. How do you see the Amateur Code as fitting into the
kinds of opinions we see expressed here by some of these older hams?

73, Jim AC6XG

2347. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-02 16:51:28 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A7AE590.7DCE0A9C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 2598

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Cecil will never get over it. His EE didn't qualify him for an Extra
> class ham radio license until the Big Dumb Down, and he still squirms
> because of it.

You seem to be the one doing all the squirming, Dick. I merely met
the requirements for the Extra extrance exam.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2348. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-02 17:23:29 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <95eqehgra0@208.206.142.91>
Source record: 2599

Jon Bloom wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > Cecil wrote:
> > >
> > > Got any proof? What sampling rate does it require to
> > > reproduce 455 kHz IF information?
> >
> > That little tidbit has absolutely nothing to do with amateur radio. The
> > fact that some receivers use a 455 kHz IF might.
>
> Sampling rates have nothing to do with amateur radio? Sez who?

SAYS I, of course. It's the TERM that has nothing to do with ham radio. "Sampling rates" are important only to those who prefer to think in such digital terms, for their own reasons. Only when a theorist decides to describe the world in digital terms ascribed to analog systems dot hose digital terms take on importance. The rest of the time the world of ham radio turnsd quite well without them. It did before the first theorist decided to describe the operation of an IF in terms of "sampling rates". It continues to do so to this day, in spite of your leaping to show your grasp of all this new description of old phenomena. So you can calculate whatever that rate might be said to be. So what? It changes nothing whatever of the system, and I guarnatee that I can design and build an IF chain without ever having heard of the term "sampling rate". So as far as the operation of that chain--and the vast numbers of they that have gone before- it means nothing whatever. It just means that some theorist decided to view the world in his own terms.

2349. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-02 17:25:45 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <3A7AED99.58F50DD6@arrl.org>
Source record: 2600

W4JLE wrote:
>
> Let me restate Jim, I can see how what I said could be confusing.
>
> I meant by "older Hams", that group of amateurs who had obtained their
> licenses under the pre 4/00 rule changes.
>
> There seems to be a one-way street working here, bend over backwards for the
> new guys (Which I have no problem with welcoming and helping anyone
> regardless of rule dates) while denigrating the efforts of the "old hams" as
> ego, pride, elitism, and other terms that imply that if you are not 100% in
> agreement, you are a less than desirable person. One who's opinions do not
> matter and are fair game for abuse.

Simply untrue. There are many -- including participants of this forum --
who disagree with the changes and who Ed has never so much as gently
chided, because they have expressed their disagreement while maintaining
respect for those who in turn disagreed with them.

> Larry can be a bit of a hardnose, but he is equally correct in his beliefs
> as anyone else on here. To see him abused by a member of the ARRL staff is
> so far over the edge, I had to state my feelings. With the exception of
> Cecil, I think everyone on here has some level that once it is reached. they
> make a decision to do something else rather than be associated with the
> abusive group.

Larry has stated repeatedly that any ham who has not passed the same
exams Larry has is a lesser ham than Larry. He is not "equally correct"
in that belief although he is, of course, entitled to hold that, or any,
opinion. Ed finds Larry's view distasteful. (So do I.) You may not. But
it is incorrect to say that when Ed expresses his distaste for that view
and the attitude that underlies it, he is denigrating that group of
amateurs who obtained their licenses under the pre 4/00 rule changes.
For one thing, he'd be denigrating himself. For another, the members of
that group of licensees by no means all subscribe to Larry's view of ham
strata. In my experience, very few of them do.

Reviewing the exchange that Ed was referring to:

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> In article <3A76E8A4.CD47059E@IEEE.org>, Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>
> >Yep, when my three year old grandson grows up and becomes an Extra,
> >Dick will still be calling him a pseudoExtra.
>

> I'll call him a "dumbed-down Nickle-Extra" myself. However,
> PseudoExtra does have a nice ring to it! Kinda grows on you,
> doesn't it?

The attitude expressed by Larry deserves, and got, censure. In brief, Ed attacked the views and attitude expressed by Larry. That does not constitute an attack on all older (by any definition) hams, or even an attack on those who believe in code testing. It is merely an attack on an unconscionable denigration of the innocent.

> The code/nocode has gotten so far out of hand that I don't think we will
> ever see a resolution in any near future. Bad enough that those that
> disagree had to grudgingly go along with it, now all the nah nah na nah
> nah's from the no code folks that feel they have to dance around in glee.
> Cheered on by no less than Mr. politically correct.

Those who belittle hams who did not obtain their licenses under the old system deserve to have that behavior treated with comtempt because it is comtemptible. That has nothing to do with one's opinion of the value of code testing.

Jon

2350. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-02 17:39:59 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <3A7AF0EF.E433D0C0@arrl.org>
Source record: 2651

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> Jon Bloom wrote:
> >
> > Sampling rates have nothing to do with amateur radio? Sez who?
>
> *SAYS I*, of course. It's the TERM that has nothing to do with ham
> radio. "Sampling rates" are important only to those who prefer to think
> in such digital terms, for their own reasons. Only when a theorist
> decides to describe the world in digital terms ascribed to analog
> systems dot hose digital terms take on importance. The rest of the time
> the world of ham radio turnsd quite well without them. It did before the
> first theorist decided to describe the operation of an IF in terms of
> "sampling rates". It continues to do so to this day, in spite of your
> leaping to show your grasp of all this new description of old phenomena.
> So you can calculate whatever that rate might be said to be. So what?
> It changes nothing whatever of the system, and I guarnatee that I can
> design and build an IF chain without ever having heard of the term
> "sampling rate". So as far as the operation of that chain--and the vast
> numbers of they that have gone before- it means nothing whatever. It
> just means that some theorist decided to view the world in his own
> terms.

If I understand what you are saying, "sampling rate" is just a term used to describe analog systems in digital terms. Well, that's a peculiar view. The purpose of sampling is to transform continuous-time (analog) data to discrete-time data so that it can be processed by discrete-time systems (digital computers). That is far more than just a theoretical exercise. It has practical, real-world application.

Of course it is possible to build a radio without sampling. No one said it wasn't. But that's not the question. The question is, does building radios that make use of sampling have anything to do with ham radio? When people build radios for amateur use that do use sampling, are they not pursuing ham radio? I think so.

Look, of course it's not necessary for hams to understand sampling in order to pursue ham radio. What I don't understand is why you react to Cecil's prodding by taking the polar opposite view that says that technologies that are in use in ham radio but that are not the technologies you prefer "have nothing to do with amateur radio." Im my view, that is not one whit different from those who denigrate CW because it doesn't interest them, which attitude you have decried more than once.

Jon

2351. Re: Good learning website

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-02 17:48:56 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <95eru4ada1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2655

In article <95cbjkojp0@208.206.142.95>,
Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

> Hey all you Novices and other Extras out there who might want to
> upgrade your knowledge, if not your license - check this one out...

Great site, Dick.

Another great one is Ian Purdie's (VK2TIP) site at

http://www.electronics-tutorials.com/

73, Hans, K0HB
--
"We are fellow travelers on a journey between two
eternities, and it's a trip far too brief for me
to be concerned about your speed at the Code of
Morse."

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2352. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-02 17:49:32 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <95ervc$k9b$1@208.206.142.91>
Source record: 2652

Cecil wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Cecil will never get over it. His EE didn't qualify him for an Extra
> > class ham radio license until the Big Dumb Down, and he still squirms
> > because of it.
>
> You seem to be the one doing all the squirming, Dick.

Really? Trying to divert attention again?

I merely met
> the requirements for the Extra extrance exam.

Uh, yes, just as I did over thirty years ago.

2353. Re: West Virginia farm boy comes of age

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-02 17:57:23 UTC
From: Jim Alder <jimalder@sssnet.com>
Message-ID: <3A7AF503.A5E88E57@sssnet.com>
Source record: 2653
Cross-posted to: alt.fan.rush-limbaugh,alt.law-enforcement,alt.rush-limbaugh,alt.society.liberalism,misc.survivalism,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,talk.politics.guns,talk.politics.misc

Welcome to alt.oldjoke! Why does everyone think they
are the first person to hear a joke? One thing I can't
stand about internet 'humor' is that everyone tries to
rewrite the old joke to make it ten times as long. For
some reason that's supposed to make it funnier?

N9NWO wrote:
>
> Stagger Lee <SLee@houston.net> wrote ...
> There is a story about a kid from a farm just outside of Glendale, WV
> and one of the local bars there.
>
> The kid's name was Roger.
>
> It seems that he had just turned 21 and his father let him go into town
> alone to buy supplies and feed. Since it was his first trip to town as
> a man, his dad told Roger to go ahead and buy himself a beer while he
> was there.
>
> Roger finished up at the feed store and went to the bar to do as his dad
> said he could. He ordered a beer and the bartender asked if he was new
> around town. As he was telling the bartender his history, a stunningly
> beautiful young woman came into the bar and sat down beside Roger.
> Roger was so powerfully affected by her presence that he began to lose
> track of his conversation with the bartender and to stammer just a bit.
>
> He turned to the girl and attempted to start up a conversation with her,
> but she seemed to be distracted. She always answered him politely, but
> acted as if she didn't really want to talk to him.
>
> A few minutes later, a second beautiful girl entered the bar. She
> immediately struck up a conversation with the first girl, and eventually
> they left the bar together.
>
> "Don't worry" said the bartender "she wouldn't ever have gotten
> interested in you. She's a lesbian."
>
> "What's a lesbian?" asked Roger.
>
> "Well see, it's this way: Lesbians only think about girls. They want
> to hang out with girls, they want to kiss girls, and they want to sleep
> with girls."
>

> "Get it?"
>
> "Um, yeah" Roger said, and then left to bring his supplies home.
>
> A few weeks later, Roger was back in Glendale and he stopped at the same
> bar again. After he'd ordered a beer and was sitting there drinking it,
> a talkative stranger entered the bar. He was a salesman and told Roger
> all about how wonderful his job was. Eventually he said to Roger, "Yep,
> I'm a salesman and proud of it. What are you?"
>
> Roger blushed, looked at the floor, and said "I'm a lesbian."

--
I sometimes think of what future historians
will say of us. A single sentence will
suffice for modern man: he fornicated and
read the papers. After that rigorous
definition, the subject will be, if I may
say so, exhausted. - The Fall; Camus

2354. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-02 17:57:56 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <95esf4$lk8$0@208.206.142.91>
Source record: 2654

Jon, I think Cecil's point flew right past you. He indicated that a Phd EE automatically knows more about ham radio than a ham without the degree. I say nonsense. I'm sure you could easily find a Phd EE who knows all about sampling rates but who has never heard of ham radio.

Dick

2355. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-02 18:01:54 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A7AF612.D41D4ED6@IEEE.org>
Source record: 2657

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> Cecil wrote:
> > You seem to be the one doing all the squirming, Dick.
>
> Really? Trying to divert attention again?

You're the one who is unhappy and trying to divert attention from
the present requirements for an Extra License back to what they were
in the past. I'm completely happy with the present situation.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2356. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-02 18:04:19 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A7AF6A3.56FD96A5@IEEE.org>
Source record: 2658

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> Cecil wrote:
> > So you claim to know as much about radios as PhDs in EE?
> > Got any proof? What sampling rate does it require to
> > reproduce 455 kHz IF information?
>
> That little tidbit has absolutely nothing to do with amateur radio. The
> fact that some receivers use a 455 kHz IF might.

There are a couple of ham transceivers already on the market using that generic technique, Dick. If you weren't living in the past, you would know that. In the future, more and more top of the line amateur radio transceivers will use digitized IF techniques.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2357. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-02 18:06:09 UTC
From: K0HB@USWEST.NET
Message-ID: <95esuh$h1m$1@news.netmar.com>
Source record: 2597

In article <95dd1oenn1@iac5.navix.net>, W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com> writes:

> I meant by "older Hams", that group of amateurs who had obtained their
> licenses under the pre 4/00 rule changes.

I obtained my current license under the "pre 6/63" rule changes, but I
have no reason to believe that someone who got their license as recently
as yesterday is any less qualified than I am. In fact, some might argue
that they are likely to be more qualified since their examination was on
topics more advanced than my examination.

> To see him abused by a member of the ARRL staff is so far over the
> edge, I had to state my feelings.

What "abuse"? W1RFI is one of the most even-handed contributors
to discussions here, stating his views politely and clearly without
abusive language. We don't link your comments to your employer, and
Ed is careful in all cases not to link his comments to his employer,
so your gratuitous slam at ARRL is unwarranted.

73, Hans, K0HB

----- Posted via NewsOne.Net: Free (anonymous) Usenet News via the Web -----
http://newsone.net/ -- Free reading and anonymous posting to 60,000+ groups
NewsOne.Net prohibits users from posting spam. If this or other posts
made through NewsOne.Net violate posting guidelines, email abuse@newsone.net

2358. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-02 18:10:32 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <3A7AF818.42D27749@arrl.org>
Source record: 2656

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> Jon, I think Cecil's point flew right past you. He indicated that a Phd
> EE automatically knows more about ham radio than a ham without the
> degree. I say nonsense. I'm sure you could easily find a Phd EE who
> knows all about sampling rates but who has never heard of ham radio.

I've known many EEs whose knowledge of ham radio was scanty. Just
because I disagree with something you said to Cecil doesn't mean I agree
with him. If you had said that an understanding of sampling rate was not
needed in order to participate in ham radio, fine. But when you said it
has nothing to do with ham radio, I just had to disagree.

Jon

2359. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-02 18:15:16 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A7AF934.5649AB68@IEEE.org>
Source record: 2660

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> Jon Bloom wrote:
> > Sampling rates have nothing to do with amateur radio? Sez who?
>
> *SAYS I*, of course. It's the TERM that has nothing to do with ham
> radio. "Sampling rates" are important only to those who prefer to think
> in such digital terms, for their own reasons.

Dick, Dick, Dick, most top of the line ham transceivers use sampling rates right now. A few of them sample at the IF frequency. Even my $1000 IC-706 uses sampling rates. Any Extra who doesn't want to understand sampling rates chooses not to understand modern day ham radio. You are burying your head in the sands of time. As time moves on and progress happens, more and more of your precious analog functions will be replaced by DSP techniques.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2360. Re: Long Delay Echos

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-02 18:21:17 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A7AFA9D.1EBC2445@IEEE.org>
Source record: 2661

K0HB@USWEST.NET wrote:
>
> In article <3A79E3DB.B1F0D00A@IEEE.org>, Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
> writes:
>
> >At the height of the best sunspot cycle of all time, we hams at
> >Texas A&M could send a 'didit' on 10m and hear it coming back
> >from around the world. It was smeared but it was there.
>
> W0UN tells of the time, zero-dark-thirty in the CQWWDX test, sitting in the
> 10M chair of his multi-multi in Colorado with the beam to the east, hearing
> his "CQ TEST DE W0UN" being repeated back to him perfectly, just slightly off
> his frequency. He was getting a bit perturbed at the jammer, until he noted
> the moon rising directly on the azimuth of his 4over4over4 10M array.

That might be useful at the depth of the sunspot cycle. :-)
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2361. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-02 18:27:41 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <95eu6hcjt1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2662

In article <95esf4$lk8$0@208.206.142.91>,
Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

> I'm sure you could easily find a Phd EE who knows all
> about sampling rates but who has never heard of ham radio.

Really?

Go down to the r.r.a.p. machine room and tell them to empty the
bit bucket, and FAST, before that baby overflows.

73, de Hans, K0HB

--
"We are fellow travelers on a journey between two
eternities, and it's a trip far too brief for me
to be concerned about your speed at the Code of
Morse."

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2362. Re: Morse Code replacement? Bigtime flame war article!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-02 18:42:41 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <95ev2t$de8$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2663

In article <95d79o$3bs$0@208.206.142.82>,
Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>
>
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > In article <9589hd$88c$0@208.206.142.67>,
> > Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
> >
> > > Yeah,we know....that's the very reason why darn few will ever
bother
> > to
> > > learn it at all when the code test requirement evaporates, and all
the
> > > more reason why even fewer 5wpm types will even be interested in
using
> > > it enough to develop faster skills. Sure, a few will be intrigued
and
> > > spend a little time at it, at least until the new wears off and
well
> > > before most ever gain sufficient skill to feel comfortable working
> > > higher speeds. THAT is human nature. And we already know your
story
> > > line, you learned it in Cub Scouts well before you ever heard of
ham
> > > radio. Or the Internet or any othe computer or radio or TV or or
or or
> > > or........Sorry those days are all gone.
> >
> > Dick, if those days are gone then its time you picked up the pieces
of
> > your shattered life and move on. To think that you and Larry have
been
> > lying to me about how PEEU the code is and now you say its only
worth
> > learning if the gubmn't puts a gun to your head.
> >
>
> So the gov't had a gun to your head for 13 years? Finally had mercy on
> you and took it away?

Not exactly. They pulled the trigger and the hammer fell on an empty
chamber. The same as your empty promises of how useful and necessary
the Morse code is. Seems even you think it doesn't have enough merit to

stand on its own.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2363. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-02 18:53:53 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <95evnr$ea0$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2664

In article <3A79E320.64206815@IEEE.org>,
Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:

> What sampling rate does it require to
> reproduce 455 kHz IF information?

First off, any competent-in-DSP bench technician (let alone PhD EE)
would scoff at 455KHz as a proper IF choice for DSP techniques.

Second, that same technician would scoff at the simplistic nature of
your question, in that it displays a basic ignorance of the information
needed in determining what sampling rate to employ.

73, Hans, K0HB
--
"We are fellow travelers on a journey between two
eternities, and it's a trip far too brief for me
to be concerned about your speed at the Code of
Morse."

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2364. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-02 19:25:42 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A7B09B6.A52BBC79@uci.edu>
Source record: 2665

Dick Carroll wrote:
> > What sampling rate does it require to
> > reproduce 455 kHz IF information?

> That little tidbit has absolutely nothing to do with amateur radio. The
> fact that some receivers use a 455 kHz IF might.

Actually it has a lot to do with how many downconversions have to be made before an ADC can convert the signal for use by a DSP. Right now the DSP rigs have "IF" frequencies in the audio range. It would be nice to be able to do DSP up at the front end of the radio, but the sampling rate is too high for currently available technology. Prolly won't be long though. Nyquist had something to say about Cecil's question I think.

73, ac6xg

2365. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-02 19:32:20 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A7B0B43.86C16727@IEEE.org>
Source record: 2666

Jim Kelley wrote:
> Nyquist had something to say about Cecil's question I
> think.

Actually, as Jon pointed out, my question was poorly worded. It
is possible to recover the audio modulation on an RF carrier
by sampling at a rate below two times the RF frequency.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2366. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-02 19:40:06 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A7B0D16.52C069AA@IEEE.org>
Source record: 2670

K0HB wrote:
>
> In article <3A79E320.64206815@IEEE.org>,
> Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
>
> > What sampling rate does it require to
> > reproduce 455 kHz IF information?
>
> First off, any competent-in-DSP bench technician (let alone PhD EE)
> would scoff at 455KHz as a proper IF choice for DSP techniques.

Do you realize that it is possible to recover the information by
sampling at a rate lower than 910,000 samples per second? I doubt
that the scoffing technician knows that. The scoffing technician
would probably say that violates the Nyquist principle.

> Second, that same technician would scoff at the simplistic nature of
> your question, in that it displays a basic ignorance of the information
> needed in determining what sampling rate to employ.

It was poorly worded. However, the meaning of the question was not
simplistic. You don't have to sample at 910,000 samples per second
to recover all the information assuming all the information is
riding *on* the carrier and not embedded *in* the carrier.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2367. Re: Good learning website

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-02 19:45:25 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010202144525.22631.00001628@nso-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 2667

In article <95eru4ada1@nnrp1.deja.com>, K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org> writes:

>In article <95cbjkojp0@208.206.142.95>,
> Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>
>> Hey all you Novices and other Extras out there who might want to
>> upgrade your knowledge, if not your license - check this one out...
>
>Great site, Dick.
>
>Another great one is Ian Purdie's (VK2TIP) site at
>
> http://www.electronics-tutorials.com/
>
>73, Hans, K0HB

A source of links to many other sites having tutorials, references, glossaries, etc. is

http://www.eevl.ac.uk

...a UK site maintained by Edinburgh University (?, U of E?). The amateur radio links are handled by a US photographer-ham.

The Carroll-mentioned site is "Integrated Publishing" which has a number of "courses" which are copies of older US Navy instructional textbooks. While good, they can be termed "knock-offs" in the publishing trade since US government info is not copyrighted. Almost everything publicly published by the US government can be scanned, duplicated, published at will. [Case in point is the long-running "J. K. Lasser's Your Income Tax" softbounds that used to be on newsstands...almost entirely a knock-off of free US IRS documents]

The average amateur can better spend their time studying the ARRL or RSGB amateur handbooks, get the same information and considerably more about amateur radio in specifics than someone's copying of a US government tutorial.

didit

2368. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-02 19:45:26 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010202144526.22631.00001629@nso-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 2669

In article <95ehfkoii0@208.206.142.91>, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
writes:

>W1RFI wrote:
>>
>> >From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
>>
>> > Well Ed, you're not nearly as sorry as I am. It really used to be fun
>> >to help younger folk learn, both theory and code, back in the days when
>> >younger folk were actually interested in learning.
>>
>> In my experience, younger hams are very much interested in learning.
>
> Where on earth do you find any younger hams today???

In driving around yesterday I saw two vehicles with ham plates,
drivers appearing about thirty-something. The customers at
the Burbank, CA, HRO branch store seem to be under 50 as
a general rule.

In order to find "younger people," one has to get out among
the public, not staying with the "old crowd" (of like-minded
people).

> I don't
>> think I would find it so if I were to keep telling them how dumb and lazy I
>> think they are.
>
> It's not the non-existant younger hams who are dumb and lazy. It's the
>TESTS that are *dumbed down*, and the 12-15 year or more *middleaged*
>hams who have sat and whined about having to pass a code test to get a
>HF ham license who are generally considered to be lazy. Got it?

So...you feel that the "non-lazy" people have to get out there to
struggle and work like you did? Are you the model of what
everyone "should be?"

I saw Ed Hare's posting of the old Novice Study Guide. Couldn't
be any simpler than that. Seems like the old Novice test itself
was very simple at that time, wasn't it?

Is amateur radio supposed to be all about using CW on HF?

>> > I truly am sorry that times have changed so much, and more's the
>> > loss for ham radio.
>>
>> Maybe someday, times will change for me, but to date, I still see the ham

>> radio you once did. Perhaps it is not the times that have changed, Dick.
>
>It's the times, Ed. I could be more comfortable with it if I had changed
>more myself.

I went through the same "times" as everyone else and don't see
any of this "dumbing-down" or the "laziness." Everyone should
attempt to adapt to "times" which are constantly changing. The
"times" don't stop for those who give up adapting. The "times" are
not geared for those who think that everything was for them alone.
Why are you so insistent on holding everyone else back to your
standards?

didit

2369. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-02 19:45:27 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010202144527.22631.00001630@nso-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 2668

In article <95eg63kvf0@208.206.142.91>, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
writes:

>Cecil wrote:
>>
>> K0HB wrote:
>> >
>> > In article <3A79B3A4.28503A64@IEEE.org>,
>> > Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
>> >
>> > > I suspect PhDs in EE know a lot more about "amateur"
>> > > radios than you do.
>> >
>> > Your suspicion is inaccurate.
>>
>> So you claim to know as much about radios as PhDs in EE?
>> Got any proof? What sampling rate does it require to
>> reproduce 455 kHz IF information?
>
>That little tidbit has absolutely nothing to do with amateur radio. The
>fact that some receivers use a 455 kHz IF might.

On the contrary, with a progression towards digital techniques,
receivers can and do use sampling and subsequent Digital
Signal Processing for both demodulation and "brick-wall"
filtering for the absolute least possible receiving bandwidth.

The normal sampling rate for a 455 KHz IF would be above
the "Nyquist limit" or roughly 2 1/2 times (minimum) rate of
the IF (1.138 MHz, minimum) for an accurate sampling.
That will reproduce the IF accurately enough to permit
digital demodulation.

There are techniques called "undersampling" at rates less
than the IF center frequency but those generally go into
non-standard (even for DSP) techniques which take a lot
more study of that part of technology.

For a good introduction on DSP there is the ARRL Handbook
section on it, written by Jon Bloom. Good stuff, but one has
to buckle down and STUDY it to grasp what is possible.

The ARRL Technical Information center on the League's
website has some very good articles using sampling and
DSP in amateur radio, written by radio amateurs. Free PDF
downloads for members or non-members. [hats off to the

ARRL for that whole website section!]

...or...one can vegetate amidst perceived past glories of
learning things a long time ago and ignore all the
state of the art advances that keep happening...and rely
on the designers and manufacturers to keep turning out
ready-built equipment using new techniques and complain
about front-panel controls that aren't like your old radios.

didit

2370. Re: Long Delay Echos

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-02 19:46:53 UTC
From: K0HB@USWEST.NET
Message-ID: <95f2rdkgf1@news.netmar.com>
Source record: 2659

In article <3A79E3DB.B1F0D00A@IEEE.org>, Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
writes:

>At the height of the best sunspot cycle of all time, we hams at
>Texas A&M could send a 'didit' on 10m and hear it coming back
>from around the world. It was smeared but it was there.

W0UN tells of the time, zero-dark-thirty in the CQWWDX test, sitting in the
10M chair of his multi-multi in Colorado with the beam to the east, hearing
his "CQ TEST DE W0UN" being repeated back to him perfectly, just slightly off
his frequency. He was getting a bit perturbed at the jammer, until he noted
the moon rising directly on the azimuth of his 4over4over4 10M array.

73, de Hans, K0HB

----- Posted via NewsOne.Net: Free (anonymous) Usenet News via the Web -----
http://newsone.net/ -- Free reading and anonymous posting to 60,000+ groups
NewsOne.Net prohibits users from posting spam. If this or other posts
made through NewsOne.Net violate posting guidelines, email abuse@newsone.net

2371. Re: Long Delay Echos

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-02 19:57:39 UTC
From: "Steven J Robeson", K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <95f3fdhsc1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2673

In article <95f2rdkgf1@news.netmar.com>,
K0HB@USWEST.NET wrote:

>W0UN tells of the time, zero-dark-thirty in the CQWWDX test, sitting
>in the 10M chair of his multi-multi in Colorado with the beam to the
>east, hearing his "CQ TEST DE W0UN" being repeated back to him
>perfectly, just slightly off his frequency. He was getting a bit
>perturbed at the jammer, until he noted the moon rising directly on
>the azimuth of his 4over4over4 10M array.

I bet he had a heck of a time getting "CQ" Magazine to accept THAT
one for contest credit!

73
Steve
--
"It Could Be That Your Life's Only Meaning Is To Serve As A Warning To
Others Of How Bad It Could REALLY Be!"

"When You Earnestly Believe You Can Compensate For A Lack OF Skill By
Doubling Your Efforts, There's No End To What You Can't Do"

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2372. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-02 20:03:06 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A7B127A.E1FA8C7A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 2674

Dick Carroll wrote:
> I didn't say that sampling rates
> have nothing to do with ham radio, I said that his little snippet of
> information does not.

Who's squirming now? :-) In Texas we call that "crawfishing".
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2373. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-02 20:03:41 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <95f3qt$b4s$0@208.207.71.174>
Source record: 2671

Jon Bloom wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > Jon, I think Cecil's point flew right past you. He indicated that a Phd
> > EE automatically knows more about ham radio than a ham without the
> > degree. I say nonsense. I'm sure you could easily find a Phd EE who
> > knows all about sampling rates but who has never heard of ham radio.
>
> I've known many EEs whose knowledge of ham radio was scanty. Just
> because I disagree with something you said to Cecil doesn't mean I agree
> with him. If you had said that an understanding of sampling rate was not
> needed in order to participate in ham radio, fine. But when you said it
> has nothing to do with ham radio, I just had to disagree.
>

Jon, what I said was "That little tidbit (of information) has nothing
to do with ham radio". And it doesn't. I didn't say that sampling rates
have nothing to do with ham radio, I said that his little snippet of
information does not.
A case could be made that says anything electronic has something to do
with ham radio, just as one can - and is now being donein several
imnfluential circles- that theory in general has nothing to do with it.

Dick

2374. Re: Morse Code replacement? Bigtime flame war article!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-02 20:05:44 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A7B1318.2704BF57@IEEE.org>
Source record: 2675

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Seems like you the rest just like you are too ignorant to understand
> that no code "stands on its own", they all must be supported.

Not all codes are supported through governmental force, Dick. Most
codes stand on their own merits in a free market economy.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2375. Re: Morse Code replacement? Bigtime flame war article!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-02 20:07:07 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <95f41b$b4s$1@208.207.71.174>
Source record: 2672

Brian wrote:
> > I

Seems even you think it doesn't have enough merit to
> stand on its own.

Seems like you the rest just like you are too ignorant to understand
that no code "stands on its own", they all must be supported.

2376. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-02 20:17:23 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <3A7B15D3.DFA7583@arrl.org>
Source record: 2676

Cecil wrote:
>
> It was poorly worded. However, the meaning of the question was not
> simplistic. You don't have to sample at 910,000 samples per second
> to recover all the information assuming all the information is
> riding *on* the carrier and not embedded *in* the carrier.

What does THAT mean? I've never before heard a distinction made between information "riding on" a carrier and information "embedded in" a carrier. Can you describe both a "riding on" modulator and an "embedded in" modulator?

Oh, by the way, the sampling rate that satifies Nyquist for your 455-kHz IF is the rate that is twice the bandwidth (not center frequency) of the IF, although practical difficulties may require a somewhat higher rate.

Jon

2377. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-02 20:35:38 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <3A7B1A1A.4A7E536E@arrl.org>
Source record: 2677

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> The normal sampling rate for a 455 KHz IF would be above
> the "Nyquist limit" or roughly 2 1/2 times (minimum) rate of
> the IF (1.138 MHz, minimum) for an accurate sampling.
> That will reproduce the IF accurately enough to permit
> digital demodulation.

I'm not sure where the 2-1/2 value comes from. Some rule of thumb, I suppose. But the Nyquist frequency is 2 times the highest frequency present in the signal being sampled. For this hypothetical case of direct sampling (no undersampling) a 455-kHz IF, you would select the IF filter attenuation that reduces the signal to a negligible level (say 90 dB attenuation, just to pick a number), find the frequency of the 90-dB point on the high side of the filter, then double that frequency to find the minimum sampling frequency. That's likely to be below 1.138 MHz unless your IF filter is 200 kHz wide (unlikely for a 455-kHz IF).

But if you have a sampling A/D that can sample at a MHz, you can undersample at a rate at or above 2 times the IF bandwidth (the 90-dB bandwidth, in this case) and save yourself the need to decimate the 1-MHz sampling rate down to something more tractable. There is nothing the least bit tricky about undersampling. One of the first tings I did when I got my first TI DSP evaluation board was to undersample the IF output of my TS-930 and make my own DSP SSB demod.

> For a good introduction on DSP there is the ARRL Handbook
> section on it, written by Jon Bloom. Good stuff, but one has
> to buckle down and STUDY it to grasp what is possible.

Actually, they've replaced the chapter I wrote with one written by Doug Smith, KF6DX. Still worth reading, though!

Jon

2378. Re: Long Delay Echos

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-02 20:38:23 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <3A7B1ABF.A1E0DB48@arrl.org>
Source record: 2678

Steven, J, Robeson, K4YZ wrote:
>
> In article <95f2rdkgf1@news.netmar.com>,
> K0HB@USWEST.NET wrote:
>
> >W0UN tells of the time, zero-dark-thirty in the CQWWDX test, sitting
> >in the 10M chair of his multi-multi in Colorado with the beam to the
> >east, hearing his "CQ TEST DE W0UN" being repeated back to him
> >perfectly, just slightly off his frequency. He was getting a bit
> >perturbed at the jammer, until he noted the moon rising directly on
> >the azimuth of his 4over4over4 10M array.
>
> I bet he had a heck of a time getting "CQ" Magazine to accept THAT
> one for contest credit!

What's even worse, the other fellow wouldn't QSL! :-)

Jon

2379. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-02 21:20:48 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <3A7B24B0.F9B9905A@arrl.org>
Source record: 2679

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> I didn't say that sampling rates
> have nothing to do with ham radio,

I said:
> > Sampling rates have nothing to do with amateur radio? Sez who?
You said:
> *SAYS I*, of course.

So, you're right, you didn't say sampling rates have nothing to do with ham radio; you said they have nothing to do with *amateur* radio.

> A case could be made that says anything electronic has something to do
> with ham radio,

Yes, at least any part of electronics that has to with radio communication. That's pretty much my point in a nutshell.

> just as one can - and is now being donein several
> imnfluential circles- that theory in general has nothing to do with it.

I don't think that case can be successfully made. Nor am I familiar with the influential circles where making that case is being attempted. Can you be more specific?

Jon

2380. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-02 21:47:50 UTC
From: W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com>
Message-ID: <95f9uhisf1@iac5.navix.net>
Source record: 2680

If you are dealing with an IF signal, under sampling is the only practical way to go, couple it with a brick wall filter. This allows a sample rate related to the bandwidth as opposed to frequency.

Fs=0(2BW)<<2F/h

If your interested, I would be glad to post the DSP section of a receiver I have been building.

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message news:20010202144527.22631.00001630@nso-fz.aol.com...
> In article <95eg63kvf0@208.206.142.91>, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
> writes:
>
> >Cecil wrote:
> >>
> >> K0HB wrote:
> >> >
> >> > In article <3A79B3A4.28503A64@IEEE.org>,
> >> > Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> >> >
> >> > > I suspect PhDs in EE know a lot more about "amateur"
> >> > > radios than you do.
> >> >
> >> > Your suspicion is inaccurate.
> >>
> >> So you claim to know as much about radios as PhDs in EE?
> >> Got any proof? What sampling rate does it require to
> >> reproduce 455 kHz IF information?
> >
> >That little tidbit has absolutely nothing to do with amateur radio. The
> >fact that some receivers use a 455 kHz IF might.
>
> On the contrary, with a progression towards digital techniques,
> receivers can and do use sampling and subsequent Digital
> Signal Processing for both demodulation and "brick-wall"
> filtering for the absolute least possible receiving bandwidth.
>
> The normal sampling rate for a 455 KHz IF would be above
> the "Nyquist limit" or roughly 2 1/2 times (minimum) rate of
> the IF (1.138 MHz, minimum) for an accurate sampling.
> That will reproduce the IF accurately enough to permit
> digital demodulation.
>
> There are techniques called "undersampling" at rates less

> than the IF center frequency but those generally go into
> non-standard (even for DSP) techniques which take a lot
> more study of that part of technology.
>
> For a good introduction on DSP there is the ARRL Handbook
> section on it, written by Jon Bloom. Good stuff, but one has
> to buckle down and STUDY it to grasp what is possible.
>
> The ARRL Technical Information center on the League's
> website has some very good articles using sampling and
> DSP in amateur radio, written by radio amateurs. Free PDF
> downloads for members or non-members. [hats off to the
> ARRL for that whole website section!]
>
> ...or...one can vegetate amidst perceived past glories of
> learning things a long time ago and ignore all the
> state of the art advances that keep happening...and rely
> on the designers and manufacturers to keep turning out
> ready-built equipment using new techniques and complain
> about front-panel controls that aren't like your old radios.
>
> didit

2381. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-02 21:59:15 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A7B2DB3.486DF79C@uci.edu>
Source record: 2681

Cecil wrote:
>
> Jim Kelley wrote:
> > Nyquist had something to say about Cecil's question I
> > think.
>
> Actually, as Jon pointed out, my question was poorly worded. It
> is possible to recover the audio modulation on an RF carrier
> by sampling at a rate below two times the RF frequency.

Okay then.

Please change my statement to: Nyquist had nothing to say about Cecil's question.

ac6xg

2382. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-02 22:29:10 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A7B34B6.A062A45D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 2683

Jon Bloom wrote:
> What does THAT mean? I've never before heard a distinction made between
> information "riding on" a carrier and information "embedded in" a
> carrier. Can you describe both a "riding on" modulator and an "embedded
> in" modulator?

You never heard of a Z0-match before our email interchange, either.
(I still have a copy of that email.) And if I remember right, I'm
the guy who taught you about the Goertzel algorithm.

Bell 103 is an example of information riding on a carrier.
CCIT V.36 is an example of information embedded in a carrier.

In general, if the BPS rate is less than the frequency of the tone,
the information is riding on the tone, e.g. FSK. In general, if the
BPS rate is higher than the frequency of the tone, the information is
embedded in the tone, e.g. M-ary-QPSK.

One can undersample an average FSK signal and still recover all the
information. I don't believe one can under-sample an M-ary-QPSK signal
and still recover all the information. But I could be wrong since I
haven't looked at this stuff since I retired. (The latest Science News
reports that scientists have figured out how to make water flow uphill. :-)

> Oh, by the way, the sampling rate that satifies Nyquist for your 455-kHz
> IF is the rate that is twice the bandwidth (not center frequency) of the
> IF, although practical difficulties may require a somewhat higher rate.

Depends on the boundary conditions. You cannot closely re-create
the 455 kHz IF frequency waveform unless you honor the Nyquist requirements
for the highest existing frequency and that's usually higher than double
the bandwidth. There are naturally occurring phase shifts in the 455kHz
carrier signal which cannot be duplicated with under-sampling. Like my
original question, you neglected to state your boundary conditions.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2383. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-02 22:29:35 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A7B34CF.E399BBF4@IEEE.org>
Source record: 2682

Jon Bloom wrote:
> What does THAT mean? I've never before heard a distinction made between
> information "riding on" a carrier and information "embedded in" a
> carrier. Can you describe both a "riding on" modulator and an "embedded
> in" modulator?

You never heard of a Z0-match before our email interchange, either.
(I still have a copy of that email.) And if I remember right, I'm
the guy who taught you about the Goertzel algorithm.

Bell 103 is an example of information riding on a carrier.
CCIT V.36 is an example of information embedded in a carrier.

In general, if the BPS rate is less than the frequency of the tone,
the information is riding on the tone, e.g. FSK. In general, if the
BPS rate is higher than the frequency of the tone, the information is
embedded in the tone, e.g. M-ary-QPSK.

One can undersample an average FSK signal and still recover all the
information. I don't believe one can under-sample an M-ary-QPSK signal
and still recover all the information. But I could be wrong since I
haven't looked at this stuff since I retired. (The latest Science News
reports that scientists have figured out how to make water flow uphill. :-)

> Oh, by the way, the sampling rate that satifies Nyquist for your 455-kHz
> IF is the rate that is twice the bandwidth (not center frequency) of the
> IF, although practical difficulties may require a somewhat higher rate.

Depends on the boundary conditions. You cannot closely re-create
the 455 kHz IF frequency waveform unless you honor the Nyquist requirements
for the highest existing frequency and that's usually higher than double
the bandwidth. There are naturally occurring phase shifts in the 455kHz
carrier signal which cannot be duplicated with under-sampling. Like my
original question, you neglected to state your boundary conditions.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2384. Re: Morse Code replacement? Bigtime flame war article!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-02 23:01:11 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <95fe7g$s4k$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2684

In article <95f41b$b4s$1@208.207.71.174>,
Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>
>
> Brian wrote:
>
> Seems even you think it doesn't have enough merit to
> > stand on its own.
>
> Seems like you the rest just like you are too ignorant to understand
> that no code "stands on its own", they all must be supported.
>

I think that you've been on government assistance so long that you think
everyone's on it.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2385. Re: DX-405 SOLICITS NUTSACK SLURPING

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-02 23:38:08 UTC
From: DX405 <lightnin9@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <95fguo$t23$1@dagobah.blueriver.net>
Source record: 2685
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.test

Right there shows the true degeneracy of your character. My mother wouldn't touch a lazy slob like you with a ten foot pole. Furthermore, my mother wouldn't be caught even talking to a piece of white trash like yourself. My mother has good morals and has religious beliefs. It just shows how much of a piece of garbage that you really are. As far as being grossly obese, I am six foot four and 230. Not to mention very well built and quite agile. I do a lot of stuff like basketball and other sports. Something that a lazy assed 45 year old doesn't do. Oh, thats right you just talk about having sex with other peoples moms. You are a real brilliant one and not to mention a 45 year old loser. Nice job on showing your true colors. .

> Yep, that's what your momma said when I had sex with her. She said you
> were an "itsy-bitsy" man with no dick. You grossly obese fuckers always
> have small pricks, that's why you went into the gay lifestyle.
>
>
> Has the POLICE been around to see you again, Lllllllloyd???
> --
> 73 de Roger, KC8JBO
> EM99 |ARRL|VE [ARRL & W5YI]|ARES |RACES
> Yaesu FT-920 |Inverted Vee @ 40 ft.
> Yaesu FT-90R
>
>
> Sent via Deja.com
> http://www.deja.com/

2386. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-03 00:43:37 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <3A7B5439.A05BA808@arrl.org>
Source record: 2686

Cecil wrote:
>
> Jon Bloom wrote:
> > What does THAT mean? I've never before heard a distinction made between
> > information "riding on" a carrier and information "embedded in" a
> > carrier. Can you describe both a "riding on" modulator and an "embedded
> > in" modulator?
>
> You never heard of a Z0-match before our email interchange, either.

And I still think it's twaddle.

> (I still have a copy of that email.) And if I remember right, I'm
> the guy who taught you about the Goertzel algorithm.

No, I first read about that in a book -- TI application manual, I think.

> Bell 103 is an example of information riding on a carrier.
> CCIT V.36 is an example of information embedded in a carrier.
>
> In general, if the BPS rate is less than the frequency of the tone,
> the information is riding on the tone, e.g. FSK. In general, if the
> BPS rate is higher than the frequency of the tone, the information is
> embedded in the tone, e.g. M-ary-QPSK.

I think what you are groping toward is the difference between a signal
that has components down to dc and one that does not. I've never heard
it expressed as "embedded in" or "riding on" a carrier, though, in any
of the engineering texts, reference books, application manuals or
product data sheets I've seen. Can you provide any references for that
usage?

> One can undersample an average FSK signal and still recover all the
> information. I don't believe one can under-sample an M-ary-QPSK signal
> and still recover all the information. But I could be wrong since I
> haven't looked at this stuff since I retired. (The latest Science News
> reports that scientists have figured out how to make water flow uphill. :-)

If you can resolve all of the frequency components of the signal without
aliasing you can recover the information. If the frequency components
extend down to dc, you have to sample at twice the highest frequency in
the signal. If the signal is bandlimited around some center frequency,
you can sample at a rate of twice the signal bandwidth. That's true
regardless of the modulation type.

> > Oh, by the way, the sampling rate that satifies Nyquist for your 455-kHz
> > IF is the rate that is twice the bandwidth (not center frequency) of the

> > IF, although practical difficulties may require a somewhat higher rate.
>
> Depends on the boundary conditions. You cannot closely re-create
> the 455 kHz IF frequency waveform unless you honor the Nyquist requirements
> for the highest existing frequency and that's usually higher than double
> the bandwidth.

That simply isn't true. A sampled signal is replicated around multiples of the sampling frequency. Thus you can generate a copy of the sampled signal at a frequency many times greater than the sampling frequency. Undersample your 455-kHz signal and then examine the spectrum of the sampled signal. You'll find that the original 455-kHz components are present in the discrete-time signal (along with many replicas at other frequencies). If your sampling rate exceeds twice the bandwidth of the 455-kHz signal, ALL of the original components, undistorted by aliasing, will be present in the sampled signal.

Jon

2387. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-03 01:49:53 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A7B63C1.6E06E20E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 2687

Jon Bloom wrote:
>
> Cecil wrote:
> > You never heard of a Z0-match before our email interchange, either.
>
> And I still think it's twaddle.

So Antenna Tuners are "twaddle"? Are you going to author a QEX article entitled, "Antenna Tuners Are Twaddle"?

> > (I still have a copy of that email.) And if I remember right, I'm
> > the guy who taught you about the Goertzel algorithm.
>
> No, I first read about that in a book -- TI application manual, I think.

Funny, when I asked you a question about it during your presentation at Hamventure, you seemed not to know what I was talking about.

> I've never heard
> it expressed as "embedded in" or "riding on" a carrier, though, in any
> of the engineering texts, reference books, application manuals or
> product data sheets I've seen.

It was common knowledge/language in the DSP group at Intel.

> Can you provide any references for that usage?

Sure - 14 lines above.

> If the frequency components
> extend down to dc, you have to sample at twice the highest frequency in
> the signal.

Son of a gun - that's what I thought. They haven't changed physics in the past three years.

> > Depends on the boundary conditions. You cannot closely re-create
> > the 455 kHz IF frequency waveform unless you honor the Nyquist requirements
> > for the highest existing frequency and that's usually higher than double
> > the bandwidth.
>
> That simply isn't true.

You're contradicting yourself, Jon. You just admitted above that to get all the components down to zero Hz, you must sample at twice the highest frequency in the signal, i.e. you must honor the 2x Nyquist sampling requirements. In order to "closely re-create" the waveform, one must have *ALL* the components. There's no such thing as a free lunch.

--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2388. Re: Morse Code replacement? Bigtime flame war article!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-03 02:43:40 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010202214340.28683.00001630@nso-mn.aol.com>
Source record: 2688

In article <3A779725.45CF79F@IEEE.org>, Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>How you can say yours are based on reality is beyond belief, Larry.
>Hams are still learning the code. Probably a third or fourth of them
>will use it a lot, including QRP, and develop proficiency. Human nature
>has not changed in the last 50 years. I know you are hoping that CW
>will cease to exist so you will be proven right but you are absolutely
>wrong. CW has enough merits to survive your doomsday wishes for it.

Cecil:

I have no problem understanding the merits of CW. My problem
is with the prospective hams who will no longer be required to learn
it in order to gain maximum HF privileges. I favor the incentive of
the multi-tiered licensing system, including the 3-level code speed
tests, because I believe this is what brought people into the mode.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2389. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-03 02:43:40 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010202214340.28683.00001631@nso-mn.aol.com>
Source record: 2689

In article <3A776CC1.DCD02D18@uci.edu>, Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> writes:

>
>> I made a world of 5 wpm QSOs when I first started, then 6 wpm QSOs and 10
>wpm
>> QSOs and kept on going.
>
>So did I, and according to Larry, so did he. How he figures nobody
>would operate at that speed I'll never understand. Selective memory
>perhaps. My first CW QSOs were on my old 2 meter IC 211 - at sub-5WPM
>speed - when I was a Tech.

Jim/Cecil:

Yes, I did make the same 5, 5.5, 5.9, 6.6, 8.2, 10.0 etc. WPM QSO's
as everyone else did. My speed increased incrementally with virtually
each QSO. I also did a lot of practice copying from the W1AW code
bulletins. My progress was swift; I was comfortable at 18 - 22 WPM
within a few months. However, if the maximum testing requirement
stopped at 5 WPM -- then my progress would have stopped there as
well. I was not a motivated and dedicated CW user at the time; that
desire came only with the added proficiency came, and that was
motivated MAINLY by the requirement. I don't think I'm much different
than anyone else in this respect, except that I seem to be more
willing to be truthful about this than the code (test) bashers are.
This is why I believe that in the absence of a "real" code testing
requirement, there will be little or no future growth in the number of
users of the Morse/CW mode. Those who support the elimination of
the requirement, and the re-allocation of Morse/CW spectrum to
phone, know this as well, but can't admit it.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2390. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-03 03:25:58 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <3A7B7A46.A2C12838@arrl.org>
Source record: 2690

Cecil wrote:
>
> Jon Bloom wrote:
> >
> > Cecil wrote:
> > > You never heard of a Z0-match before our email interchange, either.
> >
> > And I still think it's twaddle.
>
> So Antenna Tuners are "twaddle"? Are you going to author a QEX article
> entitled, "Antenna Tuners Are Twaddle"?

No, just Cecil's perspective on them. And I don't think that's worth an
article.

> > > (I still have a copy of that email.) And if I remember right, I'm
> > > the guy who taught you about the Goertzel algorithm.
> >
> > No, I first read about that in a book -- TI application manual, I think.
>
> Funny, when I asked you a question about it during your presentation at
> Hamventure, you seemed not to know what I was talking about.

I frequently don't understand what you're talking about, but only when
you're not making sense.

> > I've never heard
> > it expressed as "embedded in" or "riding on" a carrier, though, in any
> > of the engineering texts, reference books, application manuals or
> > product data sheets I've seen.
>
> It was common knowledge/language in the DSP group at Intel.
>
> > Can you provide any references for that usage?
>
> Sure - 14 lines above.

In other words, you have no references.

> > If the frequency components
> > extend down to dc, you have to sample at twice the highest frequency in
> > the signal.
>
> Son of a gun - that's what I thought. They haven't changed physics in the
> past three years.
>

> > > Depends on the boundary conditions. You cannot closely re-create
> > > the 455 kHz IF frequency waveform unless you honor the Nyquist requirements
> > > for the highest existing frequency and that's usually higher than double
> > > the bandwidth.
> >
> > That simply isn't true.
>
> You're contradicting yourself, Jon. You just admitted above that to get all the
> components down to zero Hz, you must sample at twice the highest frequency in
> the signal, i.e. you must honor the 2x Nyquist sampling requirements.

Only if there ARE components down to zero Hz. In the case of your
455-kHz signal, no signal components exist below the low end of the IF
bandwidth. That's why we can use harmonic sampling.

> In order
> to "closely re-create" the waveform, one must have *ALL* the components. There's
> no such thing as a free lunch.

Yep, but "all the compoments" exist in a small band of frequencies, not
a band 455-kHz wide, and that bandwidth can be sampled and
reconstructed, according to Nyquist, using a sampling rate twice the
bandwidth.

Jon

2391. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-03 03:29:29 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <95ftuppii0@208.206.142.74>
Source record: 2691

Cecil wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > Jon Bloom wrote:
> > > Sampling rates have nothing to do with amateur radio? Sez who?
> >
> > *SAYS I*, of course. It's the TERM that has nothing to do with ham
> > radio. "Sampling rates" are important only to those who prefer to think
> > in such digital terms, for their own reasons.
>
> Dick, Dick, Dick, most top of the line ham transceivers use sampling
> rates right now. A few of them sample at the IF frequency. Even my $1000
> IC-706 uses sampling rates.

Well, hoopty lolly doo! You got a 706 with the *audio* dsp! I've had a series of those in the past several years and have yet to find any working advantage in any of them. The one on the IC756 stays turned off, I haven't yet found any situation where I can say it is helpful to the point that I would have paid what it cost to build it into the rig.

Any Extra who doesn't want to understand
> sampling rates chooses not to understand modern day ham radio. You are
> burying your head in the sands of time.

So what's your problem? I do understand the basics of DSP sampling and have no desire nor intention of designing one for myself - I am not a digital designer and have no intent to ever become one. That I'llleaveto you who profess to be digital engineers. Since I'm not an engineer and you are, you slam me because I'm not, while your status as an engineet doesn't make you any better a ham. Fact. You're just a better digital designer. That's the way it is.

As time moves on and progress
> happens, more and more of your precious analog functions will be
> replaced by DSP techniques.
>

Tell it to your no-code no-theory Extras.

Tell it to your nocode no theory Extras.

2392. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-03 04:20:54 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010202232054.09590.00001559@nso-bk.aol.com>
Source record: 2692

In article <95evnr$ea0$1@nnrp1.deja.com>, K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org> writes:

>In article <3A79E320.64206815@IEEE.org>,
> Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
>
>> What sampling rate does it require to
>> reproduce 455 kHz IF information?
>
>First off, any competent-in-DSP bench technician (let alone PhD EE)
>would scoff at 455KHz as a proper IF choice for DSP techniques.

Really? Sometimes, in the case of a DSP adapter to work off of
an existing receiver that has a 455 KHz IF, there isn't any choice.

Please examine the IFs of existing cellular telephones and
see what those Intermediate Frequencies are...rather higher
than 455 KHz these days.

>Second, that same technician would scoff at the simplistic nature of
>your question, in that it displays a basic ignorance of the information
>needed in determining what sampling rate to employ.

Now, now, let's not get testy here... :-)

Going back over three decades to the appearance of the first
sampling oscilloscopes, those all used undersampling (using
today's terminology for yesterday's accomplished art)...i.e.,
the sampling rate was wayyyy slower than the rate of the
RF being sampled.

didit

2393. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-03 04:20:58 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010202232058.09590.00001560@nso-bk.aol.com>
Source record: 2694

In article <3A7B1A1A.4A7E536E@arrl.org>, Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org> writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> The normal sampling rate for a 455 KHz IF would be above
>> the "Nyquist limit" or roughly 2 1/2 times (minimum) rate of
>> the IF (1.138 MHz, minimum) for an accurate sampling.
>> That will reproduce the IF accurately enough to permit
>> digital demodulation.
>
>I'm not sure where the 2-1/2 value comes from. Some rule of thumb, I
>suppose.

Yes, pre-IC times. The old GE 24-voice-channel microwave radio
relay terminal used pulse-position modulation converted after
detection to pulse-width modulation. At about 8 KHz pulse
repetition rate, the modulated pulse width was tossed into a
3 KHz low-pass filter to recover the modulation audio. 1950
production stuff with tubes. Army version was AN/FRC-23.

>But the Nyquist frequency is 2 times the highest frequency
>present in the signal being sampled. For this hypothetical case of
>direct sampling (no undersampling) a 455-kHz IF, you would select the IF
>filter attenuation that reduces the signal to a negligible level (say 90
>dB attenuation, just to pick a number), find the frequency of the 90-dB
>point on the high side of the filter, then double that frequency to find
>the minimum sampling frequency. That's likely to be below 1.138 MHz
>unless your IF filter is 200 kHz wide (unlikely for a 455-kHz IF).

Yes, I'll agree that the Nyquist minimum has to hold for a
maximum modulation frequency. :-)

[If one isn't used to it, trying to "see" the process through the math
isn't a trivial task when working from the original Carson (?)
modulation equations]

Minimum signal level would be dependent on the A-to-D of the
sampler. Nowadays a 16-bit A-to-D at 0.5 MHz sample rate
is not an unreasonable requirement...the least-significant bit of the
sampled digital signal voltage would be about -96 dbc.

>But if you have a sampling A/D that can sample at a MHz, you can
>undersample at a rate at or above 2 times the IF bandwidth (the 90-dB
>bandwidth, in this case) and save yourself the need to decimate the
>1-MHz sampling rate down to something more tractable. There is nothing
>the least bit tricky about undersampling. One of the first tings I did

>when I got my first TI DSP evaluation board was to undersample the IF
>output of my TS-930 and make my own DSP SSB demod.

Sounds interesting and would be good material for an article
somewhere?

Older sampling oscilloscopes were ALWAYS running in an
undersampling mode...as were the undersampled PLL-ed
microwave frequency sources...around mid 1960s for the
first of them. I still have a problem with aliasing on the
analysis, though. [personal analysis work, used both, no
problem, specified and bought the sources for a couple
contracts]

Might be a picky detail here, but the sampler aperture time
has to be quite a bit shorter than the sampled signal period.
[got that impression when I saw an 8 GHz sinewave being
sampled at the H-P display at a 60's WESCON...:-)]

If the sampler can't hold the signal after sampling due to way
longer sampling, then a second sampler has to be used to
keep the sample charge long enough for the A-to-D to convert.
[in the old sample-and-hold input circuits, at least...]

There's still an aliasing problem if the sampling is too close
to an integral number of either the RF or the modulation
frequency, yes? Remind me if not, please...haven't gone
deep into undersampling hardware-software.

>> For a good introduction on DSP there is the ARRL Handbook
>> section on it, written by Jon Bloom. Good stuff, but one has
>> to buckle down and STUDY it to grasp what is possible.
>
>Actually, they've replaced the chapter I wrote with one written by Doug
>Smith, KF6DX. Still worth reading, though!

Hey! I want my 1999 ARRL CD-ROM upgrade! :-) :-) ;-)

didit

2394. Re: massive crosspost attempt (was: West Virginia farm boy comes of age)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-03 04:21:57 UTC
From: Jim Alder <jimalder@sssnet.com>
Message-ID: <3A7B8765.7A5F894D@sssnet.com>
Source record: 2693
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Stagger Lee wrote:
>
> On Fri, 02 Feb 2001 12:57:23 -0500, Jim Alder <jimalder@sssnet.com> wrote:
> : Welcome to alt.oldjoke! Why does everyone think they
> [drivelsnip]
>
> And why do you think that you can add a bazillion additional news groups
> to the Newsgroups list and trick other people? Talk about ancient old
> tricks ...
>
> (News groups trimmed back to the original two rec.radio.amateur groups.)

Sorry, but I didn't add anything. Here's the header I
responded to;

Subject: West Virginia farm boy comes of age
Date: Fri, 02 Feb 2001 14:05:23 GMT
From: "N9NWO" <n9nwo@amsat.org>
Newsgroups: alt.fan.rush-limbaugh,
alt.law-enforcement, alt.rush-limbaugh,
alt.society.liberalism, misc.survivalism,
talk.politics.guns, talk.politics.misc
Followup-To: alt.fan.rush-limbaugh,
alt.law-enforcement, alt.rush-limbaugh,
alt.society.liberalism, misc.survivalism,
rec.radio.amateur.misc,
rec.radio.amateur.policy,
talk.politics.guns, talk.politics.misc

2395. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-03 04:46:23 UTC
From: Bob Wex w2ilp <w2ilp@juno.com>
Message-ID: <95g2eu$c1j$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2696

In article <20010201063148.15050.00000244@ng-ff1.aol.com>,
w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:
> >From: Bob Wex w2ilp w2ilp@juno.com
>
> >Hams need more license classes and/or official FCC technical
> >endorsements.
>
> Ham need more technical knowlege. Adding another layer of government
> bureaucratic control will be a hindrance, not a help.

What government bureauocracy??? The VECs are private (non-government)
voulenteers.

> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

Perhaps more technical knowledge would give individual Hams real reason
to have more self PRIDE...and
OFFICIAL FCC Ham Exams, which challenge hams to be motivated to have
more technical knowledge would eventually give All Hams, as a group
more PRIDE.
Nothing short of that will do.

Hams need MORE OFFICIAL FCC License Classes.

73,
Bob Wex w2ilp (Increase License PRIDE)

There is something about a bureaucrat
that does not like a poem.
--Gore Vidal (1968)--

The only thing that saves us from the
bureaucracy is inefficiency. An
efficient bureaucracy is the greatest
threat to liberty.
--Eugene J. McCarthy (1979)--

I wonder if Eugene McCarthy liked
poems??? History now relates that
he was, in his hay-day, a great
threat to liberty.
--w2ilp--

Bush want all students tested so
that schools can be held accountable
for test results. Maybe all hams

should be retested so that the ARRL
can be held accountable for the
loss of what once was a national asset.
Maybe not.
--w2ilp--

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2396. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-03 04:49:12 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010202234912.00445.00001404@nso-bj.aol.com>
Source record: 2695

In article <20010202214340.28683.00001631@nso-mn.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>This is why I believe that in the absence of a "real" code testing
>requirement, there will be little or no future growth in the number of
>users of the Morse/CW mode. Those who support the elimination of
>the requirement, and the re-allocation of Morse/CW spectrum to
>phone, know this as well, but can't admit it.

tRoll;

The FCC grants US amateur radio licenses. THEIR requirements insofar as licensing is concerned is what counts.

The FCC has already said (1990 and 1999) that it doesn't think a morse code test is significant for THEIR licensing criterion in US amateur radio. They also stated that the only reason one is necessary is the ITU-R standard S25.5.

Neither you nor I nor anyone else in here can know the future with any certainty. Morse code may achieve a great popularity in the future...or languish into disuse...or simply go on as it does now...or none of those.

There is NO technical reason for the retention of a code test, no administrative reason on the part of the FCC. All that remains is some artificial-emotional standard of some individuals that a "code test is necessary to prove something."

The FCC doesn't think a code test "proves" anything to them for the purposes of granting a US amateur radio license. The FCC has said so...twice in a decade.

didit

2397. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-03 05:10:48 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A7B92D8.DDD2EB7F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 2698

Bob Wex w2ilp wrote:
> Perhaps more technical knowledge would give individual Hams real reason
> to have more self PRIDE...and
> OFFICIAL FCC Ham Exams, which challenge hams to be motivated to have
> more technical knowledge would eventually give All Hams, as a group
> more PRIDE.
> Nothing short of that will do.

"Pride goeth before destruction ..."
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2398. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-03 05:12:49 UTC
From: Bob Wex w2ilp <w2ilp@juno.com>
Message-ID: <95g40e$d8a$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2697

In article <95b0g1du1@news.service.uci.edu>,
"Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote:
>
> Bob Wex w2ilp <w2ilp@juno.com> wrote in message
>
> > Hams need more license classes and/or official FCC technical
> > endorsements.
>
> In order to do what?

To meet the BASIS and PURPOSE goals of Part 97.

> I don't find myself feeling limited by the number of
> license classes in the ARS. Necessity is the mother of invention, not
> wallpaper. Interest and curiosity must provide motivation. Without
that I
> think you'd have to convince the US Treasury to issue their
certificates
> rather than the kind the FCC offers.
>
> 73, Jim AC6XG

With all due respect, I am not talking about your feelings Jim. I am
speaking about what is required so that FUTURE Hams can regain the
PRIDE that the hobby once had. A certificate that says that you worked
all states, all zones or a hundred nations may be wallpaper BUT a
license that says that you passed really comprehensive technical exams
can restore the kind of pride that once had value to academic,
commercial and military establishments. Such a license could command
real respect, not for just individual hams, but for Ham Radio as the
technical educational hobby that it once was and should be. To do so
there has to be a lot of technical catching up for the Hams who want to
have the pride of being known as Ham Experts.

Yes...
Hams need MORE license classes and/or official FCC endorsements so that
they can show [by certification] that at least some of them have the
potential of being radio communications experts.

73,
Bob Wex w2ilp (Insure License Potential)

I know of no safe depository of the ultimate
powers of society but the people themselves;
and if we think them not enlightened enough
to exercise their control with a wholesome

discretion, the remedy is not to take it
from them, but to inform their discretion
by education. This is the true corrective
of abuses of constitutional power.
--Thomas Jefferson(1820)--

Ham Radio can only be saved by Hams themselves.
The FCC may take away their frequency bands if
they are unable to prove that they are
potentially able to meet the goals as outlined
in the BASIS and PURPOSE of Part 97. The
only protective action is accountable ham
education. Ham education is being abused by
those who are unwilling and unable to modernize it.
--w2ilp--

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2399. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-03 05:18:01 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A7B9489.77A9A10E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 2699

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Well, hoopty lolly doo! You got a 706 with the *audio* dsp! I've had a
> series of those in the past several years and have yet to find any
> working advantage in any of them.

Mine performs miracles. The point is that DSP, both audio and at RF
frequencies, is an expanding part of ham radio. If you refuse to learn
about DSP, you will become even more ignorant than the newcomers.

> So what's your problem? I do understand the basics of DSP sampling and
> have no desire nor intention of designing one for myself - I am not a
> digital designer and have no intent to ever become one. That I'll leave
> to you who profess to be digital engineers.

The point is that as time moves on and designs progress, ham radios will
become more and more digital until you will be totally ignorant. You will
be like the hams who refused to learn anything about SSB in the 50s.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2400. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-03 05:27:44 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A7B96D0.B8E80C83@IEEE.org>
Source record: 2700

Jon Bloom wrote:
> Yep, but "all the compoments" exist in a small band of frequencies, ...

That's like looking for your lost keys under a street light instead
of where you lost them. I can phase modulate at the IF frequency and
slip an undetected message right past your undersampling technique.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2401. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-03 05:34:26 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A7B9862.16CC2C67@IEEE.org>
Source record: 2751

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> However, if the maximum testing requirement
> stopped at 5 WPM -- then my progress would have stopped there as
> well.

Sounds like you have a severe personality problem regarding self
motivation. When you satisfied the requirements for a college
degree, did you also stop your progress? Do you only accomplish
what you are forced to accomplish?
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2402. Re: Morse Code replacement? Bigtime flame war article!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-03 05:37:10 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A7B9906.7A34E5A5@IEEE.org>
Source record: 2752

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> I have no problem understanding the merits of CW.

It's obvious that you do NOT understand the merits of CW, Larry.
If you understood the merits of CW, you would be pushing the
mode instead of pushing for a governmental welfare support
system for the mode.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2403. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-03 05:50:14 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3A7B9C02.960659D9@sccoast.net>
Source record: 2753

W4JLE wrote:
>
> I think you are way over the top here
> Ed. Larry is upset because the standards
> have been lowered by people who felt
> they "deserved" rather than earn an
> amateur radio license.

Larry is a little more than just "upset." For many months, Larry
has carried on an endless campaign to belittle newly licensed
operators with the use of derogotary names and insulting
characterizations, while endlessly denigrating their efforts and contributions.

Those newly licensed operators include my wife, myself, and the many
thousands of other decent people whose only ham radio "sin" is that we
didn't obtain our license in the same manner as Larry.

Now, I'm sorry if Larry does not like how I obtained my license, but
he is a damn fool if he thinks I'm going to give it up just because it
makes him "upset." And he is equally a fool if he thinks we're going
to feel sorry for him because he is "upset" about the reduced code requirements.

In the end, Larry needs to grow up and get over his relentless
self-pity. If he isn't able to do that, then Ed is absolutely right -
Larry needs to give up his license and move on to something else that
does not "upset" him so much.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net

2404. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-03 06:13:18 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3A7BA164.B3088773@sccoast.net>
Source record: 2754

W4JLE wrote:
>
> Ed, as a representative of the ARRL, I expect
> you to refrain from personal attacks on people
> you disagree with. Your message took PERSONAL
> potshots at Larry, and your excuse was "he did
> it first."

To my knowledge, Ed has never presented himself as a representative of ARRL in these newsgroups (ARRL doesn't have any representatives in this newsgroup that I'm aware of). In fact, if you had not mentioned it, I'm sure most people would have never even known about his involvement with ARRL.

But, whatever the case, I have never considered any comment made by anyone in this newsgroup to be representative of the views, opinions, or official policy, of that person's employer (or group affiliations) unless it is obviously so.

To do otherwise would have a chilling effect on free speech in these newsgroups.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net

2405. Re: QCWA TELLS FCC TO END INCENTIVE LICENSING

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-03 06:48:37 UTC
From: Bob Wex w2ilp <w2ilp@juno.com>
Message-ID: <95g9k5$ha8$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2755

In article <3A797E19.5F1D7E26@arrl.org>,
Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote:
> Bob Wex w2ilp wrote:
> >
> > Yes and this is one time I won't say "Speak for yourself Jon". You
and
> > N9GL had better read the very latest research on the cancerous eye
> > damage attributed to cellular telephone RF. I should have saved the
> > references that I had read. The research was done in UK.
> > The mechanism and the effects are known and established.
>
> I didn't say they weren't. I only said that according to N9GL, the
> standards are not derived from the mechanisms but from the known
> effects.

True...but as engineers, scientists or medical people the
MECHANISM...chemical, biological, electral, mechanical or whatever must
be understood if there is to be any corrective measures devised. No
logical standards can be concluded without an understanding of the real
cause.
A hot chicken does not tell you the mechanism by which it got hot...but
if you heated it in your microwave oven..You know the mechanism was
microwave RF not heat conducted from a gas burner or radiated by your
fireplace.

> Which makes sense. For the purpose of determining safe levels,
> the mechanisms are unimportant

Huhh? That is like saying Ohm's Law is unimportant as long as lamp
bulbs light. Only the observation of the light matters for determining
what voltage will quickly burn open the filament.

-- only the effects matter. (Again,
> that's not to say the mechanisms aren't of interest in their own
right.)
> I think they do extrapolate animal tests to the human body since I
doubt
> anyone has yet volunteered to be slowly cooked by RF for scientific
> purposes.

NOW YOU ARE NOT READING MY POSTS. Everyone who uses a cell-phone is
being volunteered [unknown to themselves] as a test subject. The
people who developed cancerous eye conditions were frequent cell-phone
users and were counted in statistical studies, which can scientifically
prove the high probability that the MECHANISM for causing the cancers
was cell-phone RF.

It is also interesting to note that for many years tobacco was not seen as a health hazard...but once the mechanism [cigarette tars] was studied lots of different diseases were found to be caused or accelerated by excessive smoking.

Yet there are smokers who live to be 100 years old, who seem to be able to physically resist the hazardous mechanism(s). Is cigarette smoking safe? NO. Not for average people.

> > The IEEE/ANSI specs, I am convinced, were made to give a clean bill of
> > health to cell-phones...but not Ham Radio VHF gear. Unfortunately it
> > might take time, more research, and sadly some blind cancer victims
> > (and their lawyers) for me to be able to say "I told you so".
> ...
> In an earlier message you said:
> > The leaders
> > who evolve from liberal artists, lawyers, and religious leaders can not
> > blaze any path of success through the world's scientific industrial
> > competition and the serious problems that the future is sure to bring.
> > They can talk;
> > They can judge; They can pray...BUT they are not equipped to make
> > decisions based on scientific facts, which can only be accepted when
> > the proper logic is applied to the proper research.
>
> Apparently you don't hold yourself to the same high standard since you
> are convinced of a conclusion that you admit cannot be supported by
> present scientific evidence.

I just said that the recent research supports my beliefs as an engineer. I am not a medical expert or even a Ham leader and I don't profess to be either.
> Hopefully, those non-scientist leaders will
> refrain from making scientific judgements on topics they are unqualified
> to evaluate. Maybe you should, too. And particularly, you should refrain
> from denigrating the professional abilities of people like N9GL when you
> clearly know nothing about them. You frequently proclaim that your views
> are based on science, but it's pretty clear in this case that prejudice
> is playing the bigger role in forming your opinion.

Yep but I have been given no grants and no cash incentives to prove the safety of either cell-phones or Ham HTs. What predjudice? I am not in power to make any
decisions...only observations of scientifically proven facts made by

others who can gather the statistical evidence and/or can perform lab experimentation. Some experimentation is being done on living cells in test tubes rather than human bodies. It can help to prove the MECHANISM. I say that UHF and microwave frequencies are a greater hazard than VHF. Why?
Because the possibility of heating human tissue or interfering with its normal biological functions is there...That is the MECHANISM! True, I have not quantified...but researchers are in the process of doing so. RF from an antenna in the near field is usually hard to evaluate. At UHF and above there can be concentrated beams of in-phase energy developed. Thus even at low RF power output, there can be dense narrow beams of RF developed. This effect is less at VHF than UHF and above. I don't claim to know all the details of cause and effect...but I also knew not to walk on thin ice before I learned basic thermodynamics.

The human body has developed various ways to protect itself from strong sunlight radiation...because there has always been a Sun; longer than there has been humans. We can not see RF or biologically protect ourselves from its hazardous radiation without technical intervention, as well as we have evolved to protect ourselves from strong sunlight. Strong spectral density RF has not been around long enough for the human body to adopt itself to its dangers. We can not afford to let people suffer and die from RF radiation until the survivors can develop protective immunity to it.

Please keep thinking,
73,
Bob Wex w2ilp (Insure License Potential)

I've got tears in my ears from lying on my back
in the night and crying my eyes out over you.
--Longest song title by Hoggy Carmichael--

...and Hoggy didn't even have any cell-phones yet.
--w2ilp--

If a cat sits on a hot stove...he will not only
not sit on a hot stove again...he will not sit
on a stove again.
--Benjamin Franklin--

Did Ben think the cat was prejudiced? The cat
had evidently developed a very conservative
level of safety for itself.
--w2ilp--

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2406. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-03 13:48:15 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <3A7C0C1F.8E1289A2@arrl.org>
Source record: 2756

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> Minimum signal level would be dependent on the A-to-D of the
> sampler. Nowadays a 16-bit A-to-D at 0.5 MHz sample rate
> is not an unreasonable requirement...the least-significant bit of the
> sampled digital signal voltage would be about -96 dbc.

Yes, although if the receiver AGC loop is separate from the DSP, that's probably overkill, and if the DSP is within the AGC loop it's probably not enough.

[Re: unsersampling]
> Might be a picky detail here, but the sampler aperture time
> has to be quite a bit shorter than the sampled signal period.

I don't think it's a picky detail at all. It's a pretty fundamental point and is what's hard about making high-speed sampling A/Ds.

> There's still an aliasing problem if the sampling is too close
> to an integral number of either the RF or the modulation
> frequency, yes? Remind me if not, please...haven't gone
> deep into undersampling hardware-software.

The concern is with a harmonic of the sampling rate falling within the band of signals being sampled. That was the main practical consideration I was referring to when I said you would probably want to use a sampling rate somewhat greater than Nyquist demands. You don't want a multiple of the sampling rate to appear within the band you're trying to sample because it makes things more complicated; you have to convert the signal to an analytic signal and then (mathematically) frequency shift it. It's just a whole lot easier if you choose a sampling rate for which no multiple appears in the band of interest.

Jon

2407. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-03 13:51:15 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <3A7C0CD3.184588E5@arrl.org>
Source record: 2757

Cecil wrote:
>
> Jon Bloom wrote:
> > Yep, but "all the compoments" exist in a small band of frequencies, ...
>
> That's like looking for your lost keys under a street light instead
> of where you lost them. I can phase modulate at the IF frequency and
> slip an undetected message right past your undersampling technique.

Nope. As long as the sidebands produced by your phase modulation fall
within the IF passband, they'll be present in the sampled signal.

Jon

2408. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-03 13:56:19 UTC
From: George McCouch <geomac@hopkinsville.net>
Message-ID: <geomac-B685F4.08004803022001@news.kih.net>
Source record: 2758

In article <3A6D2EE9.69ADA2BF@ovis.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net>
wrote:

> Aaron Jones wrote:
> >
> > Old_Timer <oldtimer@nonsuch.net> wrote:
> >
> > >Does the League's newly announced substantial dues hike in these times
> > >of low inflation strike anybody else as being excessive?
> >
> > Percentage wise it does seem high. But to gripe about $5 extra a year
> > is silly. That's less than 2 cents a day...
> >
> > >My own feeling is that $39 per year is high for value received
> >
> > Too bad you can't quit... :-)
>
> Percentage-wise, it IS high. If you look at what inflation has been
> since 1997 when the League last upped the cost of yearly dues, it is
> outrageous. I think most folks would gripe about five bucks out of
> their pockets when they get nothing additional for the fiver. If it is
> such a small amount, why doesn't the League cut the present dues by five
> bucks per year. After all, it is only five dollars--a mere 2 cents per
> day ;)
>
> I could quit but I'm paid up for life and I'm not finished living yet.
> Besides, you know the old saw: I can do more to change the ARRL from
> within than from the outside.
>
> For one thing, I can air my gripes here.
>
> Dave K8MN

Dave,

It is pretty high. I joind the ARRL in 1964 for $5.00 a year. Using the
CPI index from 1964 through 2000 that $5.00 is now worth about $27.50.
The ARRL is over 40% higher with the news dues rate. As some have
mentioned, services that were once without additional cost to members
now carry fees. I probably should have gotten life membership back
then.

73
George W3GEO

2409. Re: QCWA TELLS FCC TO END INCENTIVE LICENSING

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-03 14:02:03 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <3A7C0F5B.2158175B@arrl.org>
Source record: 2759

Bob Wex w2ilp wrote:
>
> In article <3A797E19.5F1D7E26@arrl.org>,
> Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote:
> >
> > I didn't say they weren't. I only said that according to N9GL, the
> > standards are not derived from the mechanisms but from the known
> > effects.
>
> True...but as engineers, scientists or medical people the
> MECHANISM...chemical, biological, electral, mechanical or whatever must
> be understood if there is to be any corrective measures devised.

But we can't apply corrective measures to the design of the human body.
The only factor we can control is how much RF we expose ourselves to.
For that purpose, it is the effect of the exposure that is important,
not the underlying mechanism.

> A hot chicken does not tell you the mechanism by which it got hot...but
> if you heated it in your microwave oven..You know the mechanism was
> microwave RF not heat conducted from a gas burner or radiated by your
> fireplace.

But if the point is to cook a chicken I don't need to know the mechanism
by which the cooking takes place, I only need to know that it gets
cooked when I apply either heat or RF at sufficient levels.

> > Which makes sense. For the purpose of determining safe levels,
> > the mechanisms are unimportant
>
> Huhh? That is like saying Ohm's Law is unimportant as long as lamp
> bulbs light. Only the observation of the light matters for determining
> what voltage will quickly burn open the filament.

It's nothing like that at all. We need to know Ohm's law so we can
design electrical devices. We're not designing human bodies. (Although
there are those doctors who've announced plans to clone humans, so maybe
we will be designing humans soon!)

Jon

2410. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-03 14:10:59 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <3A7C1173.39EB03B3@arrl.org>
Source record: 2760

George McCouch wrote:
>
> It is pretty high. I joind the ARRL in 1964 for $5.00 a year. Using the
> CPI index from 1964 through 2000 that $5.00 is now worth about $27.50.
> The ARRL is over 40% higher with the news dues rate.

If you choose a different base year, you get a different result. Neither the CPI nor ARRL dues increase in a smooth, continuous curve. Plus, of course, the CPI measures the costs of a lot of things that aren't relevant to ARRL's costs of providing services and doesn't measure the costs of a lot of things that are relevant, like the cost of magazine paper and mailing costs.

> As some have
> mentioned, services that were once without additional cost to members
> now carry fees. I probably should have gotten life membership back
> then.

I don't think it was available in '64, was it? Seems to me it was a few years after that when it became available.

Jon

2411. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-03 14:44:45 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccoll@radiks.net>
Message-ID: <ZNUe6.3204$B81.780176@nntp2.onemain.com>
Source record: 2761

"George McCouch" <geomac@hopkinsville.net> wrote in message
news:geomac-B685F4.08004803022001@news.kih.net...
> In article <3A6D2EE9.69ADA2BF@ovis.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net>
> It is pretty high. I joind the ARRL in 1964 for $5.00 a year. Using the
> CPI index from 1964 through 2000 that $5.00 is now worth about $27.50.
> The ARRL is over 40% higher with the news dues rate. As some have
> mentioned, services that were once without additional cost to members
> now carry fees. I probably should have gotten life membership back
> then.
>
> 73
> George W3GEO

I would suggest you look up the price of haircuts or any other personal service. The CPI is of less than phenomenal value for any analysis but any index will show that wherever the good or service in question uses people rather than capital it will rise faster than the index as a whole.

Look at your school taxes where the only two technological innovations in a thousand years have been central heating so we don't wear robes anymore and a fellow named Gutenburg making it unnecessary to chain the prof's notes to the lectern. Now there is a personal service business!

2412. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-03 15:02:28 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A7C1D84.D48B3027@IEEE.org>
Source record: 2762

Jon Bloom wrote:
> Nope. As long as the sidebands produced by your phase modulation fall
> within the IF passband, they'll be present in the sampled signal.

Of course, but that doesn't resemble my statement. I have hypothetically added unknown modulation components to an IF frequency signal *after* it has been passbanded as a test for your undersampling techniques. How well can you do?
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2413. internet repeater linking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-03 15:11:56 UTC
From: g3zhi@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <3a891fab.2733109@news.btinternet.com>
Source record: 2763

why not link your repeater to the internet
a number of repeaters around the world already are
its very easy to do
for more info check many other ham links http://www.qsl.net/g3zhi

73 ian

2414. Re: DX-405 SOLICITS NUTSACK SLURPING

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-03 15:39:44 UTC
From: KC8JBO <roger_kc8jbo@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <95h8o0$6hj$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2764
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.test

GOAT FELLATOR "DX405" <lightnin9@hotmail.com> whined in message
news:95fguo$t23$1@dagobah.blueriver.net...
> Right there shows the true <BITCHSLAP!>

It's not easy for you to talk about your mother's whoring days, is it?

> It just shows how much of a piece of garbage that you really are.

Poor baby. FOAD, remora attached to the underside of Lllllloyd Davies.

> As far as being grossly obese, I am six foot four and 230. Not to
mention very well built and >quite agile.

Suuuuuuure you are.....maybe 5 foot 6 and 330.
BWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA!!!
You're the tallest in your inbred family, aren't you? Rumor has it
you're almost incomprehensible in person (owing to your heavily
accented and alchohol-slurred speech) and this combined with your being
dirt poor and ugly makes you very uncomfortable with human interaction
of any kind.
You have therefore moved yourself far from the mainstream of human
society, thereby earning its eternal gratitude.

> I do a lot of stuff like

Stuff your face with moon pies and ding dongs. Yeah, we know.

> basketball and other sports.

Suuuuuure you do, water boy. You may fetch the towels for the people
who DO participate.

> Something that a lazy assed 45 year old doesn't do.

Assuming, again, COWARD.

> Oh, thats right you just talk about having sex with
> other peoples moms.

Poor baby....your mom sucked and swallowed every drop.

> You are a real brilliant one

I know! Too bad you didn't get through high school....DROPOUT.

>and not to mention a 45 year old

Did you take your shoes off to enable you to count that high?

> loser.

PKB. You are about as entertaining as a child's inflatable punching toy. You bop it, it springs back, you bop it again and you forget it ever existed. It slowly deflates in an unused corner, then one day you throw it away.

> Nice job on showing your true colors. .

While your posts only demonstrate your world-class cluelessness.

--
73 de Roger, KC8JBO
EM99 |ARRL|VE [ARRL & W5YI]|ARES |RACES
Yaesu FT-920 |Inverted Vee @ 40 ft.
Yaesu FT-90R

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2415. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-03 17:02:44 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <3A7C39B4.2FA0DB02@arrl.org>
Source record: 2765

Cecil wrote:
>
> Jon Bloom wrote:
> > Nope. As long as the sidebands produced by your phase modulation fall
> > within the IF passband, they'll be present in the sampled signal.
>
> Of course, but that doesn't resemble my statement. I have hypothetically
> added unknown modulation components to an IF frequency signal *after* it
> has been passbanded as a test for your undersampling techniques. How well
> can you do?

If the sidebands fall within the passband it doesn't matter whether they were created before or after bandpass filtering. If they fall outside the passband, you've created a new passband and an appropriate sampling rate for that passband must then be chosen in accordance with the Nyquist criterion of twice the bandwidth.

Jon

2416. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-03 19:19:30 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A7C59C2.9348CB34@IEEE.org>
Source record: 2766

Jon Bloom wrote:
> If the sidebands fall within the passband it doesn't matter whether they
> were created before or after bandpass filtering. If they fall outside
> the passband, you've created a new passband and an appropriate sampling
> rate for that passband must then be chosen in accordance with the
> Nyquist criterion of twice the bandwidth.

I do believe that is exactly what I said, Jon, and you argued with me. So
I repeat: If one doesn't know the passband and wants to guarantee that all
possible modulation components are decoded, one cannot use undersampling.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2417. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-03 20:26:22 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <3A7C696E.4543B8CB@arrl.org>
Source record: 2767

Cecil wrote:
>
> I do believe that is exactly what I said, Jon, and you argued with me. So
> I repeat: If one doesn't know the passband and wants to guarantee that all
> possible modulation components are decoded, one cannot use undersampling.

No, this is the first time you specified an unrestricted passband.
Strange receiver you've got there!

Why don't you just admit you didn't understand the theory initially?

Jon

2418. Re: Long Delay Echos

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-03 22:21:19 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <95i08qooa1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2768

```
In article <3A7B1ABF.A1E0DB48@arrl.org>,
Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote:
> Steven, J, Robeson, K4YZ wrote:
> >
> > In article <95f2rd$kgf$1@news.netmar.com>,
> > K0HB@USWEST.NET wrote:
> >
> > >W0UN tells of the time, zero-dark-thirty in the CQWWDX test,
sitting
> > >in the 10M chair of his multi-multi in Colorado with the beam to
the
> > >east, hearing his "CQ TEST DE W0UN" being repeated back to him
> > >perfectly, just slightly off his frequency. He was getting a bit
> > >perturbed at the jammer, until he noted the moon rising directly on
> > >the azimuth of his 4over4over4 10M array.
> >
> > I bet he had a heck of a time getting "CQ" Magazine to accept
THAT
> > one for contest credit!
>
> What's even worse, the other fellow wouldn't QSL! :-)
>
> Jon

Probably didn't include a green stamp. ;)

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/
```

2419. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-03 22:46:09 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <95i1kmigp1@news.service.uci.edu>
Source record: 2769

Bob Wex w2ilp <w2ilp@juno.com> wrote in message
news:95g40e$d8a$1@nnrp1.deja.com...
> In article <95b0g1du1@news.service.uci.edu>,
> "Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote:
> >
> > Bob Wex w2ilp <w2ilp@juno.com> wrote in message
> >
> > > Hams need more license classes and/or official FCC technical
> > > endorsements.
> >
> > In order to do what?
>
> To meet the BASIS and PURPOSE goals of Part 97.

You should probably do that anyway. I do.

> With all due respect, I am not talking about your feelings Jim. I am
> speaking about what is required so that FUTURE Hams can regain the
> PRIDE that the hobby once had.

I think you are speaking about your feelings, too.

> Such a license could command
> real respect, not for just individual hams, but for Ham Radio as the
> technical educational hobby that it once was and should be. To do so
> there has to be a lot of technical catching up for the Hams who want to
> have the pride of being known as Ham Experts.

Your explanation of why there needs to be more ham licenses reminds me of Nigel Tufnel explaning why his amp goes to eleven. I'm afraid that if you want to command respect from anybody, you'll have to do more than wave a license at them anyway. Besides, I don't think the FCC intends commanding respect as being the basis and purpose of the ARS or of licensing. It's a lovely dream nevertheless.

73, Jim AC6XG

2420. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-03 23:46:39 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <95i563$k78$1@news.service.uci.edu>
Source record: 2771

Larry Roll K3LT <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20010202214340.28683.00001631@nso-mn.aol.com...
> Jim/Cecil:
>
> Yes, I did make the same 5, 5.5, 5.9, 6.6, 8.2, 10.0 etc. WPM QSO's
> as everyone else did. My speed increased incrementally with virtually
> each QSO.

Right. And this incremental increase in speed had nothing to do with FCC rules. It occurs inevitably to almost everyone who uses CW. Personally, I don't care how fast someone can copy code if they never get on the air and communicate with it.

> However, if the maximum testing requirement
> stopped at 5 WPM -- then my progress would have stopped there as
> well. I was not a motivated and dedicated CW user at the time; that
> desire came only with the added proficiency came, and that was
> motivated MAINLY by the requirement. I don't think I'm much different
> than anyone else in this respect, except that I seem to be more
> willing to be truthful about this than the code (test) bashers are.

The point is that 5 WPM is indeed sufficient for someone to get on the air, use the code, and increase their proficiency - contrary to your claim. If they're not going to get on the air in the CW mode, then they don't need the increased proficiency and no one, not the ARS or the FCC, benefits from their increased proficiency. In my opinion, only the ham himself benefits from it, and again, only if he uses it.

I think some form of code requirement is still worth keeping - even if it's in the form of multiple choice dits and dahs on the written exam.

> This is why I believe that in the absence of a "real" code testing
> requirement, there will be little or no future growth in the number of
> users of the Morse/CW mode. Those who support the elimination of
> the requirement, and the re-allocation of Morse/CW spectrum to
> phone, know this as well, but can't admit it.

Spectrum allocations are a whole different ball of wax. Personally, I don't see the use of phone in the Novice CW portions of the band as much of a threat to CW. I can sure as heck filter out phone with my CW filter a lot better than I can filter out CW with my phone filter.

73, Jim AC6XG

2421. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-03 23:50:44 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <95i5do$k80$1@news.service.uci.edu>
Source record: 2770

Len Over 21 <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20010202234912.00445.00001404@nso-bj.aol.com...

> The FCC doesn't think a code test "proves" anything to them
> for the purposes of granting a US amateur radio license. The
> FCC has said so...twice in a decade.

They said that it doesn't prove anything about character. They never said
it doesn't prove "anything". Obviously it proves code proficiency. They
have more of a neutral bias on the issue than you do, I think..

ac6xg

2422. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-03 23:55:17 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A7C9A65.8E255602@IEEE.org>
Source record: 2772

Jon Bloom wrote:
>
> Cecil wrote:
> >
> > I do believe that is exactly what I said, Jon, and you argued with me. So
> > I repeat: If one doesn't know the passband and wants to guarantee that all
> > possible modulation components are decoded, one cannot use undersampling.
>
> No, this is the first time you specified an unrestricted passband.
> Strange receiver you've got there!

I said I could add modulation components to an undersampled *signal*
that you couldn't detect. You said I couldn't. You were wrong. Absolutely
nothing was said about a restricted passband. Strange receiver you've got
there. (I'm talking about your brain.)

> Why don't you just admit you didn't understand the theory initially?

What a laugh. Intel sure wasted their money sending me to DSP classes
for six years, huh? Why don't you just admit that you like to pick
arguments, even with people who agree with you?
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2423. Re: QCWA TELLS FCC TO END INCENTIVE LICENSING

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-03 23:56:30 UTC
From: jwill@AstraGate.net
Message-ID: <95i5re$su9$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2773

In article <3A7C0F5B.2158175B@arrl.org>,
Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote:
> Bob Wex w2ilp wrote:
> >
> > In article <3A797E19.5F1D7E26@arrl.org>,
> > Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote:
> > >
> > > I didn't say they weren't. I only said that according to N9GL, the
> > > standards are not derived from the mechanisms but from the known
> > > effects.
> >
> > True...but as engineers, scientists or medical people the
> > MECHANISM...chemical, biological, electral, mechanical or whatever
must
> > be understood if there is to be any corrective measures devised.

Hi. I came across this thread in a microwave search.

I have a PDF copy of a comment I submitted to NTIA recently: It
attempts to clarify the mechanisms involved, which seem to have
been misunderstood by many past researchers.

It is somewhat technical, but the main point should not be
difficult.

Email me at jwill@AstraGate.net for a copy.

If after reading it, you think it worthwhile and
know of a web site, I'd like to post it somewhere.

--
~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~
John

>
> But we can't apply corrective measures to the design of the human
body.
> The only factor we can control is how much RF we expose ourselves to.
> For that purpose, it is the effect of the exposure that is important,
> not the underlying mechanism.
>
> > A hot chicken does not tell you the mechanism by which it got
hot...but
> > if you heated it in your microwave oven..You know the mechanism was
> > microwave RF not heat conducted from a gas burner or radiated by
your
~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~

> > fireplace.
>
> But if the point is to cook a chicken I don't need to know the
mechanism
> by which the cooking takes place, I only need to know that it gets
> cooked when I apply either heat or RF at sufficient levels.
>
> > > Which makes sense. For the purpose of determining safe levels,
> > > the mechanisms are unimportant
> >
> > Huhh? That is like saying Ohm's Law is unimportant as long as lamp
> > bulbs light. Only the observation of the light matters for
determining
> > what voltage will quickly burn open the filament.
>
> It's nothing like that at all. We need to know Ohm's law so we can
> design electrical devices. We're not designing human bodies. (Although
> there are those doctors who've announced plans to clone humans, so
maybe
> we will be designing humans soon!)
>
> Jon
>

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2424. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-04 01:21:01 UTC
From: billsohl@mindspring.com
Message-ID: <3a7ca983.3435572@news.mindspring.com>
Source record: 2775

On Sat, 03 Feb 2001 05:12:49 GMT, Bob Wex w2ilp <w2ilp@juno.com>
wrote:

>In article <95b0g1du1@news.service.uci.edu>,
> "Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote:
>>
>> Bob Wex w2ilp <w2ilp@juno.com> wrote in message
>>
>> > Hams need more license classes and/or official FCC technical
>> > endorsements.
>>
>> In order to do what?
>
>To meet the BASIS and PURPOSE goals of Part 97.

No one has said that Part 97 Basis and Purpose is NOT
being met.

>> I don't find myself feeling limited by the number of
>> license classes in the ARS. Necessity is the mother of invention, not
>> wallpaper. Interest and curiosity must provide motivation. Without
>that I
>> think you'd have to convince the US Treasury to issue their
>certificates
>> rather than the kind the FCC offers.
>>
>> 73, Jim AC6XG
>
>With all due respect, I am not talking about your feelings Jim. I am
>speaking about what is required so that FUTURE Hams can regain the
>PRIDE that the hobby once had. A certificate that says that you worked
>all states, all zones or a hundred nations may be wallpaper BUT a
>license that says that you passed really comprehensive technical exams
>can restore the kind of pride that once had value to academic,
>commercial and military establishments.

In the cycle of this debate, it has come around to this
once again :-)

>Such a license could command
>real respect, not for just individual hams, but for Ham Radio as the
>technical educational hobby that it once was and should be.

You want that type of license=respect, then get a college
degree or a tech school certificate.

<Snip of same old/same old>

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2425. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-04 01:21:02 UTC
From: billsohl@mindspring.com
Message-ID: <3a7cab6e.3926034@news.mindspring.com>
Source record: 2774

On Sat, 3 Feb 2001 15:50:44 -0800, "Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu>
wrote:

>Len Over 21 <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20010202234912.00445.00001404@nso-bj.aol.com...
>
>> The FCC doesn't think a code test "proves" anything to them
>> for the purposes of granting a US amateur radio license. The
>> FCC has said so...twice in a decade.
>
>They said that it doesn't prove anything about character. They never said
>it doesn't prove "anything". Obviously it proves code proficiency.

Agreed. But they have, as you note, been remarkably
silent as to what, if anything other than proficiency of code
is proven by the requirement. Smetimes the silence can
be deafening.

>They
>have more of a neutral bias on the issue than you do, I think..

Do you have even the slightest belief that the FCC has
any inclination to retain code once but for the current
international requirement (S25.5)?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2426. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-04 03:15:47 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <3A7CC963.9019B140@arrl.org>
Source record: 2776

Cecil wrote:
>
> I said I could add modulation components to an undersampled *signal*
> that you couldn't detect. You said I couldn't. You were wrong.

No, I said *if* the components were in the passband I could. I was
right.

> Absolutely
> nothing was said about a restricted passband. Strange receiver you've got22
> there. (I'm talking about your brain.)

Oh, Cecil, you're a hoot!

> > Why don't you just admit you didn't understand the theory initially?
>
> What a laugh. Intel sure wasted their money sending me to DSP classes
> for six years, huh?

So it seems.

> Why don't you just admit that you like to pick
> arguments, even with people who agree with you?

Nah, I leave that to you. You've been doing it for years and are much
better at it than I am.

Jon

2427. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-04 03:29:42 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <95iib6$530$0@208.206.142.68>
Source record: 2777

Cecil wrote:
>
> "Pride goeth before destruction ..."

You would know.....

2428. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-04 03:57:08 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <95ijuk$6pf$0@208.206.142.68>
Source record: 2778

Cecil wrote:
>

> Intel sure wasted their money sending me to DSP classes
> for six years

That could be, but it sure does nothing to indicate to anyone that any other ham needs to have that level of training in DSP or they should be considered as "ignborant". Rather, anyone who would make such a statement is himself ignorant.

2429. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-04 04:22:40 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A7CD910.1A92D219@IEEE.org>
Source record: 2779

Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> Bob Wex w2ilp <w2ilp@juno.com> wrote:
> >... BUT a
> >license that says that you passed really comprehensive technical exams
> >can restore the kind of pride that once had value to academic,
> >commercial and military establishments.
>
> In the cycle of this debate, it has come around to this
> once again :-)

I just looked up "pride" in the Bible concordance. Wow, God sure
doesn't like pride. He prefers humility.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2430. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-04 04:23:45 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A7CD951.BE16D9DB@IEEE.org>
Source record: 2780

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> Cecil wrote:
> > "Pride goeth before destruction ..."
>
> You would know.....

Yep, I would - I have no pride. God prefers humility.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2431. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-04 04:42:30 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A7CDDB6.5C5268B3@IEEE.org>
Source record: 2781

Jon Bloom wrote:
> No, I said *if* the components were in the passband I could. I was
> right.

Here's the interchange. Note that I didn't say anything about any passband.
It is clear that I am talking about taking the IF signal after the filter
and modifying it so that your undersampling technique won't work. What is
it about "at the IF frequency" that you don't understand?

> Cecil said:
> > I can phase modulate at the IF frequency and
> > slip an undetected message right past your undersampling technique.

Jon replied:
> Nope.

So are you going to continue to assert that your undersampling technique
will work no matter how much extra modulation is added to a signal or are
you willing to change that "Nope" above to "Yes, but ..."?
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2432. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-04 04:46:27 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A7CDEA3.2C0A53C1@IEEE.org>
Source record: 2782

Dick Carroll wrote:
> That could be, but it sure does nothing to indicate to anyone that any
> other ham needs to have that level of training in DSP or they should be
> considered as "ignorant". Rather, anyone who would make such a
> statement is himself ignorant.

I'm telling you, Dick, if you don't learn DSP techniques, you are going
to be a technically obsolete/ignorant ham in the not too distant future.
All filtering and detection functions will soon be done with DSP.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2433. Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-04 05:20:41 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010204002041.18047.00001243@nso-ff.aol.com>
Source record: 2784

Firecracker Material (courtesy of AH0A statistics on US ham licenses)-

In the 9 months following US amateur radio restructuring, the total number of US amateur radio licenses increased by 3,701 (+0.55% of total). Code-tested licensees declined by 9,531 while non-code-tested licensees increased by 13,132.

In the 3 years from January 1998 to December 2000, the total number of US amateur radio licenses increased by 5,734 (+0.85% of total). Code-tested licensees declined by 33,267 while non-code-tested licensees increased by 39,001.

It should be fairly obvious that the non-code-tested are continuing to increase in number just enough to offset the decline in code-tested licensees plus a slight positive growth in total ARS licensees...but not a significant growth. The code-tested licensees have continued to decline despite various rationales on that seeming "inaccuracy"...an "inaccuracy" claim that will probably continue until the last code-tested licensee is SK.

As of the end of December 1997, code-tested licensees were 73.4% of the total, non-code-tested licensees were 26.6% of the total.

By the end of December 2000, code-tested licensees were 67.9% of the total, non-code-tested licensees were 32.1% of the total.

The balance scales keep tilting in favor of the non-code-tested license classes.

As far a NEW amateur radio licensees is concerned, it very obvious that newcomers are favoring the no-code-test Technician class despite the lack of operating privileges below 30 MHz. In three one-year periods (Jan to Dec) from 1998 to 2000, the numbers are -
2000:
Total new licensees: 18,658
Code-tested new: 1,768
Non-code-tested new: 16,800

1999:
Total new licensees: 16,311
Code-tested new: 2,355
Non-code-tested new: 13,946

1998:
Total new licensees: 17,521
Code-tested new: 2,745
Non-code-tested new: 14,776

While some claim that Technician Expirations are just starting and are supposed to show "signigicant decreases" in that class, such speculations ignore the continuation of new Tech licensees that show no indication of slowing down the Tech growth rate. That supposed "entry level" class is very nearly one-third of all US licensees.

didit.

2434. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-04 05:20:42 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010204002042.18047.00001244@nso-ff.aol.com>
Source record: 2783

In article <3A7C9A65.8E255602@IEEE.org>, Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Jon Bloom wrote:
>>
>> Cecil wrote:
>> >
>> > I do believe that is exactly what I said, Jon, and you argued with me. So
>> > I repeat: If one doesn't know the passband and wants to guarantee that
>all
>> > possible modulation components are decoded, one cannot use undersampling.
>>
>> No, this is the first time you specified an unrestricted passband.
>> Strange receiver you've got there!
>
>I said I could add modulation components to an undersampled *signal*
>that you couldn't detect. You said I couldn't. You were wrong. Absolutely
>nothing was said about a restricted passband. Strange receiver you've got
>there. (I'm talking about your brain.)

...this is getting to be just finger-pointing and shouting.

Cecil, demonstrate however you can with SPECIFICs, please, how
you can add modulation components to an undersampled signal
that cannot be detected. No word play, please, electrons and
waves don't respond to human word play.

Let's refer to a sampling oscilloscope. Does a sampling scope
accurately portray a waveform having a much shorter period than
its sampling period? As far as I've seen in theory and in practice
it does.

The output of a sampler frequency-shifts a waveform down in
frequency. The waveform in the time-domain contains all the
components of the frequency domain, amplitudes, phases, the
whole thing. Demodulation of a frequency-shifted modulated
RF signal is done by the same method as demodulation at the
original frequency.

If you are "adding something (unspecified)" to an undersampled
signal that "cannot be detected," then you have to start naming
these unspecified conditions to prove your point. Without those
particulars your message point cannot be detected.

didit

2435. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-04 05:20:43 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010204002043.18047.00001245@nso-ff.aol.com>
Source record: 2785

In article <95i5do$k80$1@news.service.uci.edu>, "Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu>
writes:

>Len Over 21 <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20010202234912.00445.00001404@nso-bj.aol.com...
>
>> The FCC doesn't think a code test "proves" anything to them
>> for the purposes of granting a US amateur radio license. The
>> FCC has said so...twice in a decade.
>
>They said that it doesn't prove anything about character. They never said
>it doesn't prove "anything". Obviously it proves code proficiency. They
>have more of a neutral bias on the issue than you do, I think..

As far as what I've been able to read in 1990 and in 1999, the FCC
said that the amateur radio code test does not prove anything for
their purposes of granting a US amateur radio license. [please to
include the whole sentence I wrote in quoting]

Can you say the only US civil radio regulatory agency has a "bias"
on what they grant? Said "bias" is a very subjective thing for every
observer. The FCC simply regulates US civil radio and issues
licenses where regulations call for them.

Yes, the code test proves some elementary code cognition
ability. Is that the whole point of US amateur radio below 30
MHz? To prove some code capability?

Is obtaining a code-tested US amateur radio license all about
"proving one's worth to the 'amateur community?'" I don't think
so looking at it from the FCC's point of view. The US amateur
radio community doesn't issue licenses nor does it "grade" any
licensee...officially.

As of December 1997, the number of code-tested US amateurs
was 73.39% of the total licensees while the number of US
amateurs not code tested was 26.61% of the total.

As of December 2000, the number of code-tested US amateurs
was 67.9% of the total, the number of non-code-tested US
amateurs was 32.1%. In actual numbers of amateur licensees,
the number of code-tested amateurs is dropping while the
number of non-code-tested amateurs is rising. It's been that
way for several years. The FCC can see that rather well.

Is the FCC "neutral" on amateur code testing? I don't think so.
If they were "neutral" they wouldn't have made the statements

they did in 1990 and 1999 R&Os about code tests...probably
wouldn't have even bothered to create the Technician class.

didit

2436. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-04 06:00:48 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <3A7CF010.C4CCAA0E@arrl.org>
Source record: 2786

Cecil wrote:
>
> > Cecil said:
> > > I can phase modulate at the IF frequency and
> > > slip an undetected message right past your undersampling technique.
>
> Jon replied:
> > Nope.

Falling into the desperate habit of resorting to selective quotes to twist meaning, again, eh? Let's review the *complete* quote:

Jon replied:
> Nope. As long as the sidebands produced by your phase modulation fall
> within the IF passband, they'll be present in the sampled signal.

Clearly, it was only after you read that that you tumbled to the way it actually works. Now, of course, you are trying to reinterpret your earlier statements to mean something other than what you said. Your usual scramble when you've been shown to be wrong.

> So are you going to continue to assert that your undersampling technique
> will work no matter how much extra modulation is added to a signal or are
> you willing to change that "Nope" above to "Yes, but ..."?

Since I never asserted that, as the *complete* quote above shows, it would be impossible to "continue." (See: "Have you stopped beating your wife?") You just can't stand to admit you were wrong about something. But I think I've derived enough amusement from watching you squirm. Feel free to have the last word.

Jon

2437. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-04 07:44:30 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <95j18ubtb0@208.206.142.68>
Source record: 2787

Cecil wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > That could be, but it sure does nothing to indicate to anyone that any
> > other ham needs to have that level of training in DSP or they should be
> > considered as "ignorant". Rather, anyone who would make such a
> > statement is himself ignorant.
>
> I'm telling you, Dick, if you don't learn DSP techniques, you are going
> to be a technically obsolete/ignorant ham in the not too distant future.
> All filtering and detection functions will soon be done with DSP.

NO!!! Maybe *most* newly manufactured SSB and some other gear
will incorporate DSP functions. Not homebrew nor kitted gear which is
becoming so popular with so many hams these days. Your statement is
simply untrue. Stop trying to remake the ARS to your own personal
specifications.

2438. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-04 14:47:02 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A7D6B66.525366A9@IEEE.org>
Source record: 2788

Jon Bloom wrote:
>
> Cecil wrote:
> >
> > > Cecil said:
> > > > I can phase modulate at the IF frequency and
> > > > slip an undetected message right past your undersampling technique.
> > >
> > > Jon replied:
> > > > Nope.
>
> Falling into the desperate habit of resorting to selective quotes to
> twist meaning, again, eh? Let's review the *complete* quote:
>
> Jon replied:
> > Nope. As long as the sidebands produced by your phase modulation fall
> > within the IF passband, they'll be present in the sampled signal.

Please don't try to divert the subject from what you said that was wrong
to what you said that was right. We are not discussing the truisms that
you uttered. We are discussing your assertion that I cannot add modulation
components to a signal that your undersampling techniques cannot detect.
I said I could. You said "Nope", I can't. That "Nope" is all that matters.

You seem to be continuing to assert that I cannot add modulation components
to a signal that your undersampling techniques cannot detect and you are
coming across as a person who considers himself so perfect that he never
makes a mistake. You obviously made a mistake, Jon, which can be diagnosed
by answering the following questions, true or false.

1. Cecil cannot add modulation components to a signal that cannot be
detected by my, Jon's undersampling techniques. (true or false)
If you answer true, you are mistaken. If you answer false, you
contradict your previous "Nope" assertion.

2. I, Jon made a mistake in my inference about what Cecil had said.
(true or false)

One of the above above two things happened, Jon, and either way, you
made a mistake. Sorry, you are going to have to give up your "Mr.
Perfect" posture.

> Since I never asserted that, as the *complete* quote above shows, it
> would be impossible to "continue."

It doesn't matter what you said after "Nope", Jon. The "Nope" was the part that was wrong. If I say "A=A" and you say "Nope, B=B" you are still wrong. And you are still wrong. To correct your mistake you must change "Nope" to "Yes but ..." because you know and I know that I can add modulation components to a signal that your undersampling techniques cannot detect. How you can deny saying something that is still there in the thread for all to see is unbelievable.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2439. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-04 15:39:01 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <95jt2lkss0@208.206.142.71>
Source record: 2789

Cecil wrote:
>
> Jon Bloom wrote:
> >
> > Cecil wrote:
> > >
> > > > Cecil said:
> > > > > I can phase modulate at the IF frequency and
> > > > > slip an undetected message right past your undersampling technique.

Now you've got me curious: How do you plan on going into Jon's radio
after the IF sampling has taken place to "slip an undetected message
right past your undersampling techniqjue"? Anything that appears at the
point the undersampling takes place will be sampled at an equal rate.
Are you into magic these days? Or just excessive grape juice?

2440. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-04 15:47:06 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010204104706.03780.00001049@nso-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 2790

In article <3A7B63C1.6E06E20E@IEEE.org>, Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>So Antenna Tuners are "twaddle"? Are you going to author a QEX article
>entitled, "Antenna Tuners Are Twaddle"?

Cecil:

Y knot? I twaddle with my antenna tuner all the time!

73 de Larry, K3LT

2441. Re: Long Delay Echos

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-04 15:47:06 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010204104706.03780.00001050@nso-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 2791

In article <95c0is$p9k$1@nnrp1.deja.com>, Steven J Robeson, K4YZ
<k4yz@my-deja.com> writes:

>
>Anyone have any experience with them?
>
>73
>
>Steve, K4YZ

Art Bell says they're signals that bounce around the hollow core
of the Earth. Personally, I've never heard 'em, because the planet
I live on isn't hollow!

73 de Larry, K3LT

2442. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-04 15:47:07 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010204104707.03780.00001052@nso-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 2793

In article <3A798461.CD3C8F1F@IEEE.org>, Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>> I'll call him a "dumbed-down Nickle-Extra" myself. However,
>> PseudoExtra does have a nice ring to it! Kinda grows on you,
>> doesn't it?
>
>Here's a little guy who doesn't even know what amateur radio is
>and you are going to call him a "dumbed-down Nickle-Extra" in
>15 years when he gets the only Extra class license available
>to him???? Are you trying to get him to hate older hams?

Cecil:

I never said I'd call him a "PseudoExtra" to his face. Anyway,
I didn't invent that term -- YOU did!!!

73 de Larry, K3LT

2443. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-04 15:47:07 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010204104707.03780.00001051@nso-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 2798

In article <20010201062035.15050.00000239@ng-ff1.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>
>Don't be surprised if not many people want to follow you as you try to drag
>Amateur Radio down to your level, Larry. Many of us still believe in the
>values you used to attribute to the Service.
>
>If you really feel this way, perhaps we would all be better off if you let
>your
>license expire and found something you can believe in to do.

Ed:

I'll keep my amateur radio license as long as it serves me in any manner I find useful. I do admit that my enjoyment of ham radio is greatly diminished along with the reduction in licensing standards. I seem to have worked everyone there is to work on CW, and even on the FISTS frequencies, there is nothing there but mindless awards-chasing and 84-year-old retirees in Florida trailer parks, running their letters and words together but doing it very fast, indeed. I doubt that even if large numbers of new hams come on the air in the Post-Restructuring era, as they have yet to do, that my interest will be rekindled very easily. I had high hopes and aspirations as a ham; but I now find myself strangely apathetic. I really would like to get the old ham spirit back, but that hasn't happened. I was having fun on PSK31 for a while, but once I worked seemingly everyone using that mode, and they were also 84-year-old retirees in Florida, there was no more point in it.

I'm not quite ready to give up on ham radio yet, Ed, but the ARRL, now that it's talking about trying to save a bit of CW spectrum for future use, has really put a damper on my former enthusiasm. I also see the handwriting on the wall. Our vast spectrum, especially above 500 MHz, is way to valuable to future wireless service providers for us not to lose it in vast chunks in the near future. Therefore, the future of ham radio for me may very well be to use these services on *former* amateur frequencies. Time will tell, but for now, my license stays on the wall of my "shack."

73 de Larry, K3LT

2444. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-04 15:47:08 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010204104708.03780.00001053@nso-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 2794

In article <3A7984FE.A7FB5D05@IEEE.org>, Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>> Just in case Dick didn't mean that, *I'll* say it -- and mean it! So
>> there! What are you going to do about it?
>
>So anyone who obtains the only Extra license available is a pseudoExtra?
>What if he has a PhD in EE and can do 50wpm Morse code? Is he still a
>pseudoExtra?

Cecil:

Like Dick said -- bring him around to the newsgroup, let's make an
on-the-air sked with him to verify even 20 WPM CW proficiency, and
if he checks out, then I, for one, will be perfectly happy to admit that
he's the "Real Mc Coy" as an Extra. How 'bout it?

73 de Larry, K3LT

2445. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-04 15:47:08 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010204104708.03780.00001054@nso-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 2796

In article <k0aj7tgb7bc2jk8bvesqh3rm8vc37rifgt@4ax.com>, Aaron Jones
<nomail@nomail.com> writes:

>
>w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:
>>We knew the type in grammar school; they are apparently still with us.
>
>Translation: Larry is a bully.
>
>>Don't be surprised if not many people want to follow you as you try to drag
>>Amateur Radio down to your level, Larry.
>
>Translation: Larry is a low level person.
>
>>If you really feel this way, perhaps we would all be better off if you let
>your
>>license expire and found something you can believe in to do.
>
>Translation: Ham radio would be better off without Larry.
>
>Gosh Ed, you didn't used to fight your battles by using personal
>attacks. Why don't you just rebut with the facts...

Now, now, Aaron -- Ed is doing the best he can with a lobster
Jones on his back! I think he'll be much nicer once he gets to
cash in on the bet he won with me.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2446. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-04 15:47:09 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010204104709.03780.00001055@nso-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 2797

In article <3A7A0E3B.3DFFA63E@uci.edu>, Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> writes:

>
>W4JLE wrote:
>
>> As much as I respect your efforts in ham radio, I despise the attitude
>> you are displaying towards older hams.
>
>K3LT's Birthday (from QRZ): 31 Oct 1952
>
>W1RFI's Birthday (from QRZ): 26 Aug 1950

Jim:

I don't think Fred was referring to chronological age; he was referring
to hams who have been licensed for longer periods of time. Just what
period of time he considers an "older" ham to be is anyone's guess, but
I'll attempt to quantify it by stating that anyone licensed prior to the
implementation of VE-testing, as I was, is an "older" ham. The VE-testing
was the beginning of the end, dumbing-down wise, IMHO. Ironically,
I originally supported the concept of VE testing, and upgraded rapidly
with the notion of a lengthy career serving the hobby as a VE. Then
the corruption reared its ugly head, and I washed my hands of the VE
mess while I was still relatively uninvolved. I digress. An "older" ham
is one who was licensed as a General or above prior to 1985. Since
I was originally licensed in '81 and attained Extra class in '83, I meet
my own definition as an "older" ham, regardless of my age.

Your mileage may vary.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2447. Re: Troll?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-04 15:47:10 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010204104710.03780.00001057@nso-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 2792

In article <3A7798C6.9C1D9563@IEEE.org>, Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>Ever hear of trolling for fish? Well, some posters here on netnews
>troll for suckers. "No Code = No Ham" is a troll designed to upset
>all the nocode tech hams.

Cecil:

AND, since it also happens to be the truth, it seems to work quite
effectively!

73 de Larry, K3LT

Now, THAT's a TROLL!!!

2448. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-04 15:47:10 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010204104710.03780.00001056@nso-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 2799

In article <3A7AED99.58F50DD6@arrl.org>, Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org> writes:

>
>Those who belittle hams who did not obtain their licenses under the old
>system deserve to have that behavior treated with comtempt because it is
>comtemptible. That has nothing to do with one's opinion of the value of
>code testing.

Jon:

What is truly contemptible is the raw laziness of those who ragged on and on ad infinitum about the uselessness of the code testing requirements, using the same specious arguments about how it was inhibiting the development of modern digital technology and keeping young people out of ham radio. What is equally contemptible is how the ARRL reversed its course on the support of code testing, the minute they saw a requisition for red ink from their accounting department. What is contemptible is the sappy, saccharine political correctness of ARRL officials who never saw a knuckle-dragging HT user they didn't fall in love with -- all the while staring directly at their wallets. What is truly contemptible is the way amateur radio no longer stands for any kind of meaningful accomplishments. Heck, learning isn't even required anymore, since the licensing requirements have been dumbed-down to insignificance. What is truly contemptible is how the National Association for Amateur Radio has found it necessary to insult the collective intelligence of both past, present, and future hams at the same time. Believe me, Jon -- when it comes to contemptible things, you ARRL guys know what you're talking about!

Personally, I have complete contempt for what ham radio has turned into. And, as the "National Association for Amateur Radio," I can't see anyone to blame but the ARRL. The way I see it, you (the ARRL) could have stopped Restructuring and supported, defended, and successfully retained the status quo in amateur radio license testing. You went for change for change's sake, only because the slouchers demanded it. Now, you get to lie in the bed you made.

If I read the statistics on the Speroni web site correctly, there has been a net gain of 4,063 licensed amateurs since Restructuring took place in April, '00. How many new ARRL memberships have been taken since then?

73 de Larry, K3LT

2449. Re: Code Quick RULEZ!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-04 15:47:11 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010204104711.03780.00001058@nso-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 2800

In article <95bq8f$ja4$1@nnrp1.deja.com>, jason_hsu@my-deja.com writes:

>You amuse me, Larry. First, you keep insisting that Morse Code all-
>important to all of ham radio and that the Morse Code testing
>requirements are sacred.
>
>So I decide to bring Code Quick to the attention of everyone on
>USENET. Unlike more conventional methods, Code Quick works, and people
>ACTUALLY follow through. So what do you do? You try to knock it
>down!
>
>I can tell from personal experience that Code Quick works. Because it
>takes the drudgery (memorization of dits and dahs, listening to CW and
>waiting for divine inspiration, etc.) out of learning CW, it seems that
>everyone who tries Code Quick sticks to it. You CANNOT say the same
>about other methods.

Jason:

There are plenty of better methods. Simply learning the characters
and getting on-the-air at 5 WPM is the best way to go. However,
Code Quick makes a disasterous short-cut, by employing cutsey
sound-alike phonetic phrases that require double or triple
translation in the brain before the act of writing down a letter takes
place. So, you're listening to "dadidadit" and you've got to think
to yourself "that was 'dadidadit' so that sounds like 'Debbie did it'
or something like that, and 'Debbie' starts with a 'd' so I'll write
that down. Of course, the character sent was a "C," but who's
counting? I think Code Quick is the most confusing, inhibiting,
and inefficient Morse code learning programs ever devised. The
attraction is certainly unmistakable, for it offers the proverbial
free lunch -- and therefore, gets a strong following from the
clients of the ham radio Welfare State.

>I challenge you to find anyone who tried Code Quick but failed.

Well, all I can say is, I know a lot of people who own the tapes,
but none of them are regular CW users!

>I will agree with you that Code Quick alone isn't enough for 20+ wpm.

Damn straight! It practically wires your brain in a way that makes
it impossible to get beyond 10 WPM. But, in these days of a 5 WPM
maximum code test, I guess that's no longer a problem.

>Well, at some point, the Code Quick user has to start copying in
>his/her head. But at least there's nothing to unlearn.

Nothing but everything Code Quick taught them about character recognition! You see, Code Quick users didn't learn to react directly to the sound of a Morse code character -- they have to do the "translation" sequence in their mind before the light comes on and the write down the character.

>Larry, you obviously do NOT need Code Quick.

No, thank God, I don't! Oh, speaking of God, that's another problem I have with Code Quick. It indulges in religious proselytizing right in the middle of the tape. Specifically, fundamentalist Christian proselytizing. Why is religion brought into the program? What about potential customers who are Catholic, Jewish, Muslim, or any other non-fundamentalist Christian religion? If the guy wants to sell religious tapes, he should do so within the confines of that market -- and not include HIS specific religious beliefs in a program marketed to people from all walks of life who are interested in ham radio. Is there any disclaimer on the tape package? I've never seen any!

>But the "lazy No Code" crowd certainly does.

Well, I give you Brownie points for at least admitting that.

Show me someone from this group, and I'll show
>you someone who didn't use Code Quick.

Like I said before, I know a lot of people who own Code Quick -- but virtually none of them went on to be proficient CW users. They may have passed their code tests, but they didn't gain the skill. I'll stick with what works -- learning the sound of the individual characters using the Farnsworth method, and getting 2-way practice on-the-air.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2450. Re: Morse Code replacement? Bigtime flame war article!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-04 15:47:12 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010204104712.03780.00001059@nso-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 2795

In article <957t00$a3d$1@nnrp1.deja.com>, Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
writes:

>> My choice of words is telling the truth, as it always has. If you are
>> so adamantly "Pro-Code," why didn't you support it by insisting on
>> retaining the status quo in testing requirements?
>
>I'm pro-national defense, pro-military, but I don't advocate
>conscription at this time. Does that now make me anti-military?

Brian:

I am all of the above as well, so you're preaching to the choir on
the subject of conscription. What does this have to do with the
Morse code?

73 de Larry, K3LT

2451. Re: Long Delay Echos

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-04 15:54:21 UTC
From: AC6V <ac6v@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3A7D7B2C.82FBE7FA@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 2701

```
See URL:
http://www.qsl.net/ea6vq/lde.html
--
73 From Rod AC6V In San Diego
700 Ham Topics & 6,000 Links
http://ac6v.com/
I Doubt, Therefore I Might Be!!!
==================

> In article <95c0is$p9k$1@nnrp1.deja.com>, Steven J Robeson, K4YZ
> writes:
> >Anyone have any experience with them?
> >73 Steve, K4YZ
>
```

2452. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-04 16:22:29 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <3A7D81C5.3DF88DC7@arrl.org>
Source record: 2702

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> Personally, I have complete contempt for what ham radio has turned
> into.

We know that, Larry. But the only thing that has changed about ham radio is that the artificial pecking order of license classes has been deemphasized. Ham radio is still what its participants make of it. You still have authorization to use a wide variety of signal types and operating techniques on a wide selection of frequency bands. There still are many people interested in that wide variety of activities with whom to consort. If part of what you derived from ham radio was the I'm-better-than-them ego boost provided by your position in the license structure, ham radio's benefit to you has indeed been diminished. That frankly doesn't concern me since ego boosting isn't the purpose of ham radio.

Jon

2453. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-04 16:36:20 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010204113620.29597.00005575@nso-mi.aol.com>
Source record: 2703

In article <95i563$k78$1@news.service.uci.edu>, "Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> writes:

>
>Spectrum allocations are a whole different ball of wax. Personally, I don't
>see the use of phone in the Novice CW portions of the band as much of a
>threat to CW. I can sure as heck filter out phone with my CW filter a lot
>better than I can filter out CW with my phone filter.

Jim:

Well, then, when the "noise floor" reaches the ceiling, I hope you enjoy the challenge of operating CW among all those high-powered, over-compressed, over processed phone signals!

73 de Larry, K3LT

2454. Re: Morse Code replacement? Bigtime flame war article!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-04 16:36:20 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010204113620.29597.00005573@nso-mi.aol.com>
Source record: 2704

In article <3A7B9906.7A34E5A5@IEEE.org>, Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>> I have no problem understanding the merits of CW.
>
>It's obvious that you do NOT understand the merits of CW, Larry.
>If you understood the merits of CW, you would be pushing the
>mode instead of pushing for a governmental welfare support
>system for the mode.

Cecil:

I'm giving up hope that you can ever get anything right. The
"government welfare" program is the reduction/elimination of
code testing, not the other way around. It is pandering to
lazy, unmotivated slouchers -- which is what welfare programs
do! If you don't understand the difference, then you're credibility
just went completely down the drain!

73 de Larry, K3LT

2455. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-04 16:36:20 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010204113620.29597.00005574@nso-mi.aol.com>
Source record: 2705

In article <3A7B9862.16CC2C67@IEEE.org>, Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>> However, if the maximum testing requirement
>> stopped at 5 WPM -- then my progress would have stopped there as
>> well.
>
>Sounds like you have a severe personality problem regarding self
>motivation. When you satisfied the requirements for a college
>degree, did you also stop your progress? Do you only accomplish
>what you are forced to accomplish?

Cecil:

Yes, actually, I did -- but tha was for financial reasons. My VA
educational benefits ran out the same time I got my degree! Now,
I'd be glad to go back to school full-time -- are you offering me a
personally funded scholarship? If not, quit being such a pain in
the beehind just because you know how!

73 de Larry, K3LT

2456. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-04 17:16:31 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010204121631.29597.00005579@nso-mi.aol.com>
Source record: 2706

In article <3A7B9C02.960659D9@sccoast.net>, Dwight Stewart
<stewartx@sccoast.net> writes:

> Larry is a little more than just "upset." For many months, Larry
>has carried on an endless campaign to belittle newly licensed
>operators with the use of derogotary names and insulting
>characterizations, while endlessly denigrating their efforts and
>contributions.

Dwight:

Hmmm. Just what *are* the "contributions" of these newly
licensed hams you're talking about? Specifics, please -- include
any relevant documentation -- news articles, media releases,
etc.

> Those newly licensed operators include my wife, myself, and the many
>thousands of other decent people whose only ham radio "sin" is that we
>didn't obtain our license in the same manner as Larry.

Hmmmmm again. Just where did I state that "newly licensed operators"
were not "decent people?" Please provide quotes from Deja.com.

> Now, I'm sorry if Larry does not like how I obtained my license,

I could care less how you obtained your license, Dwight.

but
>he is a damn fool if he thinks I'm going to give it up just because it
>makes him "upset."

The way you obtained your license does not make me upset and I
wouldn't dream of asking you to give it up. You struggled and
suffered through those not quite insurmountable licensing requirements,
and I feel you've earned your place in today's ARS. You can be duly
proud of your astounding achievement, in light of present day standards
and expectations. If you were here right now, I'd pat you on the back!

>And he is equally a fool if he thinks we're going
>to feel sorry for him because he is "upset" about the reduced code
>requirements.

Again, I am not "upset." The code requirements were there for me
to achieve, and the fact that they are no longer standing in YOUR
way makes me happy for you! I got to prove something to myself
and others through the application of diligent effort -- and you didn't
have to! Everything worked out well for both of us.

> In the end, Larry needs to grow up and get over his relentless
>self-pity.

Please stop looking in that mirrow while you're talking about me,
Dwight. Its confusing.

>If he isn't able to do that, then Ed is absolutely right -
>Larry needs to give up his license and move on to something else that
>does not "upset" him so much.

No upset here, Dwight. I'm fine. Wish the same were true of you!

73 de Larry, K3LT

2457. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-04 17:16:31 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010204121631.29597.00005580@nso-mi.aol.com>
Source record: 2707

In article <3A7D81C5.3DF88DC7@arrl.org>, Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org> writes:

>> Personally, I have complete contempt for what ham radio has turned
>> into.
>
>We know that, Larry. But the only thing that has changed about ham radio
>is that the artificial pecking order of license classes has been
>deemphasized.

Jon:

I guess you're more affected by such things because I was never personally aware of this "pecking order," nor was I ever negatively affected by it. Now, that's easy for me to say, because in my own case, I wasn't exposed to it very long, due to the relative simplicity of rising to the top of the so-called "pecing order." What I could never understand is why those people who WERE sensitive to the "pecking order" never bothered to apply themselves to overcoming it, or at least rise to the top so they could be the "peckers" rather than the "peckees," if they preferred. But, you know, this "pecking order" stuff is just exactly the kind of whining that was a big part of the dumbing down-process, and it doesn't surprise me to see that an ARRL staffer, in the prototypically smug, smart-assed, bad attitude manner that a lot of hams have learned to expect from ARRL HQ officials, is now writing about it. I suggest you put in Op-Ed piece in QST about how much better ham radio is now that the "pecking order" has been removed. Be sure to include the words of "Kumbya."

>If part of what you derived from ham radio was the
>I'm-better-than-them ego boost provided by your position in the license
>structure, ham radio's benefit to you has indeed been diminished.

Jon, until you brought it up, I never gave it much thought at all! However, that seems to be a concept right at the leading edge of your own conciousness. I wonder why?

>That
>frankly doesn't concern me since ego boosting isn't the purpose of ham
>radio.

And, apparently, neither is the concept of achievement through progressive learning and development of useful communications skills. What a shame.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2458. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-04 17:27:08 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <3A7D90EC.D080F819@arrl.org>
Source record: 2708

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> In article <3A7D81C5.3DF88DC7@arrl.org>, Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org> writes:
>
> >If part of what you derived from ham radio was the
> >I'm-better-than-them ego boost provided by your position in the license
> >structure, ham radio's benefit to you has indeed been diminished.
>
> Jon, until you brought it up, I never gave it much thought at all! However,
> that seems to be a concept right at the leading edge of your own
> conciousness. I wonder why?

You may not have given it much thought, but you've been practicing it by
pecking at those who you perceive to be lesser hams than yourself, based
solely on what license they hold, and by insisting that the removal of
the pecking order has turned ham radio ito something contemptible.

> >That
> >frankly doesn't concern me since ego boosting isn't the purpose of ham
> >radio.
>
> And, apparently, neither is the concept of achievement through progressive
> learning and development of useful communications skills. What a shame.

That concept is still present. It just doesn't require government
validation any more. We don't need government proclamation of who is and
who is not a "real" ham. We can recognize and celebrate real achievement
(as distinct from passing exams) within the amateur community -- and
without denigrating those who choose not to pursue a particular subset
of ham radio.

Jon

2459. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-04 17:32:39 UTC
From: W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com>
Message-ID: <95k3ogjkb1@iac5.navix.net>
Source record: 2709

Jon, the purpose of Cecil's remarks has nothing to do with theory or an exchange of ideas. You have been sucked into the "let's see how long it takes me to frustrate the hell out of him" game. Cecil has few pleasures in life, except for the "game". Like tic tac toe, the only way to win is not to play...

"Jon Bloom" <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message news:3A7C696E.4543B8CB@arrl.org...
> Cecil wrote:
> >
> > I do believe that is exactly what I said, Jon, and you argued with me. So
> > I repeat: If one doesn't know the passband and wants to guarantee that all
> > possible modulation components are decoded, one cannot use undersampling.
>
> No, this is the first time you specified an unrestricted passband.
> Strange receiver you've got there!
>
> Why don't you just admit you didn't understand the theory initially?
>
> Jon

2460. Re: Troll?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-04 18:13:35 UTC
From: Stagger Lee <SLee@houston.net>
Message-ID: <3A7D9BCF.DA71F553@houston.net>
Source record: 2710

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> In article <3A7798C6.9C1D9563@IEEE.org>, Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>
> >
> >Ever hear of trolling for fish? Well, some posters here on netnews
> >troll for suckers. "No Code = No Ham" is a troll designed to upset
> >all the nocode tech hams.
>
> Cecil:
>
> AND, since it also happens to be the truth, it seems to work quite
> effectively!

Sheese! I turn off my aol twit filter for a little bit, and look what
appears. Time to go back to killing all posts from aol and deja.

<plonk>

2461. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-04 18:24:55 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <3A7D9E77.179FF5D8@arrl.org>
Source record: 2712

W4JLE wrote:
>
> Jon, the purpose of Cecil's remarks has nothing to do with theory or an
> exchange of ideas. You have been sucked into the "let's see how long it
> takes me to frustrate the hell out of him" game. Cecil has few pleasures in
> life, except for the "game". Like tic tac toe, the only way to win is not to
> play...

Cecil and I have a long history, so I know his game. Occasionally, it's
fun to turn the tables on him and frustrate *him*. (Next up: A posting
from Cecil denying all of the above.)

Jon

2462. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-04 18:26:47 UTC
From: George McCouch <geomac@hopkinsville.net>
Message-ID: <B6A2FB07.12EE%geomac@hopkinsville.net>
Source record: 2711

> From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
> Organization: NETPLEX Internet Services - http://www.ntplx.net/
> Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
> Date: Sat, 03 Feb 2001 09:10:59 -0500
> Subject: Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement
>
> George McCouch wrote:
>>
>> It is pretty high. I joind the ARRL in 1964 for $5.00 a year. Using the
>> CPI index from 1964 through 2000 that $5.00 is now worth about $27.50.
>> The ARRL is over 40% higher with the news dues rate.
>
> If you choose a different base year, you get a different result. Neither
> the CPI nor ARRL dues increase in a smooth, continuous curve. Plus, of
> course, the CPI measures the costs of a lot of things that aren't
> relevant to ARRL's costs of providing services and doesn't measure the
> costs of a lot of things that are relevant, like the cost of magazine
> paper and mailing costs.
>
>> As some have
>> mentioned, services that were once without additional cost to members
>> now carry fees. I probably should have gotten life membership back
>> then.
>
> I don't think it was available in '64, was it? Seems to me it was a few
> years after that when it became available.
>
> Jon

Jon,

I really do not know if it was available then, but the yearly membership of $5.00 for me was two weeks allowance and seemed very reasonable at the time. While you are correct about the base year selection, one needs to start somewhere. I have always thought that the CPI actually understated the real overall cost increases that most families notice over a long period.

It is easy to get pricing from any time period and there are some things that have come down in terms of the CPI. Some examples are electronics (huge drops) many grocery items, gasoline (but it is now catching up) and some major appliances. However, other costs affecting families have shot up much faster than the CPI. Costs of vehicles, housing, many kinds of insurance except for possibly life insurance, health care, college tuition, lately heating oil and natural gas, and as some have mentioned, personal services.

The problem with the CPI is that it probably not weighted correctly, but it is the index that many things are tied to such as social security and some contract wage increases. It is also the prime indicator of inflation and can be the generator of federal reserve interest hikes or cuts that have tremendous impact on the overall economy.

I tend to look at most pricing in terms of the CPI starting at some base period, usually when I began to purchase items of the same category that I purchase today.

73
George
W3GEO

2463. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-04 18:33:24 UTC
From: George McCouch <geomac@hopkinsville.net>
Message-ID: <B6A2FC94.12EF%geomac@hopkinsville.net>
Source record: 2713

> From: "Richard McCollum" <rmccoll@radiks.net>
> Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
> Date: Sat, 3 Feb 2001 08:44:45 -0600
> Subject: Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement
>
>
> "George McCouch" <geomac@hopkinsville.net> wrote in message
> news:geomac-B685F4.08004803022001@news.kih.net...
>> In article <3A6D2EE9.69ADA2BF@ovis.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net>
>> It is pretty high. I joind the ARRL in 1964 for $5.00 a year. Using the
>> CPI index from 1964 through 2000 that $5.00 is now worth about $27.50.
>> The ARRL is over 40% higher with the news dues rate. As some have
>> mentioned, services that were once without additional cost to members
>> now carry fees. I probably should have gotten life membership back
>> then.
>>
>> 73
>> George W3GEO
>
> I would suggest you look up the price of haircuts or any other personal
> service. The CPI is of less than phenomenal value for any analysis but
> any index will show that wherever the good or service in question uses
> people rather than capital it will rise faster than the index as a whole.
>
> Look at your school taxes where the only two technological innovations in
> a thousand years have been central heating so we don't wear robes anymore
> and a fellow named Gutenburg making it unnecessary to chain the prof's
> notes to the lectern. Now there is a personal service business!

Richard,

Good Point, Especially on the school taxes. There are reasons of course. In our local school system the addition of system personnel over the last 10 years has been tremendous while student population has declined about 18%. Computers cost money, as does new sports facilities.

73
George
W3GEO

2464. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-04 19:14:21 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010204141421.14777.00001420@nso-bd.aol.com>
Source record: 2714

In article <20010204104710.03780.00001056@nso-ch.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>In article <3A7AED99.58F50DD6@arrl.org>, Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org> writes:
>
>>
>>Those who belittle hams who did not obtain their licenses under the old
>>system deserve to have that behavior treated with comtempt because it is
>>comtemptible. That has nothing to do with one's opinion of the value of
>>code testing.
>
>Jon:
>
>What is truly contemptible is the raw laziness of those who ragged
>on and on ad infinitum about the uselessness of the code testing
>requirements, using the same specious arguments about how it
>was inhibiting the development of modern digital technology and
>keeping young people out of ham radio.

Mother Superior;

US amateur radio is surviving just fine and attracting newcomers.
But...NOT through code testing for a license. Attrition is
happening, has been happening among the code-tested
licensees. See the statistics compiled from FCC public data
by a supporter of morse code, AH0A.

>What is equally contemptible
>is how the ARRL reversed its course on the support of code testing,
>the minute they saw a requisition for red ink from their accounting
>department.

tRoll, the ARRL quite rightly supports amateur radio regulations
as being the law for US amateurs. How do you manage to
make obeyance of law as contemptible? Are you an outlaw?

>What is contemptible is the sappy, saccharine
>political correctness of ARRL officials who never saw a knuckle-
>dragging HT user they didn't fall in love with -- all the while staring
>directly at their wallets.

Truly a Troll statement. No-code-test Technicians are very close
to one-third of all US amateur radio licensees yet the ARRL
membership demographics indicate that only about one-eighth
are ARRL members. How is it "comtemptible" for the ARRL
to encourage Technician class memberships?

Isn't it contemptible for the tRoll to label Technicians as
"knuckle-dragging HT users?" See past references to them
as "shack on a belt" amateurs.

> What is truly contemptible is the way
>amateur radio no longer stands for any kind of meaningful
>accomplishments.

Ah, so the tRoll does not see therefore these accomplishments
do not exist.

Digital Signal Processing (DSP) has existed for two decades
in electronics...as ready-built hardware, as kits, as computer
programs controlling computer sound cards for audio processing.
Has the tRoll done anything with that technology other than
reading sales ads on them?

If the Holy tRoller would look into past issues of QST or QEX or
even the Technical Information Service page of the ARRL he
would see a number of technical accomplishments by radio
amateurs...accomplishments that the Holy tRoll could duplicate
if he wasn't so busy sneering at no-coders.

>Heck, learning isn't even required anymore,
>since the licensing requirements have been dumbed-down to
>insignificance.

Mother Superior role again. No one knew as much at the time
of license testing as the Holy tRoll. Apparently all that was
forgotten afterwards since the tRoll does not participate in any
discussion involving technological arts.

Mother wishes everything to be static, set in the armor-plated
concrete of past standards and practices, no advancement for
the Mother cannot learn anything after being licensed long ago.

>Personally, I have complete contempt for what ham radio has turned
>into.

Then you should turn in your license, declare it null and void,
quit, go QRT, forget about it. With one less of your kind around
it would be more attractive to newcomers.

Apparently Mother Superior wishes to be honored and revered
for claimed accomplishments above and beyond human ken.
No doubt she feels truly superior, perhaps god-like in majesty,
the law-giver who sits in judgement of "lesser beings." :-)

>... The way I see it, you (the ARRL)
>could have stopped Restructuring and supported, defended, and
>successfully retained the status quo in amateur radio license testing.

The ARRL did, according to public record, support and defend
a virtual status quo in US amateur radio in 1998 and 1999. They
did not succeed in retaining the god-like powers of high-rate morse

code testing patronizingly demanded by some.

>You went for change for change's sake, only because the slouchers
>demanded it.

The "slouchers" are now a third of all US amateur radio licensees.

Those "slouchers" were also US citizens, some being military
veterans, who have accomplished other things in life besides
trying to promote continuing standards and practices of the
1930s in US amateur radio.

> Now, you get to lie in the bed you made.

...Freudian slip based on an unsuccessful Saturday night? :-)

>If I read the statistics on the Speroni web site correctly, there has
>been a net gain of 4,063 licensed amateurs since Restructuring
>took place in April, '00.

tRoll reads wrong. The net gain is 3,701 with the gain coming
from no-code-test Technicians. Code-tested US amateur
licensees decreased by 9,431 in that 9-month period. In that
same period 13,132 no-code-test Technicians were added.

It is truly contemptible for some claimed academic graduates
to be unable to handle simple arithmetic on public data. :-)

didit

2465. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-04 23:57:22 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccoll@radiks.net>
Message-ID: <3_lf6.9951$8I1.1334023@nntp3.onemain.com>
Source record: 2715

"George McCouch" <geomac@hopkinsville.net> wrote in message
news:B6A2FC94.12EF%geomac@hopkinsville.net...
>
>
>
> Good Point, Especially on the school taxes. There are reasons of course.
In
> our local school system the addition of system personnel over the last
10
> years has been tremendous while student population has declined about
18%.
> Computers cost money, as does new sports facilities.
>
> 73
> George
> W3GEO
>

You don't seriously believe that running a school system has anything to do with educating students, do you? It is the excuse for the game to go on; kind of like the relationship of peanut farming to agriculture.

Many moons ago C. Northcote Parkinson (Parkinson's Law and other Studies in Committeeology) extrapolated then-current trends in the British Navy and concluded that somewhere about now the RN would consist of one destroyer staffed entirely by Admirals supported by 100,000 Admiralty employees and a few hundred-k dockyard workers. Get the book if it is still available.

If you have a good, usually male, teacher, he has a family to support so a deal is made by which he gets hours or actually gets and Ed.D (thereby supporting another game) and becomes an administrator for twice his previous salary. Most administrators are in make-work basically to provide an advancement path when you cannot pay someone for being a good teacher.

American management theory rewards only titular leadership over others. This leads to things like the ZL hired by McDonnell as a chief who quit after a year so he could do some engineering and the police commission scrambling for a way to pay a crackerjack detective who can't pass the sergeant's exam. You wouldn't dare suggest PAYING a good teacher, would you? Or godhelpusall pay a math, Physics, or Chemistry teacher more than the PE coach; the union would have your head.

Far as sports facilities, isn't the function of the high school to entertain the taxpayers???

Dick N&#65533;BK

2466. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-05 00:06:41 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <95kqqh$74j$0@208.206.142.112>
Source record: 2716

Jon Bloom wrote:
>
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> >
> > Personally, I have complete contempt for what ham radio has turned
> > into.
>
> We know that, Larry. But the only thing that has changed about ham radio
> is that the artificial pecking order of license classes has been
> deemphasized. Ham radio is still what its participants make of it. You
> still have authorization to use a wide variety of signal types and
> operating techniques on a wide selection of frequency bands. There still
> are many people interested in that wide variety of activities with whom
> to consort. If part of what you derived from ham radio was the
> I'm-better-than-them ego boost provided by your position in the license
> structure, ham radio's benefit to you has indeed been diminished. That
> frankly doesn't concern me since ego boosting isn't the purpose of ham
> radio.
>

As a reply I repost here from rraa, a post which no doubt belonged here
in the first place, but it was a response to a codehater who began to
bash code over there, so was answered in kind. This post tells it like
it is. It you folks in Newington see that as an artificial pecking
order, then I might suggest you recruit like hell among the codefree, as
they may well constitute the vast majority of your future membershsip.
All I've seen from Newington so far indicates that nothing will be done
that could in any way be seen as negative nor in conflict of the Grate
Political Correctness that is a code free ARS, the balm of the masses,
whatever their lack of interest in any facet of radio except grabbing a
microphone.

Richard Harrison wrote: on rec.radio.amateur.antenna:
>
> Why learn Morse? Only to fill some arbitrary regulatory requirement.

No,Rich, only to 1.) Learn to use a basic communications mode, and
2.) To qualify for an HF amateur radio license so long as that
qualification is on the books as an international requirement.

> You can learn and practice Morse for fun. It hurts nobody. But require
> it? Morse is already phased out of every pursuit except amusement.

Not so, there are still a number of ham radio CW traffic nets that meet
almost daily to pass traffic, mostly for training and practice purposes.

And it is still used on occasion to actually handle traffic.
During the last hurricane season where there were serious effects from storms experienced in coastal Georgia and Texas, in both those situations emergency nets handled traffic using Morse code when conditions deteriorated to the point that SSB was no longer usable. Of course other modes could have been used had they been in place and at the ready, but they were not, and CW handled the traffic with no difficulty, since there were hams present who were proficient in its use.
Comes the day than no hams are proficient in its use, that won't be possible. That is one reason some advocates of retaining a CW qualification continue to promote it.

> Even last resort claims are more fancy than fact.

In your experience, I'm sure that is correct. All others don't share your view, however, and I have personally experienced circumstances where I would have indeed been pleased to have had radiotelegraphy to fill in for commercial communications failures. But no CW gear was available since it had been replaced and phased out years earlier. I don't advocate that it not have been phased out, that was the only logical action. But in ham radio it is different. Our mission, at least those of us who consider ham radio as anything more than "Just a hobby" ----those of us who believe it to actually be a viable backup communications service to serve on those rare occasions when failure call it into play---- know, without doubt, that Morse on radio is a viable and potentially valuable resource, still. Even in the face of all that has come in the recent past.
Why? The answer is simple-
Radiotelegraphy remains as the most simple, basic, and most easily implemented means of radio communication yet devised. *IF* there are operators available who can use it.

> The idea that Morse enobles doesn`t prove that the same effort spent on
> something else wouldn`t be more enobling.

Not much in life "Enobles". Morse code does not, except in the minds of some of its opponents. But nothing else is the equivalent of knowing and being able to use Morse. Learning Morse code ENABLES.

> It would very likely be more
> useful to spend your time on something else.

Many people feel that way, and that is certainly their right. And it's nothing new.

> If you were to become accomplished in music you might entertain music
> lovers, but not on ham radio. You can talk on ham radio, but you would
> likely profit more from studying the art of conversation than learning
> how to say it in Morse.

Until you developed a bad case of laryngitis. Or were too far from your intended recipient to shout and had no other means to contact him except

Morse. Unlikely, of course.

> The whole Morse argument is beyond odd.

Yes it is. The most odd part of it is that so many who should, and probably do, know better claim that Morse no longer has potential communications value - just because it has been around a long time and there are many other more modern modes and methods.

> The majority of the best conversationalists and scientifically astute
> have no interest in Morse code. If they liked Morse they might have
> become hams among whom Morse is still practiced. Why exclude them from
> any ham bands? They could improve the tone. They should be recruited.

It has always mystified me that so many individuals who can learn so much are put off by so little learning as Morse code represents. When I decided as a kid to become a ham, I don't think it would have stymied me if they had required me to learn Greek. For darn sure Morse code didn't.

> Why exclude the inept in science and conversation who don`t do code?
> They might benefit from the amateur experience, and bring something to
> the hobby that is missing.

Who excludes one who decides he doesn't want to learn something that is really simple but takes a modest amount of time and effort? The person himself! Why exclude him, indeed!

>
> Numbers count!

Any mathematician will confirm that statement.

> With a large market for ham gear, you might benefit from lower unit
> pricing. With a lot more hams, congress would pay more attention to what
> hams wanted. Bigger is better. Minimum requirements is the way to grow.

I've always been one who felt that it should be only as difficult as necessary to obtain a ham radio license, and never more difficult than necessary. As a practicing Volunteer Examiner for the first eight years of the new VE system I always put that exact philosophy into practice, and there are many licensed hams who were tested by my team who will confirm that. I am not a "big" CW man, by any stretch of the imagination. I do believe firmly, however, that all ham radio operators should feel the responsibility to take it onto themselves to learn to use the most basic and most simple mode of radio communication.
Any ham who cannot operate effective CW is not an accomplished ham, whatever his other accomplishments. CW is BASIC radio communication.

73, Dick Carroll W0EX

2467. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-05 00:16:41 UTC
From: billsohl@mindspring.com
Message-ID: <3a7df06c.8563404@news.mindspring.com>
Source record: 2717

On Sun, 04 Feb 2001 11:22:29 -0500, Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote:

>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>>
>> Personally, I have complete contempt for what ham radio has turned
>> into.
>
>We know that, Larry. But the only thing that has changed about ham radio
>is that the artificial pecking order of license classes has been
>deemphasized. Ham radio is still what its participants make of it.

Amen Jon! That is the core element that Larry fails to
see or just doesn't want to accept.

>You
>still have authorization to use a wide variety of signal types and
>operating techniques on a wide selection of frequency bands. There still
>are many people interested in that wide variety of activities with whom
>to consort. If part of what you derived from ham radio was the
>I'm-better-than-them ego boost provided by your position in the license
>structure, ham radio's benefit to you has indeed been diminished. That
>frankly doesn't concern me since ego boosting isn't the purpose of ham
>radio.

Amen again! Well said.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2468. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-05 00:20:08 UTC
From: billsohl@mindspring.com
Message-ID: <3a7df0fe.8709297@news.mindspring.com>
Source record: 2718

On 04 Feb 2001 17:16:31 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>In article <3A7D81C5.3DF88DC7@arrl.org>, Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org> writes:
>
>>> Personally, I have complete contempt for what ham radio has turned
>>> into.
>>
>>We know that, Larry. But the only thing that has changed about ham radio
>>is that the artificial pecking order of license classes has been
>>deemphasized.
>
>Jon:
>I guess you're more affected by such things because I was never
>personally aware of this "pecking order," nor was I ever negatively
>affected by it.

ROTFLMAO! Larry, do youself a favor and go back
and read the stuff you have written before. To suggest in this
forum that you have never been personally aware of the
"pecking order" is sheer lunacy on your part. You, more
than most anyone else, have been a key proponent of
that pecking order claim.

<Big SNIP>

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2469. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-05 00:35:25 UTC
From: billsohl@mindspring.com
Message-ID: <3a7df549.9808660@news.mindspring.com>
Source record: 2719

On 04 Feb 2001 15:47:07 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>In article <20010201062035.15050.00000239@ng-ff1.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com
>(W1RFI) writes:
>
>>
>>Don't be surprised if not many people want to follow you as you try to drag
>>Amateur Radio down to your level, Larry. Many of us still believe in the
>>values you used to attribute to the Service.
>>
>>If you really feel this way, perhaps we would all be better off if you let
>>your
>>license expire and found something you can believe in to do.
>
>Ed:
>
>I'll keep my amateur radio license as long as it serves me in any
>manner I find useful. I do admit that my enjoyment of ham radio
>is greatly diminished along with the reduction in licensing standards.

Why? Just how has a change in licensing diminished YOUR
enjoyment?

>I seem to have worked everyone there is to work on CW, and even
>on the FISTS frequencies, there is nothing there but mindless
>awards-chasing and 84-year-old retirees in Florida trailer parks,
>running their letters and words together but doing it very fast,
>indeed.

So? What has that to do with any change in requirements?

>I doubt that even if large numbers of new hams come
>on the air in the Post-Restructuring era, as they have yet to do,
>that my interest will be rekindled very easily.

Perhaps you are just "burned out" with amateur radio
in general and it is your own misconception that ties
your dis-interest with restructuring.

> I had high hopes
>and aspirations as a ham;

High hopes? High hopes for what exactly?

> but I now find myself strangely
>apathetic. I really would like to get the old ham spirit back, but

>that hasn't happened.

Sounds like a personal problem.

> I was having fun on PSK31 for a while, but
>once I worked seemingly everyone using that mode, and they
>were also 84-year-old retirees in Florida, there was no more
>point in it.

You might try voice sor a change.

>I'm not quite ready to give up on ham radio yet, Ed, but the
>ARRL, now that it's talking about trying to save a bit of CW
>spectrum for future use, has really put a damper on my
>former enthusiasm. I also see the handwriting on the wall. Our
>vast spectrum, especially above 500 MHz, is way to valuable
>to future wireless service providers for us not to lose it in
>vast chunks in the near future. Therefore, the future of ham
>radio for me may very well be to use these services on
>*former* amateur frequencies. Time will tell, but for now, my
>license stays on the wall of my "shack."

Actually, regarding 500MHz and up, I suspect you are
probably correct. The interesting point, however, is that
those frequencies above 500MHz have very limited
use to most hams except for short distance transmissions...which
is exactly why the cell phone/pager/PCS folks want them.
I truly wonder what percent of all hams have ever made even
a single contact on any frequency (ham frequency) above
500 MHz?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2470. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-05 00:55:00 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <3A7DF9E4.7CB17F57@arrl.org>
Source record: 2720

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> As a reply I repost here from rraa, a post which no doubt belonged here
> in the first place, but it was a response to a codehater who began to
> bash code over there, so was answered in kind. This post tells it like
> it is. It you folks in Newington see that as an artificial pecking
> order, then I might suggest you recruit like hell among the codefree, as
> they may well constitute the vast majority of your future membershsip.
> All I've seen from Newington so far indicates that nothing will be done
> that could in any way be seen as negative nor in conflict of the Grate
> Political Correctness that is a code free ARS, the balm of the masses,
> whatever their lack of interest in any facet of radio except grabbing a
> microphone.

Dick, as you ought to know, I have zero problem with Morse as an operating mode. I've spent far more time operating Morse than I have operating any other mode, and I expect that to continue. But it's not the be-all and end-all of ham radio, nor do I consider Morse skill to be the litmus test of amateur ability that you think it is. Still, I have no problem with people who believe that Morse testing has a value that makes it desirable to keep it as a requirement, even though I happen to disagree with that particular viewpoint. What I do have a problem with is people who look down on others simply because those others have not passed a code test. Equally, I have a problem with those who look down on others who *have* passed a code test. Both of those extreme viewpoints are occasionally expressed in this NG; both are equally wrong.

Jon

2471. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-05 02:05:23 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <95l1p3nqs0@208.206.142.112>
Source record: 2721

Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> On Sun, 04 Feb 2001 11:22:29 -0500, Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote:
>
> >Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> >>
> >> Personally, I have complete contempt for what ham radio has turned
> >> into.
> >>
> >We know that, Larry. But the only thing that has changed about ham radio
> >is that the artificial pecking order of license classes has been
> >deemphasized. Ham radio is still what its participants make of it.
>
> Amen Jon! That is the core element that Larry fails to
> see or just doesn't want to accept.
>
> >You
> >still have authorization to use a wide variety of signal types and
> >operating techniques on a wide selection of frequency bands. There still
> >are many people interested in that wide variety of activities with whom
> >to consort. If part of what you derived from ham radio was the
> >I'm-better-than-them ego boost provided by your position in the license
> >structure, ham radio's benefit to you has indeed been diminished. That
> >frankly doesn't concern me since ego boosting isn't the purpose of ham
> >radio.
>
> Amen again! Well said.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK

So, Jon, when do you take your seat on the Board of Directors of NCI?

2472. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-05 03:34:29 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A7E1F45.E50EB050@IEEE.org>
Source record: 2725

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> The notion of
> a "pecking order" is just another specious construct from
> those who pander to the politically correct popular culture.

Seems "The St. Valentine's Day Massacre" is exactly one of those
"specious constructs".
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2473. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-05 03:34:38 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010204223438.13655.00002586@nso-mq.aol.com>
Source record: 2724

In article <3a7df0fe.8709297@news.mindspring.com>, billsohl@mindspring.com (Bill Sohl) writes:

>
>ROTFLMAO! Larry, do youself a favor and go back
>and read the stuff you have written before. To suggest in this
>forum that you have never been personally aware of the
>"pecking order" is sheer lunacy on your part. You, more
>than most anyone else, have been a key proponent of
>that pecking order claim.

Bill:

I'll admit that I have supported the concept of a progressive, multi-tiered licensing system, for the purpose of encouraging continued learning and communications skill development by using increased operating privileges as the incentive. I have not, to the best of my knowledge, supported this system merely to keep an elitist "pecking order" in place. That is the fear of the no-coders, to be sure, but those of us who have reached the top of the former licensing structure don't really consider that achievement that unique, since people of all ages and from all walks of life have done so. The notion of a "pecking order" is just another specious construct from those who pander to the politically correct popular culture. Purely nose-piercing and pony-tail stuff -- with no relationship whatsoever to the reality of people who understand how to achieve things on their own.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2474. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-05 03:34:39 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010204223439.13655.00002588@nso-mq.aol.com>
Source record: 2722

In article <3A7DF9E4.7CB17F57@arrl.org>, Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org> writes:

>
>Dick, as you ought to know, I have zero problem with Morse as an
>operating mode. I've spent far more time operating Morse than I have
>operating any other mode, and I expect that to continue. But it's not
>the be-all and end-all of ham radio, nor do I consider Morse skill to be
>the litmus test of amateur ability that you think it is. Still, I have
>no problem with people who believe that Morse testing has a value that
>makes it desirable to keep it as a requirement, even though I happen to
>disagree with that particular viewpoint. What I do have a problem with
>is people who look down on others simply because those others have not
>passed a code test. Equally, I have a problem with those who look down
>on others who *have* passed a code test. Both of those extreme
>viewpoints are occasionally expressed in this NG; both are equally
>wrong.
>
>Jon

In other words, Dick, those of us who support reasonable
testing requirements to ensure that radio amateurs can effectively
employ one of the most useful communications modes in the ARS
are extremists; those who support the concept of touchy-feely,
politically correct "inclusiveness" are in the right, due to the fact
that they meet the needs of a much larger clientele. Jon's
gracious admission that he has a "problem" with people who look
down on others who have passed a code test notwithstanding, this
is just more of the usual pandering from 225 Main St.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2475. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-05 03:34:39 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010204223439.13655.00002587@nso-mq.aol.com>
Source record: 2723

In article <3a7df549.9808660@news.mindspring.com>, billsohl@mindspring.com (Bill Sohl) writes:

>
>Actually, regarding 500MHz and up, I suspect you are
>probably correct. The interesting point, however, is that
>those frequencies above 500MHz have very limited
>use to most hams except for short distance transmissions...which
>is exactly why the cell phone/pager/PCS folks want them.
>I truly wonder what percent of all hams have ever made even
>a single contact on any frequency (ham frequency) above
>500 MHz?
>
>Cheers,
>Bill K2UNK

Bill:

Probably around .05 percent, and that's being generous. I've personally never owned any amateur gear capable of generating a signal above a frequency of 1.2 GHz; and I've only made two successful QSO's in that band. The problem: Nobody to talk to -- even many years after the adoption of 100% codeless licensing for operating privileges in that spectrum. We (the amateur community in general) were given airtight assurances that removal of the 5 WPM code test from the Technician-class licensing requirements would inspire major growth in amateur radio and widely increased utilization of our spectrum in the UHF range -- largely dedicated to high-speed digital data communications. Yet, after all this time, I can not send a wireless message over strictly amateur-based circuits any further than my own county line -- and most of the time, I can't even get that far! Therefore, I can't help but wonder why giving away HF phone privileges is supposed to be such a major benefit to our service. I say, the sooner commercial interests start doing some productive and profitable work on that spectrum, the better. I wouldn't sell off our amateur spectrum above 500 MHz -- I'd give it away free to whomever proposed the best commercial use thereof, in order to stimulate that business and all of the economic benefits that would come with it.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2476. Re: Code Quick RULEZ!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-05 03:39:31 UTC
From: tlbryant@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <95l79j01sl@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 2732

In article <20010204104711.03780.00001058@nso-ch.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam says...
>
>In article <95bq8f$ja4$1@nnrp1.deja.com>, jason_hsu@my-deja.com writes:
>
>>You amuse me, Larry. First, you keep insisting that Morse Code all-
>>important to all of ham radio and that the Morse Code testing
>>requirements are sacred.
>>
>>So I decide to bring Code Quick to the attention of everyone on
>>USENET. Unlike more conventional methods, Code Quick works, and people
>>ACTUALLY follow through. So what do you do? You try to knock it
>>down!
>>
>>I can tell from personal experience that Code Quick works. Because it
>>takes the drudgery (memorization of dits and dahs, listening to CW and
>>waiting for divine inspiration, etc.) out of learning CW, it seems that
>>everyone who tries Code Quick sticks to it. You CANNOT say the same
>>about other methods.
>
>Jason:
>
>There are plenty of better methods. Simply learning the characters
>and getting on-the-air at 5 WPM is the best way to go. However,
>Code Quick makes a disasterous short-cut, by employing cutsey
>sound-alike phonetic phrases that require double or triple
>translation in the brain before the act of writing down a letter takes
>place. So, you're listening to "dadidadit" and you've got to think
>to yourself "that was 'dadidadit' so that sounds like 'Debbie did it'
>or something like that, and 'Debbie' starts with a 'd' so I'll write
>that down. Of course, the character sent was a "C," but who's
>counting? I think Code Quick is the most confusing, inhibiting,
>and inefficient Morse code learning programs ever devised. The
>attraction is certainly unmistakable, for it offers the proverbial
>free lunch -- and therefore, gets a strong following from the
>clients of the ham radio Welfare State.
>
>>I challenge you to find anyone who tried Code Quick but failed.
>
>Well, all I can say is, I know a lot of people who own the tapes,
>but none of them are regular CW users!
>
>>I will agree with you that Code Quick alone isn't enough for 20+ wpm.
>

>Damn straight! It practically wires your brain in a way that makes
>it impossible to get beyond 10 WPM. But, in these days of a 5 WPM
>maximum code test, I guess that's no longer a problem.
>
>>Well, at some point, the Code Quick user has to start copying in
>>his/her head. But at least there's nothing to unlearn.
>
>Nothing but everything Code Quick taught them about character
>recognition! You see, Code Quick users didn't learn to react directly
>to the sound of a Morse code character -- they have to do the
>"translation" sequence in their mind before the light comes on and
>the write down the character.
>
>>Larry, you obviously do NOT need Code Quick.
>
>No, thank God, I don't! Oh, speaking of God, that's another problem
>I have with Code Quick. It indulges in religious proselytizing right in
>the middle of the tape. Specifically, fundamentalist Christian
>proselytizing. Why is religion brought into the program? What about
>potential customers who are Catholic, Jewish, Muslim, or any other
>non-fundamentalist Christian religion? If the guy wants to sell
>religious tapes, he should do so within the confines of that market --
>and not include HIS specific religious beliefs in a program marketed
>to people from all walks of life who are interested in ham radio. Is
>there any disclaimer on the tape package? I've never seen any!
>
>>But the "lazy No Code" crowd certainly does.
>
>Well, I give you Brownie points for at least admitting that.
>
>Show me someone from this group, and I'll show
>>you someone who didn't use Code Quick.
>
>Like I said before, I know a lot of people who own Code Quick --
>but virtually none of them went on to be proficient CW users. They
>may have passed their code tests, but they didn't gain the skill.
>I'll stick with what works -- learning the sound of the individual
>characters using the Farnsworth method, and getting 2-way practice
>on-the-air.
>
>73 de Larry, K3LT
>

2477. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-05 03:41:55 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A7E2103.E9D4DA8C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 2726

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> In article <3A798461.CD3C8F1F@IEEE.org>, Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>
> >> I'll call him a "dumbed-down Nickle-Extra" myself. However,
> >> PseudoExtra does have a nice ring to it! Kinda grows on you,
> >> doesn't it?
> >
> >Here's a little guy who doesn't even know what amateur radio is
> >and you are going to call him a "dumbed-down Nickle-Extra" in
> >15 years when he gets the only Extra class license available
> >to him???? Are you trying to get him to hate older hams?

> I never said I'd call him a "PseudoExtra" to his face. Anyway,
> I didn't invent that term -- YOU did!!!

Nope, not me, Dick did.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2478. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-05 03:49:46 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A7E22DA.B100E65D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 2729

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> Cecil wrote:
> >
> > Jon Bloom wrote:
> > >
> > > Cecil wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Cecil said:
> > > > > I can phase modulate at the IF frequency and
> > > > > slip an undetected message right past your undersampling technique.
>
> Now you've got me curious: How do you plan on going into Jon's radio
> *after* the IF sampling has taken place to "slip an undetected message
> right past your undersampling techniqjue"? Anything that appears at the
> point the undersampling takes place will be sampled at an equal rate.
> Are you into magic these days? Or just excessive grape juice?

I'm not talking about a radio, Dick, I'm talking about any signal. I said it
was a hypothetical exercise. But if the added modulation were done before
the signal reached the receiver, it would be even more impossible to detect.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2479. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-05 03:53:19 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <95l83f$9kq$0@208.207.71.165>
Source record: 2727
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Richard Harrison wrote:

> CW may be basic, but it is no prerequisite to any other mode.

Of course not, it is prerequisite unto itself- you can't use it if you don't know how.

>
> CW has been defended as essential to emergency communications,

No, it has not- it has been shown to be the most basic of radio communications modes, still very effective even though it is quite ancient by comparison to the flashy efficient new modes that require much more hardware overhead and support.

> which is
> mistakenly claimed as a mandate of amateur radio.

You can ignore the history of the amateur radio service but your attitude cannot change it.

>
> Amateur radio is a hobby.

Sure it is. But unlike almost all other hobbies, it is something much more. No stamp or coin collector will ever find himself in the position to use his hobby to perform critical public services. Most hams will never see the time when they are called to do so, either. So in your opinion no ham need ever prepare nor expect such a thing to happen nowadays, what with cell phones and satellites. Your understanding of the frailties of modern communications belies the level of your education and experience. You simply should know better than that. For some strange reason a number of engineer-hams suffer from that very deficiency. Oddly, many are no-coders, also.

> Amateurs set up emergency and public service groups in which they can
> put their communications gear to good use. It`s all voluntary. Cell
> phone users can do the same. If the cell phones fail, there are
> satellite phone and internet connections. There are more do-gooders with
> cell phones than radio amateurs. They are welcomed volunteers with the
> Red Cross, etc..

This paragraph only shows your lack of expressed knowledge of reality of life in the world of communications. Only ham radio incorporates such a diversified widespread cadre of operator/stations as to be capable of detaching itself from the gridded infrastructure to the extent that it

can function on its own without dependence on such things as power grids, networking schemes, or both. When the lights go out for long periods, or some natural calamity comes, the telephone network clogs- did you ever get the "all circuits are busy" notice? Don't even mention the cellphone network. It was never designed to handle large percentages of its subscribers and saturates straight away. Satellite phones? You mean IRIDIUM? Globalstar? Yeah, right! Not much help there. ALL public safety comms are in instant overload when the ship hits the sand, been there and done that. That leaves FRS and CB. Real organization and true communications capability there, for sure. NOT!

So you go right on blithely assuming that all is well, and your world is secure. If you lived in California you would have assumed, until a couple weeks ago, that your lights were certain to stay on at will, too, and there would always be a working traffic signal at each intersection on the glutted streets and highways.
Modern communications systems are far more fragile and vulnerable than you evidently can imagine. Ever hear of the "Digital Pearl Harbor"? Everything out there is ran by computer these days. That makes everything vulnerable to the hackers. Microsoft itself is not secure. What next? It won't necesarily be a natural disaster that takes modern comms down.
A few years ago in a fairly large town not far away a fire in the central telephone office put the city off all telephone service for days. Meanwhile, the local ham radio 2meter repeater filled in nicely for local critical communcations. Later the telephone company awarded the ham radio club repeater space on its mountaintop site in appreciation of their help. Not a big deal, and rare, but just one more example. So many of you code bashers are so eager to do away with all but the "hobby" aspect of ham radio. Why?

> Amateur emergency help may be welcome, but it is seldom essential.

And when it is essential it is far more than welcome. It is - well, essential.

> Newsflash: Amateurs don`t have to earn spectrum for their radio hobby
> through good deeds. They have access rights simply by getting an FCC
> license.

Ah, now we get down to it. "I have a right". Sure you do. One which can be withdrawn at the stroke of a pen "In the public interest, convenience and necessity".
Comes the time when amateur radio is seen by officialdom as nothing but a burdensome klaven of simple hobbyists and troublesome misfits, a significant portion of whom really don't care, and that pen stroke becomes reality. It has been made perfectly clear that the slide in the direction of worthlessness as a service has been in progress within the Amateur Radio Service for decades.
The instant brouhaha merely serves to grease the skids.

> Just as commerce and industry are worthy and have rights, so do
> individuals, for their life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness.

Which does NOT include transmitting access to any part of the radio spectrum for recreational purposes. There is a "basis and purpose" for the amateur radio service in the FCC rules. You really should read it sometime.

> Dick Carroll is dwelling upon long gone times and conditions before
> there were modern communications.

Very creative writing, Rich, but far too unrealistic to gain credibility as fact.

73, Dick Carroll W0EX

2480. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-05 03:56:48 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A7E2480.B4EC3C18@IEEE.org>
Source record: 2731

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> Like Dick said -- bring him around to the newsgroup, let's make an
> on-the-air sked with him to verify even 20 WPM CW proficiency, and
> if he checks out, then I, for one, will be perfectly happy to admit that
> he's the "Real Mc Coy" as an Extra. How 'bout it?

I doubt there's a PhD in my entire home county, Larry, so you should be on
the lookout for him on the air. Sooner or later, some Extra-Lite is going to
cause you to send QRS.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2481. Re: Code Quick RULEZ!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-05 03:57:04 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <u29s7tsndq6lu5r4gf5grfq9do9g4211n7@4ax.com>
Source record: 2728

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote:
>Code Quick makes a disasterous short-cut, by employing cutsey
>sound-alike phonetic phrases that require double or triple
>translation in the brain before the act of writing down a letter

Only in the beginning. If you stick with it, Code Quick will soon fade
away as the brain starts to automatically decode with no conscious
thinking involved...

>I think Code Quick is the most confusing, inhibiting,
>and inefficient Morse code learning programs ever devised.

It's only bad if it doesn't work for you.
Apparently it works for many...

>it offers the proverbial
>free lunch -- and therefore, gets a strong following from the
>clients of the ham radio Welfare State.

This is the *real reason* you don't like Code Quick. People who have
no intention of ever using the code on the air have found success in
using Code Quick to quickly pass the code test. But then I suppose
that's similar to people who have no intention of learning electronics
using memorization to quickly pass the written test...

>
>>I challenge you to find anyone who tried Code Quick but failed.
>
>Well, all I can say is, I know a lot of people who own the tapes,
>but none of them are regular CW users!
>
>>I will agree with you that Code Quick alone isn't enough for 20+ wpm.
>
>Damn straight! It practically wires your brain in a way that makes
>it impossible to get beyond 10 WPM. But, in these days of a 5 WPM
>maximum code test, I guess that's no longer a problem.
>
>>Well, at some point, the Code Quick user has to start copying in
>>his/her head. But at least there's nothing to unlearn.
>
>Nothing but everything Code Quick taught them about character
>recognition! You see, Code Quick users didn't learn to react directly
>to the sound of a Morse code character -- they have to do the
>"translation" sequence in their mind before the light comes on and
>the write down the character.
>

>>Larry, you obviously do NOT need Code Quick.
>
>No, thank God, I don't! Oh, speaking of God, that's another problem
>I have with Code Quick. It indulges in religious proselytizing right in
>the middle of the tape. Specifically, fundamentalist Christian
>proselytizing. Why is religion brought into the program? What about
>potential customers who are Catholic, Jewish, Muslim, or any other
>non-fundamentalist Christian religion? If the guy wants to sell
>religious tapes, he should do so within the confines of that market --
>and not include HIS specific religious beliefs in a program marketed
>to people from all walks of life who are interested in ham radio. Is
>there any disclaimer on the tape package? I've never seen any!
>
>>But the "lazy No Code" crowd certainly does.
>
>Well, I give you Brownie points for at least admitting that.
>
>Show me someone from this group, and I'll show
>>you someone who didn't use Code Quick.
>
>Like I said before, I know a lot of people who own Code Quick --
>but virtually none of them went on to be proficient CW users. They
>may have passed their code tests, but they didn't gain the skill.
>I'll stick with what works -- learning the sound of the individual
>characters using the Farnsworth method, and getting 2-way practice
>on-the-air.
>
>73 de Larry, K3LT

2482. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-05 04:00:41 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <3A7E2569.7458F345@arrl.org>
Source record: 2730

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> In other words, Dick, those of us who support reasonable
> testing requirements to ensure that radio amateurs can effectively
> employ one of the most useful communications modes in the ARS
> are extremists; those who support the concept of touchy-feely,
> politically correct "inclusiveness" are in the right, due to the fact
> that they meet the needs of a much larger clientele.

No, the extremists are those of you who denigrate those who haven't taken the same tests as you. In short, it has nothing to do with code testing and everything to do with how you treat people. If you think how you treat others is a issue of "political correctness," well, that pretty much proves my point.

Jon

2483. Re: Code Quick RULEZ!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-05 04:15:41 UTC
From: tlbryant@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <95l9dd01l8@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 2737

In article <20010204104711.03780.00001058@nso-ch.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam says...

>There are plenty of better methods. Simply learning the characters
>and getting on-the-air at 5 WPM is the best way to go. However,
>Code Quick makes a disasterous short-cut, by employing cutsey
>sound-alike phonetic phrases that require double or triple
>translation in the brain before the act of writing down a letter takes

Since when are you an expert on how the human brain works? Do you have any proof that CodeQuick doesn't achieve its purpose of helping one pass the code test, other than your own subjective opinion?

>>I challenge you to find anyone who tried Code Quick but failed.
>
>Well, all I can say is, I know a lot of people who own the tapes,
>but none of them are regular CW users!

That's not what he asked you. Besides, if CodeQuick served the purpose of passing the morse hazing ritual, that's all that matters.

>>I will agree with you that Code Quick alone isn't enough for 20+ wpm.
>
>Damn straight! It practically wires your brain in a way that makes
>it impossible to get beyond 10 WPM. But, in these days of a 5 WPM
>maximum code test, I guess that's no longer a problem.

Again, where's your proof?

>Nothing but everything Code Quick taught them about character
>recognition! You see, Code Quick users didn't learn to react directly
>to the sound of a Morse code character -- they have to do the
>"translation" sequence in their mind before the light comes on and
>the write down the character.

Ah, yes! The frustration and anxiety of a stonge-age learning technique known as rote memorization is always best.

>>Larry, you obviously do NOT need Code Quick.
>
>No, thank God, I don't! Oh, speaking of God, that's another problem
>I have with Code Quick. It indulges in religious proselytizing right in
>the middle of the tape. Specifically, fundamentalist Christian
>proselytizing. Why is religion brought into the program? What about
>potential customers who are Catholic, Jewish, Muslim, or any other
>non-fundamentalist Christian religion? If the guy wants to sell
>religious tapes, he should do so within the confines of that market --

>and not include HIS specific religious beliefs in a program marketed
>to people from all walks of life who are interested in ham radio. Is
>there any disclaimer on the tape package? I've never seen any!

BFD!

>>But the "lazy No Code" crowd certainly does.
>
>Well, I give you Brownie points for at least admitting that.
>
>Show me someone from this group, and I'll show
>>you someone who didn't use Code Quick.
>
>Like I said before, I know a lot of people who own Code Quick --
>but virtually none of them went on to be proficient CW users. They
>may have passed their code tests, but they didn't gain the skill.

Here's a thought: MAYBE THEY DIDN'T WANT TO!

>I'll stick with what works -- learning the sound of the individual
>characters using the Farnsworth method, and getting 2-way practice
>on-the-air.

If it works for you fine, but I suggest you do a little reading on NLP/"whole
mind" learning techniques. Your subjectivity shows your ignorance.

2484. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-05 04:16:14 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A7E290E.DC72A37B@IEEE.org>
Source record: 2733

Jon Bloom wrote:
> Cecil and I have a long history, so I know his game. Occasionally, it's
> fun to turn the tables on him and frustrate *him*.

I was wondering why you leveled those unprovoked ad hominem attacks.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2485. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-05 04:18:56 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A7E29B0.34ECA47B@IEEE.org>
Source record: 2734

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> >Sounds like you have a severe personality problem regarding self
> >motivation. When you satisfied the requirements for a college
> >degree, did you also stop your progress? Do you only accomplish
> >what you are forced to accomplish?
>
> Yes, actually, I did -- but tha was for financial reasons. My VA
> educational benefits ran out the same time I got my degree! Now,
> I'd be glad to go back to school full-time -- are you offering me a
> personally funded scholarship? If not, quit being such a pain in
> the beehind just because you know how!

You're worse off than I suspected, Larry. Do you really believe that
you have to go back to school to make any progress? I made virtually
all of my progress after I got out of school.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2486. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-05 04:21:57 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A7E2A65.10D7D804@IEEE.org>
Source record: 2735

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> Well, then, when the "noise floor" reaches the ceiling, I hope you enjoy
> the challenge of operating CW among all those high-powered, over-
> compressed, over processed phone signals!

- . -. ..-. --- ..- .-. --. ..- -.. -... ..- -.. -.. -.--
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2487. Re: Morse Code replacement? Bigtime flame war article!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-05 04:33:33 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A7E2D1D.EA727BAA@IEEE.org>
Source record: 2736

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> I'm giving up hope that you can ever get anything right. The
> "government welfare" program is the reduction/elimination of
> code testing, not the other way around.

Obviously false, Larry. The reduction/elimination of Morse code testing
is the reduction/elimination of its federally sponsored welfare support
program. When a person receives welfare, he/she receives something tangible
that he/she can hold in his/her hand. There's absolutely nothing tangible
being given away. To think otherwise is to think like a Liberal.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2488. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-05 05:14:13 UTC
From: Bob Wex w2ilp <w2ilp@juno.com>
Message-ID: <95lcr2qf1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2740

In article <3a7ca983.3435572@news.mindspring.com>,
billsohl@mindspring.com wrote:
> On Sat, 03 Feb 2001 05:12:49 GMT, Bob Wex w2ilp <w2ilp@juno.com>
> wrote:
>
> >In article <95b0g1du1@news.service.uci.edu>,
> > "Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote:
> >>
> >> Bob Wex w2ilp <w2ilp@juno.com> wrote in message

And please read the comments of W2ILP below.

> >> > Hams need more license classes and/or official FCC technical
> >> > endorsements.
> >>
> >> In order to do what?

To be Hams.

> >To meet the BASIS and PURPOSE goals of Part 97.
>
> No one has said that Part 97 Basis and Purpose is NOT
> being met.

Well...Let me be the first to say it here. Nah...Vince and others may
have said it first.
>
> >> I don't find myself feeling limited by the number of
> >> license classes in the ARS.

Maybe that is because YOU are not meeting the Basis and Purpose of Ham
Radio yourself.

> >> Necessity is the mother of invention,

Yes and it is necessary to have a basis and purpose to this hobby and
it is necessary for many hams to meet that basis and purpose or the
hobby will not only lose government support...It will be unable to
attract new members.

> >>not
> >> wallpaper. Interest and curiosity must provide motivation. Without
> >that I
> >> think you'd have to convince the US Treasury to issue their
> >certificates
> >> rather than the kind the FCC offers.

Some attitude...Many affluent folks think that money is the only thing
that talks. Ham Radio once was a hobby which attracted frugal people
who built their own radios and got technically educated at low cost.
Today the technical knowledge required to be a ham has little
commercial value and it is a fact that most Hams buy rice boxes.
> >>
> >> 73, Jim AC6XG
> >
> >With all due respect, I am not talking about your feelings Jim. I am
> >speaking about what is required so that FUTURE Hams can regain the
> >PRIDE that the hobby once had. A certificate that says that you
worked
> >all states, all zones or a hundred nations may be wallpaper BUT a
> >license that says that you passed really comprehensive technical
exams
> >can restore the kind of pride that once had value to academic,
> >commercial and military establishments.
>
> In the cycle of this debate, it has come around to this
> once again :-)

There is no cycle the subject is a linear opinion that must be
considered and most of the posts here which brag or complain about the
hobby eventually get down to this kind of logic.
>
> >Such a license could command
> >real respect, not for just individual hams, but for Ham Radio as the
> >technical educational hobby that it once was and should be.
>
> You want that type of license=respect, then get a college
> degree or a tech school certificate.

I have a BSEE...but when I did not have a BSEE my ham license meant
more to some employers than a BSEE because I had been able to show that
as a Ham I had been able to build my own equipment from scratch. Most
tech school and college grads did not have the practical experience
that most Hams had in those days. Today things are a lot different
because most Hams are not keeping up with the latest technology or
building anything themselves. How can Hams, as Hams, meet the parts
of Part 97 Basis and Purpose goals (which say that hams should be
prepared to asdvance the state of the art) without changing their basic
primary motivation to be hams??? My answer is by drastically changing
their attitudes. When they do they might just be suprised to find that
Ham Radio can again attract lots of new techies as well as the computer
clubs seem to now be able to do. Bill Gates didn't have to finish
getting his college degree...Neither did Edison, Farnsworth, Sarnoff,
etc. For most older Hams it may be too late to expect them to now keep
up with modern technology {they are veterans of the technologies of the
past)...BUT let it not be too late to attract new hams into our ranks
by offering more modern challenging exams that can not only give more
pride but can prove more value. Ham Radio must have the same vaue to
the individual and the USA as it had in 1940 and 1950. This is not an

impossible goal...but it is hampered by old Hams who are only
interested in what Ham Radio means to them. Many existing hams fear
that any additional technical exam requirements might take away their
frequency privileges or their ability to call themselves "Extra
Class". The subject is PRIDE.

> <Snip of same old/same old>

Yep...Snip it if you want to but its meaning won't go away.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK
>
73...
Cheers for the Hams who are not afraid to take MORE ham exams.

Bob Wex w2ilp (Insure License Potential)

In history it is always those with little
learning who overthrow those with much
learning...When young people grasp a truth
they are invincible and old people can not
compete with them.
--Mao Tse-tung (1958)--

Mao was getting old when he said the above.
--w2ilp--

The young techies of today are motivated
to repair their computer hardware and
hack their computer software...but the old
or the young hams are no longer being motivated
to repair their radios or even to try. Why would
a young techie of today want to be a ham?
--w2ilp--

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2489. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-05 05:24:10 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010205002410.04061.00001321@nso-mh.aol.com>
Source record: 2739

In article <20010204223439.13655.00002587@nso-mq.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>In article <3a7df549.9808660@news.mindspring.com>, billsohl@mindspring.com >(Bill Sohl) writes:
>
>>
>>Actually, regarding 500MHz and up, I suspect you are
>>probably correct. The interesting point, however, is that
>>those frequencies above 500MHz have very limited
>>use to most hams except for short distance transmissions...which
>>is exactly why the cell phone/pager/PCS folks want them.
>>I truly wonder what percent of all hams have ever made even
>>a single contact on any frequency (ham frequency) above
>>500 MHz?
>>
>>Cheers,
>>Bill K2UNK
>
>Bill:
>
>Probably around .05 percent, and that's being generous. I've personally
>never owned any amateur gear capable of generating a signal above
>a frequency of 1.2 GHz; and I've only made two successful QSO's in
>that band. The problem: Nobody to talk to -- even many years after
>the adoption of 100% codeless licensing for operating privileges in
>that spectrum.

...try using an antenna system that doesn't have a VSWR
of 10:1 or higher.

> We (the amateur community in general) were given
>airtight assurances that removal of the 5 WPM code test from the
>Technician-class licensing requirements would inspire major growth
>in amateur radio and widely increased utilization of our spectrum
>in the UHF range -- largely dedicated to high-speed digital data
>communications.

Just exactly who gave those "airtight assurances?" The 1990
Report and Order that created the Technician class simply
created the Technician class license. The FCC did not give
any "airtight assurances" other than the creation of that class.

However, tRoll is quite WRONG on "major growth." Major
growth was enough to make the single no-code-test Tech
class within a percentage point of ONE-THIRD of all licensees

as of the end of the year 2000.

As to the utilization of VHF and higher, where were the
ALREADY LICENSED US radio amateurs? They were, and
still are, able to operate on all allocated bands on up to the
300 GHz allocation limit.

tRoll bitches and complains about "underutilization" when
he was part of the problem of underutilizing spectrum.

> Yet, after all this time, I can not send a wireless
>message over strictly amateur-based circuits any further than my
>own county line -- and most of the time, I can't even get that far!

Here's a thought: Try asking for help on what you are doing wrong.
It would seem you aren't doing it right.

>Therefore, I can't help but wonder why giving away HF phone
>privileges is supposed to be such a major benefit to our service.

The FCC doesn't regulate or license radio amateurs to some
sort of "major benefit to your service." The FCC regulates US
amateur radio as one of MANY different US civil radio
services.

tRoll wants a federal subsidy or federal recognition for "time in
grade" as a code-tested ham superbeing?

>I say, the sooner commercial interests start doing some productive
>and profitable work on that spectrum, the better. I wouldn't sell
>off our amateur spectrum above 500 MHz -- I'd give it away free to
>whomever proposed the best commercial use thereof, in order
>to stimulate that business and all of the economic benefits that
>would come with it.

So...just to prove your "superiorness" or whatever ego-trip thing
you are doing here, you wish to SELL OFF everything above
500 MHz because no one will talk to you up there?!?

tRoll, why do you wish to destroy FREE SPECTRUM for all
others?

didit

>
>73 de Larry, K3LT

2490. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-05 05:24:11 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010205002411.04061.00001322@nso-mh.aol.com>
Source record: 2738

In article <20010204223438.13655.00002586@nso-mq.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>n article <3a7df0fe.8709297@news.mindspring.com>, billsohl@mindspring.com
>(Bill Sohl) writes:
>
>>
>>ROTFLMAO! Larry, do youself a favor and go back
>>and read the stuff you have written before. To suggest in this
>>forum that you have never been personally aware of the
>>"pecking order" is sheer lunacy on your part. You, more
>>than most anyone else, have been a key proponent of
>>that pecking order claim.
>
>Bill:
>
>I'll admit that I have supported the concept of a progressive,
>multi-tiered licensing system, for the purpose of encouraging
>continued learning and communications skill development by
>using increased operating privileges as the incentive. I have
>not, to the best of my knowledge, supported this system
>merely to keep an elitist "pecking order" in place.

By all evidence of your statements in here you DO wish to keep the pecking order alive and well because you've managed to get to the "top" of the old pecking order.

>That is
>the fear of the no-coders, to be sure, but those of us who have
>reached the top of the former licensing structure don't really
>consider that achievement that unique, since people of all
>ages and from all walks of life have done so.

Oh, dear, more hypocrisy. That SOME others have jumped through hoops conceived and lobbied for by elitists, those at the top of the pecking order (tRoll included) can now claim superiority and insist that everyone else do as they did.

>The notion of
>a "pecking order" is just another specious construct from
>those who pander to the politically correct popular culture.

Bullshit, tRoll. The pecking order arrived, was joined by those who believed in the popular culture of the "incentive plan" multi-tiered US amateur license class structure... along with the Vanity Call system codified in law so that

younger, less-knowledgeable-about-theory, but capable of
fast morse code rates could pretend to be old-timers with
1x2 and 2x1 call signs.

>Purely nose-piercing and pony-tail stuff -- with no relationship
>whatsoever to the reality of people who understand how to
>achieve things on their own.

So...no doubt everyone will be treated to yet-another go-around
on how the tRoll set about disciplining himself and worked Real
Hard to rise to the top of the amateur pecking order? That
everyone else can do the same as he but everyone who does not
share his views, aspirations are somehow "inferior?" :-)

The question is not whether or not tRoll, by himself, accomplished
anything. The question is whyinhell are there certain standards
and requirements in US amateur radio regulations. tRoll has
danced around that without answering, his only rationale ending
with a statement of his Hard Work and Dedication.

Hard Work and Dedication to old standards and practices
should be respected. However, that respect does not carry
through to enforcing the SAME thing to all newcomers by
codifying it in law. If that were the case, amateur radio would
have ended with the outlawing of spark emissions...the major
transmitters of amateur radio in the beginning. Old-timers of
that era would have insisted that all newcomers DO AS THEY
DID. :-)

didit

2491. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-05 05:41:30 UTC
From: Bob Wex w2ilp <w2ilp@juno.com>
Message-ID: <95leea$20p$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2741

In article <3A7CD910.1A92D219@IEEE.org>,
Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> Bill Sohl wrote:
> >
> > Bob Wex w2ilp <w2ilp@juno.com> wrote:
> > >... BUT a
> > >license that says that you passed really comprehensive technical
exams
> > >can restore the kind of pride that once had value to academic,
> > >commercial and military establishments.
> >
> > In the cycle of this debate, it has come around to this
> > once again :-)
>
> I just looked up "pride" in the Bible concordance. Wow, God sure
> doesn't like pride. He prefers humility.

What does he say about the folks who are proud to have humility?
> --
> http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca
>
With humble respectful 73,
Bob Wex w2ilp (Insignificent Little Poster)...Is that enough humility???
Nah...(I Like PRIDE)

You may have prejudice without PRIDE...
but you can't have PRIDE without prejudice.
--?(?)--

Abbu Ben Adam admitted that he loved his fellow
man even more than G-d. An angel put Abbu at the top
of the list of those who would go to heaven...
perhaps because of his humility....but Isaac Asimov
told his English teacher that it was because the
list must have been in alphabetical order.
Isaac's reason always seemed more logical to me.
--w2ilp--

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2492. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-05 06:06:12 UTC
From: Bob Wex w2ilp <w2ilp@juno.com>
Message-ID: <95lfsi$34m$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2742

In article <3A7B92D8.DDD2EB7F@IEEE.org>,
Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> Bob Wex w2ilp wrote:
> > Perhaps more technical knowledge would give individual Hams real
reason
> > to have more self PRIDE...and
> > OFFICIAL FCC Ham Exams, which challenge hams to be motivated to have
> > more technical knowledge would eventually give All Hams, as a group
> > more PRIDE.
> > Nothing short of that will do.
>
> "Pride goeth before destruction ..."
BUT what cometh after???

Patriotism is nationalistic PRIDE. Such PRIDE is enhanced by
distruction...Destruction of the enemy that is.

Be it known to all of yee...
Pride cometh with construction of thy own ham gear.
> --
> http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

73,
...with humble pride,
Bob Wex w2ilp (Ignorance Loses PRIDE)
w2ilp@juno.com
No www site to be proud of.

Howdeee...
And I'm just as PROUD to be here.
--Minnie Pearl--

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2493. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-05 06:28:42 UTC
From: billsohl@mindspring.com
Message-ID: <3a7e47b9.1005425@news.mindspring.com>
Source record: 2743

On 05 Feb 2001 03:34:39 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>In article <3a7df549.9808660@news.mindspring.com>, billsohl@mindspring.com
>(Bill Sohl) writes:
>>Actually, regarding 500MHz and up, I suspect you are
>>probably correct. The interesting point, however, is that
>>those frequencies above 500MHz have very limited
>>use to most hams except for short distance transmissions...which
>>is exactly why the cell phone/pager/PCS folks want them.
>>I truly wonder what percent of all hams have ever made even
>>a single contact on any frequency (ham frequency) above
>>500 MHz?
>>
>>Cheers,
>>Bill K2UNK
>
>Bill:
>
>Probably around .05 percent, and that's being generous. I've personally
>never owned any amateur gear capable of generating a signal above
>a frequency of 1.2 GHz; and I've only made two successful QSO's in
>that band. The problem: Nobody to talk to -- even many years after
>the adoption of 100% codeless licensing for operating privileges in
>that spectrum. We (the amateur community in general) were given
>airtight assurances that removal of the 5 WPM code test from the
>Technician-class licensing requirements would inspire major growth
>in amateur radio and widely increased utilization of our spectrum
>in the UHF range -- largely dedicated to high-speed digital data
>communications.

Airtight assurances? Seriously, no one in their right mind
would ever make such assurances as they are totally
unpredicatble.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2494. Re: Morse Code replacement? Bigtime flame war article!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-05 11:18:51 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <95m26mgsc1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2744

In article <20010204104712.03780.00001059@nso-ch.aol.com>,
yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote:
> In article <957t00$a3d$1@nnrp1.deja.com>, Brian
<brianburke@my-deja.com>
> writes:
>
> >> My choice of words is telling the truth, as it always has. If you
are
> >> so adamantly "Pro-Code," why didn't you support it by insisting on
> >> retaining the status quo in testing requirements?
> >
> >I'm pro-national defense, pro-military, but I don't advocate
> >conscription at this time. Does that now make me anti-military?
>
> Brian:
>
> I am all of the above as well, so you're preaching to the choir on
> the subject of conscription. What does this have to do with the
> Morse code?
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

I don't think we need Morse Code conscription at this time either.
Stating such, however, does appear to make me "anti-Morse Code" by some.

Remember Larry, Morse is PEEU and doesn't need government price
supports. Its so PEEU that people stand in line to learn it.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2495. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-05 13:16:07 UTC
From: "Steven J Robeson", K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <95m92h$lv1$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2745

In article <20010204002041.18047.00001243@nso-ff.aol.com>,
lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:

>Code-tested licensees declined by 9,531 while non-code-tested
>licensees increased by 13,132

(Big snip...)

>That supposed "entry level" class is very nearly one-third of all US
>licensees.

Which STILL makes the CODE TESTED licenses 66 2/3 of the total, a
majority (not that it matters) by ANYONE'S definition.

And in as much as the Technician Class is now only one of three
licenses available, what's so significant that it's "one-third of all
US licensees", other than you trolling for another "no cw test"
arguement?

Not that we'd expect anything less.

--
"It Could Be That Your Life's Only Meaning Is To Serve As A Warning To
Others Of How Bad It Could REALLY Be!"

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2496. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-05 13:50:32 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3A7EAF89.412ECB83@sccoast.net>
Source record: 2746

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> Hmmm. Just what *are* the "contributions" of
> these newly licensed hams you're talking about?
> Specifics, please -- include any relevant
> documentation -- news articles, media releases,
> etc.

You're right, Larry, newly licensed hams have probably not contributed a thing - only more advanced license holders such as yourself could contribute anything to ham radio. By the way, exactly how many contributions have you made to ham radio over the great many years you've been involved (be sure to include any relevant documentation -- news articles, media releases, etc)? Now, we're not talking about routine stuff like emergency communications, and so forth (plenty of newly licensed hams do that). We're talking about those special contributions that you've made, that, as you suggest above, newly licensed hams don't make.

> Hmmmmm again. Just where did I state that
> "newly licensed operators" were not "decent
> people?" Please provide quotes from Deja.com.

Trying to change the subject, Larry? I've never accused you of saying that newly licensed operators were not decent people. What I said is that you've carried on an endless campaign to belittle newly licensed operators with the use of derogotary names and insulting characterizations. And I don't need Daja.com to verify that - anyone who has been involved with this newsgroup for even a month or two has saw it themselves many times.

> I could care less how you obtained your
> license, Dwight.

Sure you do, Larry. You've posted many, many, messages over the last few years complaining about ham operators who got their license without a code requirement.

> The way you obtained your license does not
> make me upset and I wouldn't dream of asking
> you to give it up. [snip]

I'm sure you wouldn't ask me. It would be a disaster for you if everyone who got their license without knowing code gave up that license - it would leave you with absolutely nothing to complain about (something you obviously need to do on a regular basis).

> Again, I am not "upset." The code requirements
> were there for me to achieve, and the fact that
> they are no longer standing in YOUR way makes me
> happy for you! I got to prove something to myself
> and others through the application of diligent
> effort -- and you didn't have to! Everything
> worked out well for both of us.

And that is the major difference between you and me. Because of my involvement with marine communications (my "diligent effort" goes there), I got involved with ham radio to learn more about radio (not just to get a license to impress people with - which, based on how often you make an issue out of the class of license you hold, seems to be your goal). After that, ham radio is just a hobby that allows me to experiment, practice radio techniques, and enjoy conversations with friends.

> No upset here, Dwight. I'm fine.

I'm glad for you, Larry.

> Wish the same were true of you!

Thanks for your concern.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net

2497. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-05 14:31:01 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <95mdf5$pv3$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2747

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:

> In the 9 months following US amateur radio restructuring, the
> total number of US amateur radio licenses increased by
> 3,701 (+0.55% of total). Code-tested licensees declined by
> 9,531 while non-code-tested licensees increased by 13,132.

We are fellow travelers on a journey between two
eternities, and it's a trip far too brief for me
to be concerned about how fast someone can copy
the Code of Morse."
--K0HB

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2498. Re: Long Delay Echos

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-05 16:35:25 UTC
From: "Steven J Robeson", K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <95mkoc$16t$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2748

In article <95c989$277$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
Steven J Robeson, K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com> wrote:

> In article <95c162ptv1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
> K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org> wrote:

>
> > Good topic, but probably will reach more likely respondents in
> > rec.radio.amateur.misc or rec.radio.amateur.dx.

I haven't posted to the groups that Hans suggested yet, however I
did take a look at the link AC6V sent. I guess calling what I heard
a "long delay echo" was really innacurate. I was hearing the return
ping at the receiver reset from transmit, so it was a very short
enroute time from where ever the echo was occuring. Less than 90K miles?

Considering the extremely modest antennas I run for HF, I would
exclude any side-lobe presentation. Perhaps a true circumfrential
return?

73 and thanks to all.

Steve, K4YZ

--
"It Could Be That Your Life's Only Meaning Is To Serve As A Warning To
Others Of How Bad It Could REALLY Be!"

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2499. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-05 17:42:32 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <95mojb$2c5$1@news.service.uci.edu>
Source record: 2749

Bob Wex w2ilp <w2ilp@juno.com> wrote in message news:95lcr2> > >In article
<95b0g1du1@news.service.uci.edu>,
> > > "Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote:
> > >> Bob Wex w2ilp <w2ilp@juno.com> wrote in message

> > >> > Hams need more license classes and/or official FCC technical
> > >> > endorsements.

> > >> In order to do what?

> To be Hams.

But only one license class is necessary for that to be true.

73, Jim AC6XG

2500. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-05 17:44:22 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <95momp$2cc$1@news.service.uci.edu>
Source record: 2750

Bob Wex w2ilp <w2ilp@juno.com> wrote in message
> Be it known to all of yee...
> Pride cometh with construction of thy own ham gear.

How many license classes are needed for hams to be able to construct their own gear?

73, Jim AC6XG

2501. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-05 17:51:05 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <95mp3c$2i1$1@news.service.uci.edu>
Source record: 2601

Larry Roll K3LT <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message >
> Jim:
>
> I don't think Fred was referring to chronological age; he was referring
> to hams who have been licensed for longer periods of time.

Yes. It is much easier to know that now that he has said as much. Until
then, I just thought older meant older. W4JLE is older in that sense.
Still, the accusation he made is no more valid by either definition.

> Since
> I was originally licensed in '81 and attained Extra class in '83, I meet
> my own definition as an "older" ham, regardless of my age.

I think all that's important is that we meet the definition of a good ham.

73, Jim AC6XG

2502. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-05 17:54:48 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <95mpab$2lp$1@news.service.uci.edu>
Source record: 2602

Len Over 21 <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20010204002043.18047.00001245@nso-ff.aol.com...
> In article <95i5do$k80$1@news.service.uci.edu>, "Jim Kelley"
<jwkelley@uci.edu>
> writes:
>
> >Len Over 21 <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20010202234912.00445.00001404@nso-bj.aol.com...
> >
> >> The FCC doesn't think a code test "proves" anything to them
> >> for the purposes of granting a US amateur radio license. The
> >> FCC has said so...twice in a decade.
> >
> >They said that it doesn't prove anything about character. They never
said
> >it doesn't prove "anything". Obviously it proves code proficiency. They
> >have more of a neutral bias on the issue than you do, I think..
>
> As far as what I've been able to read in 1990 and in 1999, the FCC
> said that the amateur radio code test does not prove anything for
> their purposes of granting a US amateur radio license. [please to
> include the whole sentence I wrote in quoting]
>
> Can you say the only US civil radio regulatory agency has a "bias"
> on what they grant? Said "bias" is a very subjective thing for every
> observer. The FCC simply regulates US civil radio and issues
> licenses where regulations call for them.
>
> Yes, the code test proves some elementary code cognition
> ability. Is that the whole point of US amateur radio below 30
> MHz? To prove some code capability?
>
> Is obtaining a code-tested US amateur radio license all about
> "proving one's worth to the 'amateur community?'" I don't think
> so looking at it from the FCC's point of view. The US amateur
> radio community doesn't issue licenses nor does it "grade" any
> licensee...officially.
>
> As of December 1997, the number of code-tested US amateurs
> was 73.39% of the total licensees while the number of US
> amateurs not code tested was 26.61% of the total.
>
> As of December 2000, the number of code-tested US amateurs
> was 67.9% of the total, the number of non-code-tested US

> amateurs was 32.1%. In actual numbers of amateur licensees,
> the number of code-tested amateurs is dropping while the
> number of non-code-tested amateurs is rising. It's been that
> way for several years. The FCC can see that rather well.
>
> Is the FCC "neutral" on amateur code testing? I don't think so.
> If they were "neutral" they wouldn't have made the statements
> they did in 1990 and 1999 R&Os about code tests...probably
> wouldn't have even bothered to create the Technician class.

They said that the code test doesn't prove anything about character. They never said it doesn't prove "anything". Obviously it proves code proficiency. They have more of a neutral bias on the issue than you do, I think..

73, Jim AC6XG

2503. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-05 17:58:04 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <95mpgg$2rm$1@news.service.uci.edu>
Source record: 2603

Larry Roll K3LT <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20010204113620.29597.00005575@nso-mi.aol.com...
> In article <95i563$k78$1@news.service.uci.edu>, "Jim Kelley"
<jwkelley@uci.edu>
> writes:
>
> >
> >Spectrum allocations are a whole different ball of wax. Personally, I
don't
> >see the use of phone in the Novice CW portions of the band as much of a
> >threat to CW. I can sure as heck filter out phone with my CW filter a
lot
> >better than I can filter out CW with my phone filter.
>
> Jim:
>
> Well, then, when the "noise floor" reaches the ceiling, I hope you enjoy
> the challenge of operating CW among all those high-powered, over-
> compressed, over processed phone signals!

If the noise floor reaches the ceiling as you say, it'd still be easier to
copy CW out of it than it would be to copy phone.

2504. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-05 18:01:54 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <95mpnn$2v8$1@news.service.uci.edu>
Source record: 2605

Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3A7E2A65.10D7D804@IEEE.org...
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > Well, then, when the "noise floor" reaches the ceiling, I hope you enjoy
> > the challenge of operating CW among all those high-powered, over-
> > compressed, over processed phone signals!

> - . -. ..-. --- ..- .-. --. ..- -.. -... ..- -.. -.. -.--
> --

.- --. -. ..--.. -.-

2505. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-05 18:21:20 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010205132120.00445.00001527@nso-bj.aol.com>
Source record: 2606

In article <95m92h$lv1$1@nnrp1.deja.com>, Steven J Robeson, K4YZ
<k4yz@my-deja.com> writes:

>In article <20010204002041.18047.00001243@nso-ff.aol.com>,
> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
>
>>Code-tested licensees declined by 9,531 while non-code-tested
>>licensees increased by 13,132
>
>(Big snip...)
>
>>That supposed "entry level" class is very nearly one-third of all US
>>licensees.
>
> Which STILL makes the CODE TESTED licenses 66 2/3 of the total, a
>majority (not that it matters) by ANYONE'S definition.

Code-tested licensees are DIMINISHING in number. The
trend is there, visible to all except those who wear blinders
of old-time CW radio.

Non-code-tested licensees are INCREASING in number.

If it weren't for the 1990 creation of the Technician class
license in the USA, the number of USA radio amateurs
would be DECREASING in number.

That trend has been clear to the FCC for over a decade.

That trend hasn't been seen by those who jumped through
old-standard hoops or who think they are "boss" in ham
radio through meeting old standards.

> And in as much as the Technician Class is now only one of three
>licenses available, what's so significant that it's "one-third of all
>US licensees", other than you trolling for another "no cw test"
>arguement?

Wrongo. The restructuring only removed three of six NEW-
license classes. Novice, Technician-Plus, and Advanced
classes are still in the US amateur radio database AND in
the revised Part 97.

For those who have taken an overly-long lunch hour (perhaps
to another planet), the morse code test is STILL PRESENT in
US amateur regulations for General and Extra classes.

The morse code test for any worldwide amateur radio license
is STILL PRESENT in ITU-R standard S25.5.

> Not that we'd expect anything less.

What is your point by that closing crack? Are you going to
launch into the usual personal attack commentary? Try to
avoid such comments since you can't win a single thing by
doing so.

didit

2506. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-05 18:25:36 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A7EF020.6943B04@IEEE.org>
Source record: 2607

Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> news:3A7E2A65.10D7D804@IEEE.org...
> > Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > > Well, then, when the "noise floor" reaches the ceiling, I hope you enjoy
> > > the challenge of operating CW among all those high-powered, over-
> > > compressed, over processed phone signals!
>
> > - . -. ..-. --- ..- .-. --. ..- -.. -... ..- -.. -.. -.--
> > --
>
> .- --. -. ..--.. -.-

The > > -- is part of my signature file, not part of the Morse code
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2507. Re: Morse Code replacement? Bigtime flame war article!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-05 19:17:15 UTC
From: Carl Zager <kb9rvb@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <95mu7haut1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2608

Why are you screaming that the other side has no evidence and your side does -- without offering the evidence to support your position?

Your arguments throughout the various permutations of these debates have been based entirely on personal opinion and entirely on as much anecdotal evidence as you accuse the others of offering.

You are sure "if the truth be known it support [you]." Yet you offer no statistical evidence of your own, only continual demands that those who disagree with you do the research so that you can nit-pick it.

Put up. Is there less CW activity as a result of the 5wpm? How do you know? Anecdotes from HF operators? Statements from new 5 wpm Hams about what modes they are using? Is there more or less QRP interest since 5wpm? Among new 5wpm-ers or among oldtimers? What is the evidence? Not what you think, what are the facts? What can you prove?

I was almost happier when you were posturing yourself as the gatekeeper of appropriate callsigns. Now you are the determiner of Ham motivation. "Everyone knows..." is not a fact. "When I started..." is a fact only for you. Whether it applies to anyone else is an opinion. Why someone is motivated is so personal to that person that your attempts to describe every Ham as sharing your motivations and your interests is close to an insult.

In article <20010130195432.02315.00004615@nso-fi.aol.com>,
yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote:
> In article <3A744AFB.140BB694@IEEE.org>, Cecil
<Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>
> >
> >W1RFI wrote:
> >> If you really are giving up, perhaps you could stand back and let
those
> >with a
> >> more positive outlook take over from here. Your choice of words is
really
> >> trying to hasten the demise of my favorite mode. I disagree with
you that
> >Morse
> >> code use is unable to stand on its own merits.
>
> My choice of words is telling the truth, as it always has. If you are
> so adamantly "Pro-Code," why didn't you support it by insisting on
> retaining the status quo in testing requirements?
>

> >Ditto for me. QRP interest is on the rise.
>
> Is that among currently licensed, already CW-using hams, or
> among new hams, recently licensed, and who just learned CW
> for the sake of accessing the benefits of QRP operation? I'm sure
> that if the truth could be known, it would support my arguments,
> not yours. Mine are based on reality; yours are based on
> dreamy, politically correct wishful thinking!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>

--
Carl Zager
http://www.mccsc.edu/~czager
kb9rvb@my-deja.com

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2508. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-05 19:26:38 UTC
From: "Steven J Robeson", K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <95mup1bgk1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2609

In article <20010205132120.00445.00001527@nso-bj.aol.com>,
lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:

> Code-tested licensees are DIMINISHING in number. The
> trend is there, visible to all except those who wear blinders
> of old-time CW radio.

No kidding, Lennie...?!?! You mean that the MOST POPULAR, EASIEST
to get license is GROWING..?!?! Say it isn't so!!!

The only person wearing blinders here is YOU, Chump. You CAN'T
(or worse, WON'T) see that Amatuer Radio is moving along nicely without
you or your opinion. TOO BAD FOR LENNIE!

Must be TERRIBLE to not be wanted!

> If it weren't for the 1990 creation of the Technician class
> license in the USA, the number of USA radio amateurs
> would be DECREASING in number.

Prove it.

> > And in as much as the Technician Class is now only one of three
> >licenses available, what's so significant that it's "one-third of all
> >US licensees", other than you trolling for another "no cw test"
> >arguement?
>
> Wrongo. The restructuring only removed three of six NEW-
> license classes. Novice, Technician-Plus, and Advanced
> classes are still in the US amateur radio database AND in
> the revised Part 97.

And NOT being issued by the FCC. Novice licenses were essentially
zero for years, Tech Plus was just a matter of an administrative
update, making the Advanced Class the only real spoiler for your "no-
code" arguement.

> For those who have taken an overly-long lunch hour (perhaps
> to another planet), the morse code test is STILL PRESENT in
> US amateur regulations for General and Extra classes.

More "no kidding", Lennie. A whopping 5wpm, which will be ZERO
wpm before too long, afterwhich your life will be TOTALLY irrelevant.

> The morse code test for any worldwide amateur radio license
> is STILL PRESENT in ITU-R standard S25.5.

Whoopie doo. After WRC-2003, that's probably going to change. I
KNOW you refuse to acknowledge it, but you just keep jousting at that
windmill, Quixote. Sooner or later it will cry "Uncle".

> > Not that we'd expect anything less.
>
> What is your point by that closing crack? Are you going to
> launch into the usual personal attack commentary? Try to
> avoid such comments since you can't win a single thing by
> doing so.

Lennie, YOU are the last person in this newsgroup who has ANY right
to whine about "personal attack commentary".

First and foremost because YOU are the Preeminent Abuser of the Ad
Hominen Attack. You revel at it. We wouldn't be having THIS exchange
if you weren't. So take your crocadile tears and stuff them.

Secondly, I am not the one trying to "win" anything here,
Anderson. I HAVE a license. I AM an Amateur. I HAVE all those perks
and priviledges that having taken all those tests conveys.

You DON'T have a license because you have neither the guts nor the
character to do it, and I am tiring of your incessant whining and
hatred of Amateur Radio.

Now, run along, loser. Your troll is kaput.

--
"It Could Be That Your Life's Only Meaning Is To Serve As A Warning To
Others Of How Bad It Could REALLY Be!"

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2509. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-05 19:31:24 UTC
From: K0HB@qwest.net
Message-ID: <95mv2ckpg1@news.netmar.com>
Source record: 2604

In article <3a7e47b9.1005425@news.mindspring.com>, Bill Sohl
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>Airtight assurances?

The amateur community begged for an allocation for high speed digital
interconnect circuits. ARRL lobbied FCC and won a new allocation at
219-220 MHz, reserved solely for high speed digital backbone circuits.

It is virtually unused!

dit dit

de Hans, K0HB

----- Posted via NewsOne.Net: Free (anonymous) Usenet News via the Web -----
http://newsone.net/ -- Free reading and anonymous posting to 60,000+ groups
NewsOne.Net prohibits users from posting spam. If this or other posts
made through NewsOne.Net violate posting guidelines, email abuse@newsone.net

2510. Engineers, Technicians, and Appliance Operators

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-05 19:53:29 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <95n0bk$d3v$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2611
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

ENGINEERS EXPLAINED

People who work or play in the fields of science and technology are not like other people. This can be frustrating to the non-technical (QCAO) people who have to deal with them. The secret to coping with technology-oriented people is to understand their motivations.

Engineering is so trendy these days that everybody wants to be one. The word "engineer" is greatly overused. If there's somebody in your life who you think is trying to pass as an engineer, but is really only a Technician at best, (often only an Appliance Operator) give her(or him) this test to discern the truth.

ENGINEER IDENTIFICATION TEST

You walk into a room and notice that a picture is hanging crooked. You ...

A. Straighten it.
B. Ignore it.
C. Buy a CAD system and spend the next six months designing a solar-powered, self-adjusting picture frame while often stating aloud your belief that the inventor of the nail was a total moron.

The correct answer is "C" but partial credit can be given to anybody who writes, "it depends" in the margin of the test or simply blames the whole stupid thing on "Marketing."

FASCINATION WITH GADGETS

To the engineer, all matter in the universe can be placed into one of two categories:

1. Things that need to be fixed, and
2. Things that will need to be fixed after you've had a few minutes to play with them.

Engineers like to solve problems. If there are no problems handily available, they will create their own problems. Normal people don't understand this concept; they believe that if it ain't broke, don't fix it. Engineers believe that if it ain't broke, it doesn't have enough features yet.

No engineer looks at a television remote control without wondering what it would take to turn it into a stun gun.

No engineer can take a shower without wondering if some sort of Teflon coating would make showering unnecessary.

To the engineer, the world is a toy box full of sub-optimized and feature-poor toys.

HONESTY

Engineers are always honest in matters of technology and human relationships. That's why it's a good idea to keep engineers away from customers, romantic interests, and other people who can't handle the truth.

Engineers sometimes bend the truth to avoid work. They say things that sound like lies but technically are not because nobody could be expected to believe them. The complete list of engineer lies is listed below:

- "I won't change anything without asking you first."
- "I'll return your hard-to-find cable tomorrow."
- "I have to have new equipment to do my job."
- "I'm not jealous of your new computer."

POWERS OF CONCENTRATION

If there is one trait that best defines an engineer it is the ability to concentrate on one subject to the complete exclusion of everything else in the environment. This sometimes causes engineers to be pronounced dead prematurely. Some funeral homes in high-tech areas have started checking resumes before processing the bodies. Anybody with a degree in electrical engineering or experience in computer programming is propped up in the lounge for a few days just to see if she [or he] snaps out of it.

RISK

Engineers HATE risk. They try to eliminate it whenever they can. This is understandable, given that when an engineer makes one little mistake, the media will treat it like it's a big deal or something.

EXAMPLES OF BAD PRESS FOR ENGINEERS

- Incentive Licensing
- Hindenberg
- Space Shuttle Challenger
- SPANet (tm)
- Hubble space telescope
- Apollo 13
- Titanic
- Ford Pinto
- Corvair

The risk/reward calculation for engineers looks something like
this:

RISK - public humiliation and the death of thousands of innocent
people.
REWARD - a certificate of appreciation in a handsome plastic frame.

EGO

Ego-wise, two things are important to engineers:

1. How smart they are.
2. How many cool devices they own.

The fastest way to get an engineer to solve a problem is to
declare that the problem is unsolvable. No engineer can walk
away from an unsolvable problem until it's solved. No illness
or distraction is sufficient to get the engineer off the case.
These types of challenges quickly become personal - a battle
between the engineer and the laws of nature.

Engineers will often go without food and hygiene for days to
solve a problem - other times, just because they forgot. And
when they succeed in solving the problem they will experience
an ego rush.

Nothing is more threatening to the engineer than the suggestion
that somebody has more technical skill. Normal people sometimes
use that knowledge as a lever to extract more work from the
engineer. When an engineer says that something can't be done
(a code phrase that means it's not fun to do), some clever
normal people have learned to glance at the engineer with a
look of compassion and pity and say something along these
lines: "I'll ask Bob to figure it out. He knows how to solve
difficult technical problems."

At that point, it is a good idea for the normal person to not
stand between the engineer and the problem. The engineer will
set upon the problem like a starved Chihuahua on a pork chop.

--
"We are fellow travelers on a journey between two
eternities, and it's a trip far too brief for me
to be concerned about your speed at the Code of
Morse."

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2511. Re: Drop by - www.ab7sl.com -

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-05 19:59:15 UTC
From: Charles Johnston <ctj92@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <997840DF9BC645CD.B7B07E5DBD4C7619.FC81283DC567A4B7@lp.airnews.net>
Source record: 2610
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Brian you gotta quit giving my posts a free double-billing! 73 / DX

--

Charles Johnston
charles@ab7sl.com

AB7SL - Ham Radio Pages
http://www.ab7sl.com

2512. Novice CW

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-05 20:18:19 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <95n1q0eeh1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2613

For a reasoned and well thought response to RM-10018, see the following URL:

http://gullfoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/retrieve.cgi?native_or_pdf=pdf&id_document=6512460080

I support it 100%.

73, Hans, K0HB

--
"We are fellow travelers on a journey between two eternities, and it's a trip far too brief for me to be concerned about your speed at the Code of Morse."

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2513. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-05 20:18:38 UTC
From: billsohl@mindspring.com
Message-ID: <3a7f09df.831364@news.mindspring.com>
Source record: 2612

On Mon, 05 Feb 2001 13:16:07 GMT, Steven J Robeson, K4YZ
<k4yz@my-deja.com> wrote:

>In article <20010204002041.18047.00001243@nso-ff.aol.com>,
> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
>
>>Code-tested licensees declined by 9,531 while non-code-tested
>>licensees increased by 13,132
>
>(Big snip...)
>
>>That supposed "entry level" class is very nearly one-third of all US
>>licensees.
>
> Which STILL makes the CODE TESTED licenses 66 2/3 of the total, a
>majority (not that it matters) by ANYONE'S definition.

A numerical majority simply because almost all those so licensed
had no alternative. It was either pass a code test or no license
at all. Later it became (and still is) pass a code test or no
HF operation. As such, those that have a code license include
many that would have no support for code requiremments.

> And in as much as the Technician Class is now only one of three
>licenses available, what's so significant that it's "one-third of all
>US licensees", other than you trolling for another "no cw test"
>arguement?

It shows that there is an every increasing number of hams that
don't see any reason to pass a code test.

> Not that we'd expect anything less.

Woudn't want you to be disappointed.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2514. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-05 20:30:25 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A7F0D61.E96AC732@uci.edu>
Source record: 2614

Len Over 21 wrote:

> By the end of December 2000, code-tested licensees
> were 67.9% of the total, non-code-tested licensees were
> 32.1% of the total.

> The balance scales keep tilting in favor of the non-code-
> tested license classes.

That's a funny kinda scale you got there, Len. You either need to have it calibrated, or you need to try to keep your thumb off of it.

73 de ac6xg

2515. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-05 21:08:01 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <95n4n9$hc7$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2615

In article <3A7F0D61.E96AC732@uci.edu>,
Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote:
> Len Over 21 wrote:
> > The balance scales keep tilting in favor of the non-code-
> > tested license classes.
>
> That's a funny kinda scale you got there, Len. You either need to
have
> it calibrated, or you need to try to keep your thumb off of it.
>
> 73 de ac6xg

File under "Figures don't lie, but liars figure."

73, Hans, K0HB
--
"We are fellow travelers on a journey between two
eternities, and it's a trip far too brief for me
to be concerned about your speed at the Code of
Morse."

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2516. Re: Code Quick RULEZ!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-05 21:20:52 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <95n5f8$i20$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2616

In article <20010204104711.03780.00001058@nso-ch.aol.com>,
yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote:

> No, thank God, I don't! Oh, speaking of God, that's another problem
> I have with Code Quick. It indulges in religious proselytizing right
in
> the middle of the tape. Specifically, fundamentalist Christian
> proselytizing. Why is religion brought into the program? What about
> potential customers who are Catholic, Jewish, Muslim, or any other
> non-fundamentalist Christian religion? If the guy wants to sell
> religious tapes, he should do so within the confines of that market --
> and not include HIS specific religious beliefs in a program marketed
> to people from all walks of life who are interested in ham radio

Really? If I were God, I wouldn't want to be on a code tape!
If I were God, I'd get together with all my other God friends
and have a big party. We'd all get drunk and create unliftable
rocks, then try to lift them. It would be loads of fun! Then I'd
probably just destroy the rocks with a lightning bolt. Then I'd
probably pass out. :^)

73, Hans, K0HB

--
"We are fellow travelers on a journey between two
eternities, and it's a trip far too brief for me
to be concerned about your speed at the Code of
Morse."

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2517. Re: Code Quick RULEZ!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-05 22:20:13 UTC
From: tlbryant@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <95n8ut031ba@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 2618

In article <u29s7tsndq6lu5r4gf5grfq9do9g4211n7@4ax.com>, nomail@nomail.com says...

>>it offers the proverbial
>>free lunch -- and therefore, gets a strong following from the
>>clients of the ham radio Welfare State.
>
>This is the *real reason* you don't like Code Quick. People who have
>no intention of ever using the code on the air have found success in
>using Code Quick to quickly pass the code test. But then I suppose
>that's similar to people who have no intention of learning electronics
>using memorization to quickly pass the written test...

Larry will never change. Technology has advanced in the area of superior modes, but his proselytizing is akin to having to demonstrate how to start a car with a hand crank in order to recieve your driver's license.

2518. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-05 22:25:46 UTC
From: tlbryant@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <95n99a131ba@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 2619

In article <3A7E2569.7458F345@arrl.org>, jbloom@arrl.org says...
>
>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>>
>> In other words, Dick, those of us who support reasonable
>> testing requirements to ensure that radio amateurs can effectively
>> employ one of the most useful communications modes in the ARS
>> are extremists; those who support the concept of touchy-feely,
>> politically correct "inclusiveness" are in the right, due to the fact
>> that they meet the needs of a much larger clientele.
>
>No, the extremists are those of you who denigrate those who haven't
>taken the same tests as you. In short, it has nothing to do with code
>testing and everything to do with how you treat people. If you think how
>you treat others is a issue of "political correctness," well, that
>pretty much proves my point.
>
>Jon

If Larry really cared about amateur radio, he'd be doing some elmering instead
sitting here kvetching on a daily basis.

2519. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-05 22:29:45 UTC
From: tlbryant@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <95n9gp231ba@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 2620

In article <20010205002411.04061.00001322@nso-mh.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com says...
>
>In article <20010204223438.13655.00002586@nso-mq.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam >(Larry Roll K3LT) writes:
>
>>n article <3a7df0fe.8709297@news.mindspring.com>, billsohl@mindspring.com >>(Bill Sohl) writes:
>>
>>>
>>>ROTFLMAO! Larry, do youself a favor and go back
>>>and read the stuff you have written before. To suggest in this
>>>forum that you have never been personally aware of the
>>>"pecking order" is sheer lunacy on your part. You, more
>>>than most anyone else, have been a key proponent of
>>>that pecking order claim.
>>
>>Bill:
>>
>>I'll admit that I have supported the concept of a progressive,
>>multi-tiered licensing system, for the purpose of encouraging
>>continued learning and communications skill development by
>>using increased operating privileges as the incentive. I have
>>not, to the best of my knowledge, supported this system
>>merely to keep an elitist "pecking order" in place.
>
>By all evidence of your statements in here you DO wish to
>keep the pecking order alive and well because you've
>managed to get to the "top" of the old pecking order.

So now it's known: For Larry, morse code is a phallic symbol.

2520. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-05 22:41:36 UTC
From: tlbryant@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <95na70331ba@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 2621

In article <95momp$2cc$1@news.service.uci.edu>, jwkelley@uci.edu says...
>
>
>Bob Wex w2ilp <w2ilp@juno.com> wrote in message
>> Be it known to all of yee...
>> Pride cometh with construction of thy own ham gear.
>
>How many license classes are needed for hams to be able to construct their
>own gear?
>
>73, Jim AC6XG

None. but you must have a license if you decide to transmit with it on amateur frequencies.

2521. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-05 22:44:29 UTC
From: tlbryant@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <95nacd431ba@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 2622

In article <3A7EAF89.412ECB83@sccoast.net>, stewartx@sccoast.net says...
>
>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>>
>> Hmmm. Just what *are* the "contributions" of
>> these newly licensed hams you're talking about?
>> Specifics, please -- include any relevant
>> documentation -- news articles, media releases,
>> etc.
>
>
> You're right, Larry, newly licensed hams have probably not
>contributed a thing - only more advanced license holders such as
>yourself could contribute anything to ham radio. By the way, exactly
>how many contributions have you made to ham radio over the great many
>years you've been involved (be sure to include any relevant
>documentation -- news articles, media releases, etc)? Now, we're not
>talking about routine stuff like emergency communications, and so
>forth (plenty of newly licensed hams do that). We're talking about
>those special contributions that you've made, that, as you suggest
>above, newly licensed hams don't make.

His contribution is that he can beep really fast.

2522. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-05 23:12:38 UTC
From: "Steven J Robeson", K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <95nc0tojn1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2617

In article <95n4n9$hc7$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org> wrote:

> File under "Figures don't lie, but liars figure."<

But I thought there weren't any liars here...?!?! Or did I
misunderstand something?

73

Steve, K4YZ

--
"It Could Be That Your Life's Only Meaning Is To Serve As A Warning To
Others Of How Bad It Could REALLY Be!"

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2523. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-05 23:48:29 UTC
From: Larry Klose <lklose@net-link.net>
Message-ID: <3a7f3bdc$0$30012$44a10c7e@news.net-link.net>
Source record: 2623

<K0HB@qwest.net> wrote in message news:95mv2ckpg1@news.netmar.com...

> The amateur community begged for an allocation for high speed digital
> interconnect circuits. ARRL lobbied FCC and won a new allocation at
> 219-220 MHz, reserved solely for high speed digital backbone circuits.
>
> It is virtually unused!

Why?

Larry KC8EPO

2524. Re: Engineers, Technicians, and Appliance Operators

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-05 23:50:04 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010205185004.22631.00001778@nso-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 2624

In article <95n0bk$d3v$1@nnrp1.deja.com>, K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org> writes:

>ENGINEERS EXPLAINED
>
>People who work or play in the fields of science and technology

Nice cribbing from elsewhere in the Web, Hans.

I'll be kind and give this a resounding 2 on the Trollometer.

didit

2525. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-05 23:50:07 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010205185007.22631.00001780@nso-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 2625

In article <3A7F0D61.E96AC732@uci.edu>, Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>
>> By the end of December 2000, code-tested licensees
>> were 67.9% of the total, non-code-tested licensees were
>> 32.1% of the total.
>
>> The balance scales keep tilting in favor of the non-code-
>> tested license classes.
>
>That's a funny kinda scale you got there, Len. You either need to have
>it calibrated, or you need to try to keep your thumb off of it.

Nice try, Jim, but let me cut and paste from my original post -

As of the end of December 1997, code-tested licensees
were 73.4% of the total, non-code-tested licensees were
26.6% of the total.

By the end of December 2000, code-tested licensees
were 67.9% of the total, non-code-tested licensees were
32.1% of the total.

==========

So...going from 73.4% in '67 to 67.9% in '00 for code-tested
and going from 26.6% to 32.1% for not-code-tested doesn't
indicate the scales are shifting? Amazing non-observation
on your part, Jim. Or do you just want to obliterate any
comments that cast doubt on newcomers not favoring code?
Jim

I believe your thumb is somewhere...and not on any posting.

didit

2526. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-05 23:50:07 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010205185007.22631.00001779@nso-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 2626

In article <95mup1bgk1@nnrp1.deja.com>, Steven J Robeson, K4YZ
<k4yz@my-deja.com> writes:

>In article <20010205132120.00445.00001527@nso-bj.aol.com>,
> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
>
>> Code-tested licensees are DIMINISHING in number. The
>> trend is there, visible to all except those who wear blinders
>> of old-time CW radio.
>
> No kidding, Lennie...?!?! You mean that the MOST POPULAR, EASIEST
>to get license is GROWING..?!?! Say it isn't so!!!

I said it was so. I've been saying so for some years.

What is your point...besides trying to start yet-another "battle"
in here on personalities?

> The only person wearing blinders here is YOU, Chump. You CAN'T
>(or worse, WON'T) see that Amatuer Radio is moving along nicely without
>you or your opinion. TOO BAD FOR LENNIE!

"Amatuer?" Is that anything like a Heath lunchbox rig on 2m?

On subtracting the overall gains from new Technician class
licensees over the last 3 years, the remaining five classes
show a DECLINE IN TOTAL NUMBERS. That doesn't mean
that Amatuer (or even amateur) radio in the USA is "moving
along nicely."

> Must be TERRIBLE to not be wanted!

The whole subject is not about "being wanted." It is rather
in pointing out what others have wanted...and that want is not
morse code skill tested and approved with an official
government merit badge.

>> If it weren't for the 1990 creation of the Technician class
>> license in the USA, the number of USA radio amateurs
>> would be DECREASING in number.
>
> Prove it.

The proof is in the tabulation of publicly-available data on the
AH0A website. Simply subtract the number of Technician
class licensees from the total US ARS licensees. The total
of all code-tested licensees is DECREASING.

>> Wrongo. The restructuring only removed three of six NEW-
>> license classes. Novice, Technician-Plus, and Advanced
>> classes are still in the US amateur radio database AND in
>> the revised Part 97.
>
> And NOT being issued by the FCC. Novice licenses were essentially
>zero for years, Tech Plus was just a matter of an administrative
>update, making the Advanced Class the only real spoiler for your "no-
>code" arguement.

Really really lame response. I said that the FCC is NOT issuing
any NEW Novice, Tech-Plus, or Advanced licenses. Quit trying
to prove some point by rewording it.

Have the regulations in Part 97 eliminated the Advanced, Tech-
Plus, or Novice licensees? No. They are still there in current
law. The USA still has 6 classes of amateur radio licenses.

>> For those who have taken an overly-long lunch hour (perhaps
>> to another planet), the morse code test is STILL PRESENT in
>> US amateur regulations for General and Extra classes.
>
> More "no kidding", Lennie. A whopping 5wpm, which will be ZERO
>wpm before too long, afterwhich your life will be TOTALLY irrelevant.

Define "too long," hotshot. WRC-03? How do you "know" that?
There is nothing firm in ITU agendas or study group documents
or FCC International Bureau agenda items that indicates ITU-R
S25.5 will be discussed at all, let alone be voted upon.

According to the FCC International Bureau there will be some
discussion at WRC-03 on S25. S25 is the entire set of amateur
radio standards.

> Whoopie doo. After WRC-2003, that's probably going to change.

You can't know that.

For one thing, the recent ARRL BoD policy position was to NOT
make any statements on what the FCC should do IFF ("if and
only if") S25.5 were deleted. If the ARRL has any clout with the
FCC then that policy position would have the FCC *KEEP* the
code test even if the ITU-R S25.5 were deleted. [do you under-
stand the significance of that or do you only want to fight about
personalities?]

>KNOW you refuse to acknowledge it, but you just keep jousting at that
>windmill, Quixote. Sooner or later it will cry "Uncle".

ALL laws, rules, regulations may appear to be sturdy "windmills"
that refuse to be beaten. However, all those laws, rules, and
regulations were made by man...and can be eliminated by man.

It is not an quixotic undertaking in attempting to change law,
Sancho Panza.

> Lennie, YOU are the last person in this newsgroup who has ANY right
>to whine about "personal attack commentary".

Poor baby. You want to strut around as a Dill Instructor and
issue orders as if you had some USMC rank in here...and then
accuse others of "improper behavior."

Tsk, tsk, tsk...nobody is Obeying the Dill Instructor.

But, big steebie HAS to make this a personal issue with -

> First and foremost because YOU are the Preeminent Abuser of the Ad
>Hominen Attack. You revel at it. We wouldn't be having THIS exchange
>if you weren't. So take your crocadile tears and stuff them.

Poor baby...you want to Issue Orders and then get all bent out
of shape if someone comes on back IN KIND and shoves it
back down your throat. Tsk, tsk, tsk, tsk....and tsk.

> Secondly, I am not the one trying to "win" anything here,
>Anderson. I HAVE a license. I AM an Amateur. I HAVE all those perks
>and priviledges that having taken all those tests conveys.

Oh, my, yes. :-)

Poor baby is suffering Lack of Respect Syndrome?

I started this particular thread regarding newcomers opting for
what in USA amateur radio. Based on publicly-available data
as tabulated by Joe Speroni on his website (AH0A is a fan of
morse code). This thread was NOT about big Steebie or his
accomplishments, didn't even name Robeson or even hint at
that noble eminence.

That the US ARS newcomers are NOT opting for morse code
has nothing whatever to do with personal viewpoints of anyone
who is already maximally "upgraded" in licensing.

> You DON'T have a license because you have neither the guts nor the
>character to do it, and I am tiring of your incessant whining and
>hatred of Amateur Radio.

Poor poor little peurile creature still trying to taunt and belittle
newcomers or maybe-comers as if this were the USMC.

It's sad that the maximally-upgraded non-comms of US amateur
radio have sunk to such a level. One could well imagine these
militaristic patronistic self-elevated knowitall jerkoffs demanding
"blood pinning" to prove their amateur radio worth.

Get this through your cartilage-filled cranium, Steebie, I have NO
repeat NO "hatred" of amateur radio. I once had thoughts of
getting an amateur license to round out my commercial license
and have some fun in retirement. Those thoughts have been
repeatedly dashed for around two decades by the self-important,
self-appointed non-comms of US amateur radio who keep

insisting that all newcomers have to de exactly as they did or be the subject of all kinds of personal abuse.

Now, it is my experience that MOST radio amateurs are not the self-important, self-appointed non-comm Dill Instructors of some kind of US Amateur Marine Code Corps...but there are just enough of YOU around to make it unattractive to many..

> Now, run along, loser. Your troll is kaput.

The original starting message of this thread was not a troll, but rather a refutation of some statements made by some self-important, self-appointed non-comm Dill Instructors in other platoons of the US Amateur Marine Code Corps.

Now put on your campaign hat and run some code cadets through some close order drill. Try to stay out of discussions of radio regulation changes and, certainly, radio theory. You can't handle either.

It's the SUBJECT, not personalities stupid.

didit

PS: "Non-comm" is an individual who cannot communicate in any reasonable discussion other than to denigrate and villify those persons who do not share the non-comm's viewpoints. A "Dill Instructor" is the self-styled non-comm who struts around shouting Orders To Be Obeyed as if the amateur radio service were really a Military Service.

2527. Re: Novice CW

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-05 23:53:07 UTC
From: kg4ggx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010205185307.24637.00001048@ng-bg1.aol.com>
Source record: 2627

For some reason I can not open this.
73 Rob

2528. Re: Drop by - kh2d.net -

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-06 00:03:45 UTC
From: kh2d@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <3a7f3e27.45097540@news.guam.net>
Source record: 2629
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Not much to do, but you don't have to type the
'www' into your browser so you can get there
faster....

http://kh2d..net

2529. Re: Drop by - www.k7on.com -

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-06 00:21:59 UTC
From: Jack <kc8pkn@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <95ng0j$oa1$1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 2628
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

WOW Another Canon A-1 user.

Jack

"Brian Short" <k7on@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:MPG.14e91447c57b768898968b@news.earthlink.net...
> In article <E726D3BB25D9E8B4.6E6FDE8C6F0A27EF.61E89A24B67E58A5
> @lp.airnews.net>, ctj92@earthlink.net says...
> > Lots of STUFF to do such as...
> >
> > Charles Johnston
> > charles@ab7sl.com
> >
> > - Ham Radio Pages
> > ----------------------------
>
>
> --
> http://www.k7on.com/
> --

2530. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-06 00:36:57 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <95ngv9$7ci$0@208.206.142.72>
Source record: 2630

Jon Bloom wrote:
>
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> >
> > Personally, I have complete contempt for what ham radio has turned
> > into.
>
> We know that, Larry. But the only thing that has changed about ham radio
> is that the artificial pecking order of license classes has been
> deemphasized. Ham radio is still what its participants make of it. You
> still have authorization to use a wide variety of signal types and
> operating techniques on a wide selection of frequency bands. There still
> are many people interested in that wide variety of activities with whom
> to consort. If part of what you derived from ham radio was the
> I'm-better-than-them ego boost provided by your position in the license
> structure, ham radio's benefit to you has indeed been diminished. That
> frankly doesn't concern me since ego boosting isn't the purpose of ham
> radio.

Jon, there's sure nothing artificial about that boatload of nonsense,
it's the real thing for certain.

When the Extras of today are commonly licensed with no more technical
nor code qualifications than Novices of old, and nothing has changed but
some vaporous "artificial pecking order"??
You know the appropriate descriptive word - and it isn't bullfeathers.

Dick

2531. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-06 00:49:29 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <95nhmmtgn1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2631

In article <95nc0tojn1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
Steven J Robeson, K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com> wrote:
> In article <95n4n9$hc7$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
> K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org> wrote:
>
> > File under "Figures don't lie, but liars figure."<
>
> But I thought there weren't any liars here...?!?! Or did I
> misunderstand something?

LIERS?

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2532. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-06 01:07:18 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A7F4E46.19F92C22@uci.edu>
Source record: 2633

Len Over 21 wrote:
> Nice try, Jim, but let me cut and paste from my original post -

Everybody knows what you said, whether I include it in my post or not Len. It does not change a thing.

> As of the end of December 1997, code-tested licensees
> were 73.4% of the total, non-code-tested licensees were
> 26.6% of the total.

> By the end of December 2000, code-tested licensees
> were 67.9% of the total, non-code-tested licensees were
> 32.1% of the total.
>
> ==========
>
> So...going from 73.4% in '67 to 67.9% in '00 for code-tested
> and going from 26.6% to 32.1% for not-code-tested doesn't
> indicate the scales are shifting? Amazing non-observation
> on your part, Jim. Or do you just want to obliterate any
> comments that cast doubt on newcomers not favoring code?
> Jim

I just know how scales work, Len. The scale gets tipped in the direction of the heavier side. Your scale was tipped the other way - by YOU.

73 de ac6xg

2533. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-06 01:08:27 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A7F4E8B.2D785130@uci.edu>
Source record: 2632

"T. L. Bryant" wrote:
>
> In article <95momp$2cc$1@news.service.uci.edu>, jwkelley@uci.edu says...
> >
> >
> >Bob Wex w2ilp <w2ilp@juno.com> wrote in message
> >> Be it known to all of yee...
> >> Pride cometh with construction of thy own ham gear.
> >
> >How many license classes are needed for hams to be able to construct their
> >own gear?
> >
> >73, Jim AC6XG
>
> None. but you must have a license if you decide to transmit with it on amateur
> frequencies.

Seems to me I read about that somewhere.

2534. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-06 01:09:50 UTC
From: "Steven J Robeson", K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <95nispugv1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2634

In article <20010205185007.22631.00001779@nso-fz.aol.com>,
lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:

Entire rambling, self appreciating trash deleted.

Leonard, I tried to read through the post, but it's just more of
the same.....you took a powder from the NG for a while, but now your
spite is built up again and you just can't help yourself.

You are a very sick, tormented and dying man, faced with your
impending mortality. You haven't adjusted. There are/were things you
wanted to do in life but never did for whatever reason, and by-golly
SOMEONE is going to pay for it.

Unfortunately, it is US.

No one gives a damn about the Sperroni numbers, how you single-
handedly built a USN/USA communications net out of an old TV and a pair
of 6146's, or your opinion on Morse Code testing. They don't matter.

You have proven how callous and shallow you are on occassions TOO
NUMEROUS to count. You have insulted and denigrated just about every
subset of society that you can that is "not you" in order to try and
prove YOUR superiority.

I know you think this NG is somehow important or that anyone here
really gives a hoot about you, your opinion, or MY opinion ABOUT you,
but the fact remains that this is just a respository for "actin' a
fool", and you, Lennie the Licenseless, are it's center stage court
jester. (You WERE in second place, but first place got wise and got
lost, so you ascended to first only through attrition)

Meanwhile, those of us with a license (regardless of class) will
be having fun on a radio tonight while you slather over the keyboard to
make some meaningless and ineffectual response to this post.

Good night, Lennie. Your life whittles away.....

PS: This was for you.....
--
"It Could Be That Your Life's Only Meaning Is To Serve As A Warning To
Others Of How Bad It Could REALLY Be!"

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2535. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-06 01:20:04 UTC
From: "Steven J Robeson", K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <95njft$v1n$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2635

In article <3a7f09df.831364@news.mindspring.com>,
billsohl@mindspring.com wrote:

> It shows that there is an every increasing number of hams that
> don't see any reason to pass a code test.

Meaningless, Bill.

We are now into our 11th year of the "no code" era. And with the exception of a brief explosion of new licensees in 91-92, the "growth rate" of Amatuer Radio has hardly been "stellar", and barely above attrition.

The NCT has NOT been the "growth hormone" it was cast to be at it's inception. Is it beneficial...?!?! Of course it is. But it's NOT been the "fix all" that it was forcasted to be at it's onset.

Lennie makes some deal about how this is the "fastest growing class" of licensee. Well, I'd say that it's NO WHERE close to being where it COULD be, and it's NOTHING close to being some revoloution that Lennie claims.

You said that the code tested licensee's were that way because they had no other choice.

I suggest you go back and research the demographics of the current TechPlus and above licensees and look at the dates of thier entry to Ham Radio. More than half of that 66 2/3 HAD a choice.

73

Steve, K4YZ

--
"It Could Be That Your Life's Only Meaning Is To Serve As A Warning To Others Of How Bad It Could REALLY Be!"

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2536. Re: Engineers, Technicians, and Appliance Operators

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-06 01:23:20 UTC
From: "Steven J Robeson", K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <95njm0$v52$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2636

In article <20010205185004.22631.00001778@nso-fz.aol.com>,
lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:

> I'll be kind and give this a resounding 2 on the Trollometer.

You would, but the REAL engineers that I work with have been
laughing thier butts off reading it.

Not usta-bee ex-technicians like yourself, that is.
--
"It Could Be That Your Life's Only Meaning Is To Serve As A Warning To
Others Of How Bad It Could REALLY Be!"

"When You Earnestly Believe You Can Compensate For A Lack OF Skill By
Doubling Your Efforts, There's No End To What You Can't Do"

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2537. Re: Novice CW

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-06 01:38:30 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <95nkim$g04$0@208.206.142.72>
Source record: 2637

The link doesn't work.

KG4GGX wrote:
>
> For some reason I can not open this.
> 73 Rob

2538. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-06 02:59:33 UTC
From: Bob Wex w2ilp <w2ilp@juno.com>
Message-ID: <95npah$40k$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2638

In article <95momp$2cc$1@news.service.uci.edu>,
"Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote:
>
> Bob Wex w2ilp <w2ilp@juno.com> wrote in message
> > Be it known to all of yee...
> > Pride cometh with construction of thy own ham gear.

PRIDE comes with motherhood or fatherhood but there are no classes
required to become a mother or father....unless you want to count
optional sex education from Dr. Ruth.

> How many license classes are needed for hams to be able to construct
their
> own gear?

NONE.

All Hams are permitted by law to build anything that they want to build
and this includes Radio transmitters, provided that the transmitter
outputs comply with FCC regulations (It does not include propriatory
descramblers or items that could be used by spies which might be deemed
illegal or a threat to national security). BUT do hams want to build
anything themselves if they have no confidence that they are smart
enough to do so? Are most US hams in favor of having the state of the
Ham Radio art advanced solely by Japanese hams?

BUT many more license classes are needed for hams, as a group, to
comply with the goals of the basis and purpose of amateur radio. This
is now especially true because President George W. Bush wants all
levels of education to be accountable. "Accountable" means taking
appropriate written tests to establish all standard levels of
education. Pres. Bush says this was necessary in Texas and is also
necessary in the entire USA, since the value of education available can
not meet national goals without such tests. If ham radio is to be
exempt then it must admit that it is no longer a worthy educational
hobby. If it is not to be exempt then we need more tests. If a
majority of Hams can not pass the tests...I'm sure that Pres. Bush
wouldn't want to take away their licenses or privileges.
Hmmmm...Maybe we can get the federal government to issue vouchers so
that Hams can get "better" Ham Radio classes at the church of their
choice.

Nah...Maybe many Hams are in favor of separation of signals from noise,
communication from spam...and church from state.
>
> 73, Jim AC6XG

Please keep thinking...and don't hesitate to post if you have any more
questions.

73, Bob Wex w2ilp (Intelligent Learned President?)

Folks are dumb,
Whar I come from,
Bout schools 'n books n' lernen.
Still they die at ninty-three...
Doin' what comes naturally.

Hams radiate,
Procrastinate,
And don't check their Vis-warh.
They can't live to ninty-three...
Knowing less that a cee-bee.

Hams got dumb,
Where I come from,
No building and no learning,
Still licensed by the eff-cee-cee...
Doing what comes naturally.

--w2ilp--

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2539. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-06 03:08:44 UTC
From: Bob Wex w2ilp <w2ilp@juno.com>
Message-ID: <95nprn$4fb$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2639

In article <95mojb$2c5$1@news.service.uci.edu>,
"Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote:
>
> Bob Wex w2ilp <w2ilp@juno.com> wrote in message news:95lcr2> > >In
article
> <95b0g1du1@news.service.uci.edu>,
> > > > "Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote:
> > > >> Bob Wex w2ilp <w2ilp@juno.com> wrote in message
>
> > > >> > Hams need more license classes and/or official FCC technical
> > > >> > endorsements.
>
> > > >> In order to do what?
>
> > To be Hams.

Well...actually REAL HAMS.

> But only one license class is necessary for that to be true.

Yep...Some kids learn to read in kindergarden with only one reading
test by a psychologist...but most kids need more time, teachers and
TESTS which they usually get in higher classes.
>
> 73, Jim AC6XG

73, Bob Wex w2ilp (Increase License Potential)

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2540. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-06 03:22:27 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A7F6DF3.3A87199@uci.edu>
Source record: 2640

Bob Wex w2ilp wrote:
> BUT many more license classes are needed for hams, as a group, to
> comply with the goals of the basis and purpose of amateur radio. This
> is now especially true because President George W. Bush wants all
> levels of education to be accountable. "Accountable" means taking
> appropriate written tests to establish all standard levels of
> education. Pres. Bush says this was necessary in Texas and is also
> necessary in the entire USA, since the value of education available can
> not meet national goals without such tests.

George W. Bush is NOT advocating adding more grades, or more diplomas.
But if he felt it would improve the quality of education, I'm sure he
would.

> If ham radio is to be
> exempt then it must admit that it is no longer a worthy educational
> hobby.

Oh, that's hogwash. Go answer all the questions in all the pools cold
turkey, and then tell us about a worthy educational hobby. When was the
last time you took an FCC test anyway, Wex?

2541. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-06 03:22:44 UTC
From: Bob Wex w2ilp <w2ilp@juno.com>
Message-ID: <95nqlt$522$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2642

In article <3A7F4E8B.2D785130@uci.edu>,
Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote:
> "T. L. Bryant" wrote:
> >
> > In article <95momp$2cc$1@news.service.uci.edu>, jwkelley@uci.edu
says...
> > >
> > >
> > >Bob Wex w2ilp <w2ilp@juno.com> wrote in message
> > >> Be it known to all of yee...
> > >> Pride cometh with construction of thy own ham gear.
> > >
> > >How many license classes are needed for hams to be able to
construct their
> > >own gear?
> > >
> > >73, Jim AC6XG
> >
> > None. but you must have a license if you decide to transmit with it
on amateur
> > frequencies.
>
> Seems to me I read about that somewhere.

How many classes and tests did you need to take before you were able to
read so well Jim?

Hams need more license classes.

73,
Bob Wex w2ilp (Increase License Potential)

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2542. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-06 03:28:01 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A7F6F41.576C3F1B@uci.edu>
Source record: 2641

Bob Wex w2ilp wrote:
> > But only one license class is necessary for that to be true.

> Yep...Some kids learn to read in kindergarden with only one reading
> test by a psychologist...but most kids need more time, teachers and
> TESTS which they usually get in higher classes.

And therefore, what, ham radio should offer more certificates? I only got one high school diploma. Would I have been better educated had I been offered three or four?

"This one goes to eleven."

2543. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-06 03:33:49 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A7F709C.DE385FD8@IEEE.org>
Source record: 2643

Dick Carroll wrote:
> When the Extras of today are commonly licensed with no more technical
> nor code qualifications than Novices of old, ...

When/if that happens, you would have a point. My 1957 ARRL License Manual had 3 pages of Novice Q&A. My pre-April 15 ARRL Extra License Manual had 94 pages of Q&A. How you can believe 3 equals 94 is beyond belief.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2544. Re: Novice CW

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-06 03:47:04 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <3A7F7398.6447890A@sccoast.net>
Source record: 2644

KG4GGX wrote:
>
> For some reason I can not open this.

The URL wrapped into two lines. To open the page, you'll have to copy both sections of the URL into the location block and then hit return (enter).

However, to save you some time, I'll give you a brief review. The page contains a letter from John S. Rippey (W3ULS), to the FCC. The letter is supposed to be about "re-allocation of certain sub-bands," but the author distracts from that with constant references to various license classes. For example, he ends the letter with, "...the Novice, Tech Plus, etc. licenses are hybrids of dubious value that deserve to be put out of their misery."

Obviously, since the letter was dated January 2001, Rippey doesn't make much of an effort to keep up with current events - the Novice and Tech Plus licenses were dropped from the current license structure almost a year ago. In time, even the various sub-band allocations will be dropped as the number of current license holders in those classes eventually decrease.

He also doesn't seem to know much about the old license structure either. For example, in one sentence, he refers to "Technician Plus licensees as well as Technician licensees who have passed the 5wpm code requirement." That is the same thing - a Technicion Plus is a Technician that has passed the 5wpm code requirement.

The idea of Novice sub-band reallocation is sound, but, in my opinion, it is a bit premature (there are still too many people using those sub-bands). Perhaps in another year or two.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net

2545. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-06 03:52:37 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A7F7505.BBE13546@uci.edu>
Source record: 2645

Bob Wex w2ilp wrote:
> How many classes and tests did you need to take before you were able to
> read so well Jim?

I can't remember exactly. But I know for sure they didn't award a
certificate for every one.

2546. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-06 03:57:31 UTC
From: Bob Wex w2ilp <w2ilp@juno.com>
Message-ID: <95nsn7$6s1$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2646

In article <20010131190404.15160.00000155@ng-fc1.aol.com>,
w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:
> >From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
>
> >> Some here who may believe that they are "helping" the mode survive
ad not
> >> making newcomers feel like they will find personal support on the
bands.
> >> Unfortunately, there is not enough on the bands to really make
that happen,
> >> either.
>
> > Ed when you gonna get real? No one here is witholding any sort of
> >helping hand from anyone. The last thing the code bashers want is a
> >helping hand with it. You think Baby Brian Burke sat on his ass for
13
> >years in whining protest about the test because he wanted a helping
hand
> >to learn code???
>
> Your idea of the helping hand? Sounds more like that helping hand
just slapped
> Brian in the face.
>
> Are you trying to make your prediction that the use of Morse code is
doomed
> come true?
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
I've always been a MUGWUMP on the subject of retining the CW exam
speeds...but it seems to me that you, Ed, are neglecting the facts.
There is no longer a Novice Class... because when there was, there were
few applicants...BUT Another way of looking at it: IS that now many
Generals are really at the old Novice level! CW wise the General
license is really a Novice license with a different name and a few more
multiple choice fixed Q & As. It is like the reading groups in first
grade. Naturally the teachers don't want to kill the kids self-esteem
or give them swelled heads by calling the groups "The Slow Readers'
Group" and "The Fact Readers' Group", so they call them "The Bluebird
Team" and The Owl Team" or whatever. The Extra Class license might
actually be thought of as the old Advanced class license with a
different name. That is why I believe that we need more classes of

license, in order to really provide for the technical diversity within the hobby. We need a even easier entry class for really new novices (small n) and we need more expert classes for the more really technically advanced hams. We need kindergartens and high schools....Head starts and advanced classes...Very few people, who have been trained to be educators, would deny that.

73,
Bob Wex w2ilp (Increase License Potential)

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2547. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-06 05:02:22 UTC
From: billsohl@mindspring.com
Message-ID: <3a7f84e7.966781@news.mindspring.com>
Source record: 2647

On 6 Feb 2001 00:36:57 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
> When the Extras of today are commonly licensed with no more technical
>nor code qualifications than Novices of old, and nothing has changed but
>some vaporous "artificial pecking order"??

Let me get this straight Dick...you are saying that the technical
content of the novice test I took in 1957 had the same technical
content as today's Extra test?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2548. Re: QCWA TELLS FCC TO END INCENTIVE LICENSING

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-06 05:32:13 UTC
From: Bob Wex w2ilp <w2ilp@juno.com>
Message-ID: <95o28ubcg1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2648

In article <3A7C0F5B.2158175B@arrl.org>,
Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote:
> Bob Wex w2ilp wrote:
> >
> > In article <3A797E19.5F1D7E26@arrl.org>,
> > Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote:
> > >
> > > I didn't say they weren't. I only said that according to N9GL, the
> > > standards are not derived from the mechanisms but from the known
> > > effects.
> >
> > True...but as engineers, scientists or medical people the
> > MECHANISM...chemical, biological, electral, mechanical or whatever
must
> > be understood if there is to be any corrective measures devised.
>
> But we can't apply corrective measures to the design of the human
body.
> The only factor we can control is how much RF we expose ourselves to.
> For that purpose, it is the effect of the exposure that is important,
> not the underlying mechanism.
>
> > A hot chicken does not tell you the mechanism by which it got
hot...but
> > if you heated it in your microwave oven..You know the mechanism was
> > microwave RF not heat conducted from a gas burner or radiated by
your
> > fireplace.
>
> But if the point is to cook a chicken I don't need to know the
mechanism
> by which the cooking takes place, I only need to know that it gets
> cooked when I apply either heat or RF at sufficient levels.

If you are a chef, then all you may need to know is that the chicken
got cooked to your liking...BUT if you are a scientist or engineer you
need to know a lot more; and if you are afraid that the chicken was not
cooked well enough to kill the bacteria in it, you work with scientists
and engineers; You don't care much about what a chef might think
because he doesn't understand the MECHANISM, nor the cause and effect
of the groth of bacteria populations in what might be pockets of
relatively raw chicken. The chef might not even be able to smell or
taste bad chicken that is dangerously tainted. Worse he might attempt
to cover up bad chicken with gravies that hide the rotten, stinking

chicken and make it profitable to do so.

Some of the "experts" who talk about what are considered RF hazard levels are no more scientific than old grandmothers who think that chicken soup will cure any illness. True, chicken soup might have some healthy benefits for some minor ailments...but the old grannys who make it don't know much about the spread of bacteria that exists within humans and certainly aren't aware of the latest reasearch about the AIDS virus. Chicken soup might just have a psychological beneficial effect on some humans...others might be better off with mock clam chowder or mock turtle soup....or some real Johnny Walker.
>
> > > Which makes sense. For the purpose of determining safe levels,
> > > the mechanisms are unimportant
> >
> > Huhh? That is like saying Ohm's Law is unimportant as long as lamp
> > bulbs light. Only the observation of the light matters for
determining
> > what voltage will quickly burn open the filament.
>
> It's nothing like that at all. We need to know Ohm's law so we can
> design electrical devices. We're not designing human bodies. (Although
> there are those doctors who've announced plans to clone humans, so
maybe
> we will be designing humans soon!)

When you design electrical devices there are certain intrinsic conditions that must be delt with. There are physical limitations that involve the actual fabrication of resistors, conductors, insulators, etc. (although I admit the human body is much more complex than an electrical resistance path)...
BUT
WE need to know the mechanism by which hazards can be hazardous before we can determine what the safe levels are...just like we need Ohm's Law before we can design for appropriate resistances, voltages and currents that can make a circuit function as we intend it to.
True, we can not reengineer humans yet...although genetic manipulation may not be out of the question in the far future...BUT we need to design RF radiating equipments (including cell-phones and Ham HTs) so that they are safe for use by humans IF this is possible. On the down side, it might not be possible....just like it has not been possible to manufacture a truly safe cigarette that is still a cigarette. We can not just think of the human body as a dummy load for RF...nor can we just think of the overall thermal effects on the body, without knowing the mechanisms that have dangerous propensities. Considering only thermal effects will definately prove to be a gross error. If the RF can be more consentrated on vulnerable parts of the human body at UHF than at VHF then this would not be a consideration if only thermal effects on the entire body are all that is being considered. It is a known fact that heat is generated when RF causes electrons in certain molecules to be agitated. (Heat is actually defined as electron

agitation) BUT the effects of agitating electrons in the material that constitutes human tissue of various functions is poorly understood. What levels, at what frequencies can cause genetic damage? What can cause or accelerate cancerous malignancies? What tissues are most vulnerable? Can some individuals be more at risk than others? All must be considered before setting any safe radiation level standards. Although the research continues, we have been permitted to work with standards that may be considered conservatively safe by some "grannys"...BUT not by W2ILP.

I admit that I dunno at this point in time... nor does N9GL. Let us leave it at that.
>
> Jon
>
Hams need MORE license classes.
73,
Bob Wex w2ilp (Increase License Potential)

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2549. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-07 10:40:59 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <95r8nr$37k$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2649

In article <3A80B04C.9E9A93A0@uci.edu>,
Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote:
> Brian wrote:
> > Perhaps "the pendulum is swinging,"
>
> Same thing. Ever actually SEE a balance scale, Brian?

Yes, on Miami Vice.

> > or the
> > actuarial tables have been invoked.
>
> Hmmmm, that's profound. How does one "invoke" a table?

By dying on time.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2550. Re: Novice CW

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-07 10:49:17 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <95r97b$3ik$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2650

In article <ccn18tgigv2g406luirgp125otrsg2p7f1@4ax.com>,
Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com> wrote:
> Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com> wrote:
> >Ergo, I'm fully capable of self-testing other emission types as well.
>
> How fast can you send RTTY with a bug... :-)
>

I smell a dung beetle.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2551. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-07 11:05:03 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010207060503.03780.00001602@nso-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 2802

In article <3A80D2CE.27155E46@IEEE.org>, Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>> I have never equated CW proficiency to license class.
>> If you think I have, prove it. If you can't prove it, shut up about it.
>
>You have certainly equated lack of CW proficiency to lack of class.

Cecil:

Wrong again, OM. I've equated whining about the code testing
requirements to lack of class, and I've equated an unwillingness to
make the effort to gain CW proficiency to lack of class (knuckle
dragging, drooling, slack-jawed trailer trash, etc.). I don't think I've
ever specified any minimum level of proficiency as being associated
with a lack of class, however. Again, provide proof to support YOUR
argument, or shut up!

73 de Larry, K3LT

2552. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-07 11:05:03 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010207060503.03780.00001601@nso-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 2803

In article <3A80BAA8.743A0DD6@uci.edu>, Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> writes:

>
>From looking over the question pools Larry, the scope of material is the
>same as it was before restructuring. How would increasing the number of
>steps on the ladder increase the height of the ladder? Are you
>proposing an Extra Cum Laude or something? Is that something you need?
>I know I certainly don't.

Jim:

If there were such a thing as an "Extra Cum Laude," then I'm the kind of person who would just go out and achieve it -- without whining about it. As a recent "non-traditional" college graduate, I achieved Summa Cum Laude status by making a diligent effort to ensure that I did fall within the parameters of that lofty status. Now, nobody can take that achievement away from me -- just like they can't take my Pre-Restructuring Extra-class achievement away from me!

My question for you is -- what do you have against striving to achieve a lofty goal?

73 de Larry, K3LT

2553. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-07 11:05:04 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010207060504.03780.00001603@nso-ch.aol.com>
Source record: 2801

In article <95qiri3cu2@enews3.newsguy.com>, tlbryant@my-deja.com (T. L. Bryant) writes:

>
>The system is still there, Larry. It works quite well, too. It's just that
>your
>worthless, outdated, hazing ritual of high-speed code testing isn't part of
>it
>anymore.

T. L.:

Well, to some, it's a whined about as a "worthless, outdated hazing ritual of high-speed code testing." To others, the relatively slow (even at 20 WPM) code tests provided the incentive to learn and master a useful communications skill in return for increased operating privileges. I guess your mileage varies depending on your attitude toward being a fully-capable radio communications hobbyist. If all you want to pursue is the easy stuff, then code testing would make you, well, testy! It's too bad the requirements easily achieved by tens of thousands of people from all walks of life were such a problem for you, if that's the case.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2554. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-07 11:12:59 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net>
Message-ID: <3A812DBB.ABB6D7C6@ovis.net>
Source record: 2804

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3A7F4E46.19F92C22@uci.edu>, Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> writes:
>
> >I just know how scales work, Len. The scale gets tipped in the
> >direction of the heavier side. Your scale was tipped the other way - by
> >YOU.
>
> Noo, noo, noo, Jim. I said the "scales are tipping." I didn't say
> that they had tipped the other way.
>
> Why do you deny they are tipping?
>
> didit

Scales don't tip until the weight on one side exceeds the weight on the other side. There are still far greater numbers of code tested hams than non-code tested hams. If you said that the scales are tipping, you are wrong. Why couldn't you just say that there is a good growth rate in the ____ class of license?

Dave Heil K8MN

2555. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-07 11:18:29 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccoll@radiks.net>
Message-ID: <58ag6.1078$0W5.364698@nntp3.onemain.com>
Source record: 2805

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:95qojh$5pc$0@208.207.71.168...
>
>
> >
> > There is a place for ham radio to relay a message during a disaster to
> > nieces and nephews that Aunt Suzy is safe. That`s worthwhile and
> > memorable.
>
>
> And when the infrastructure goes out- and contrary to your dreams, it
> DOES go out, authorities are more than pleased to utilize ham radio for
> serious purposes when needed, even if you don't believe it.

Having been thru two earthquakes including one with an epicenter in metro St. Louis in my days there, there is nothing in this world more terrifying. Earthquakes in the mid-Continent are not the localized (however severe) California type but cover vast areas. It is said that the big one in the early 19th century rang the church bells in Washington DC with aftershocks for months. Should another New Madrid occur, you can write off St. Louis, Memphis, and pretty much everything in between.

Two questions:

1. Dick, if you were involved in planning just what did the plan entail? How do you plan for Swampeast Missouri to essentially disappear?

2. For numbers alone, the amateur service cannot be planned for in any disaster scenario. The history is that we fortuitously appear like the gnomes in the night. The most obvious is H&W traffic which sort of implies a National Traffic System if things are not going to turn into a cluster. What sort of shape is it in? In Guatemala many years ago, the H&W traffic was flown into New Orleans on Pan Am and NTS from there. Still possible? Good solution for the remaining amateurs in Guatemala had better things to do and a long-term working relationship with the Red Cross was put into use to do H&W. The question is whether anyone at any level has even the barest outline of a sketch to handle anything like this?

Dick NBK

2556. Re: I heard a CB'er on 20 meters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-07 12:24:46 UTC
From: Ed Cregger <ecregger@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <i8bg6.2406$2g.174374@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 2806
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner

I just got back into amateur radio after a three to four year layoff. The language has changed a bit since I was last active.

For instance, where did saying "QSL" or "Contact" come from?

Q codes are for CW, not phone. Saying QSL is the same as saying 10-4 to my ears.

Contact? I have no idea where this could have come from. The traditional method of injecting oneself into a conversation (which is rude if the conversation is between two hams), is to announce your callsign. If the participants want company, they will invite you into the conversation. If not, you will be acknowledged as the next in line for the frequency when their conversation is complete.

I'm not stupid enough to think that anyone cares about my opinion, so there's no need to be offended. It's just that even I, an ex-CBer during the seventies, can see some of the CB SSB language infiltrating the ham lexicon/culture.

Does it matter? Not really, but it does seem to make us seem a little less intelligent. After all, the rules for telephony state that we are to use plain language, not codes or ciphers. But then again, that's just my opinion.
--
Ed Cregger, NM2K
ecregger@earthlink.net

"T. L. Bryant" <tlbryant@my-deja.com> wrote in message news:95qgub0cu2@enews3.newsguy.com...
> In article <wouff.hong@goodRadio>, bummer-radio@licensing.org says...
> >
> >And the son of a bitch had a restructured ham license. I'll bet the bastards
> >an ARRL member too. Probably got in on the League discount membership plan.
> >All this started me wondering, What make a ham a ham? Is a ham someone
> >that's working to improve their knowledge of radio theory, electronics and
> >operating skills?
> >

> >Or is a ham someone with a radio license who doesn't care
to improve, who only
> >wants to sit around and talk, act like a CB'er hurting
others enjoyment of the
> >service, and not learn anything?
> >
> >God help us, I'm hearing more and more of these stupid
assholes on the bands
> >everyday. They don't know anything either and ask alot of
stupid questions
> >that if they had been compelled to study the licensing
manual alittle more
> >thoroughly that know the answers to all their questions.
But I guess the point
> >of restructured licenses is to give some fucking idiot a
piece of paper with a
> >callsign on it and not require anything more, All this
means the fcc going to
> >be forced to do more enforcement to control these
assholes and that going to
> >hurt all of us.
> >
> >I wish there were an organization in America that would
work to improve ham
> >radio, licensing, and improve the level of expertise of
its operators.
>
>
> What, exactly, did this person do that was so stupid? Did
he say "10-4" instead
> of "QSL"? There's nothing illegal about that, you know.
>
> ...and did you do anything to try to steer them in the
right direction, or does
> it just make you feel better if you make posts, bitching
and moaning about the
> state of amateur radio?
>
>

2557. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-07 12:37:07 UTC
From: "Steven J Robeson", K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <95rfhi$81u$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2808

In article <20010207015558.02997.00001926@nso-mg.aol.com>,
lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
> In article <95pfnthkc1@nnrp1.deja.com>, Steven J Robeson, K4YZ
> <k4yz@my-deja.com> writes:

> Ah, but you didn't say WHO is doing all your computer-modem
> typing while you are having lotsa fun on ham radio at night.

Myself, Lennie...Don't need the help.
>
> Who does your typing, steebie?

> > Usual tripe dismissed without comment. Nothing but the
> >same "personal attacks" that he claims HE never uses.
>
> Poor baby. Can't take REPLIES IN KIND? Tsk, tsk, tsk.

Didn't say I couldn't Lennie. Just pointing out that you have
been lying AGAIN. You have (recently) stated you don't do that kind of
thing, yet you have been doing it to me for two years now and you
started the "Jelly" comments on Fred. Fred did NOT make any
such "endearments" to you, but you certainly have tried to rip him a
new one.

Of course, I am sure if you keep it up and then start getting it
in return from him, you will, as you have with me, claim "victim"
status and then begin your own rhetorical abuses.

You always do.

--
"It Could Be That Your Life's Only Meaning Is To Serve As A Warning To
Others Of How Bad It Could REALLY Be!"

PLEASE SEND PRIVATE E MAIL COMMENTS TO K4YZ@AOL.COM. RESPSONSES TO THE
DEJA MAY OR MAY NOT BE RETRIEVED IN A TIMELY FASHION.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2558. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-07 12:42:04 UTC
From: "Steven J Robeson", K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <95rfqq$8co$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2809

In article <95q4m7$6n2$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com> wrote:

> Would you deny them vanity calls? Why else abandon a spiffy KC call?

Probably because in THIS case, Twitless, the calls are expiring
due to non-renewal.

These were NOT calls vacated due to Vanity options. And NO, I
would not deny anyone, even you, a Vanity call.

Now, run along and catch up to Uncle Lennie. Maybe he'll let you
play with his hand puppet.

--
"It Could Be That Your Life's Only Meaning Is To Serve As A Warning To
Others Of How Bad It Could REALLY Be!"

PLEASE SEND PRIVATE E MAIL COMMENTS TO K4YZ@AOL.COM. RESPSONSES TO THE
DEJA MAY OR MAY NOT BE RETRIEVED IN A TIMELY FASHION.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2559. Re: ARRL HQ "Attitude" (Was: Re: Pride)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-07 12:47:27 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <3A8143DF.6213A9A7@arrl.org>
Source record: 2807

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> What I write in this newsgroup is not the way I treat people in
> person; and I've never made any claim that there was any such
> connection. Usenet postings are made in a relatively sanitized,
> impersonal manner.

Which doesn't mean they don't have some influence on how the readers of them view attitudes within ham radio. And I suspect the attitude toward newcomers you express here is not completely absent from your in-person behavior. It's hard for anyone to completely compartmentalize their feelings.

> As far as treating people is concerned, I must advise you that
> ARRL HQ employees definitely live in a glass house as far as
> that issue is concerned. From my first visit in '84, to recent
> contacts with HQ officials at hamfests, I have continuously
> experienced a smug, arrogant, and even contemptuous
> attitude. I have come to expect this from ARRL HQ people,
> and your postings to this NG are certainly no surprise.

The only thing I've ever expressed contempt for is behavior that exhibits a lack of basic human respect for others. I can't help it if you find that "smug" and "arrogant." Frankly, I think those words far better reflect your attitudes than mine. As for your other contacts with ARRL HQ, I don't know the specifics. But since your reaction is precisely opposite from the one most HQ visitors display, I suspect your feelings have more to do with your prejudicial view of ARRL than with anything actually done by any HQ staff person.

Jon

2560. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-07 12:52:30 UTC
From: "Steven J Robeson", K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <95rgeb$8qh$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2810

In article <20010207015600.02997.00001928@nso-mg.aol.com>,
lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
> In article <95pgvqist1@nnrp1.deja.com>, Steven J Robeson, K4YZ

> That's AH0A, not "AHoA." That's an Extra's call sign.

No screamin' eagle doodoo, huh?

> qrz.com is an interesting website...but it does not grant US
> amateur radio licenses.

I guess I am wasting my time asking YOU how you came to this
comment? (You never explain anything else...why should I expect any
diffrent now?) The information conveyed in "QRZ" is no more or no less
accurate than Speroni's site.

> Joe Speroni, AH0A, does a fine job on his website and has
> been doing that for over three years with many different
> tabulation presentations. Again, why do you wish to insult
> him by requesting others to abandon looking at his data?

Insult Speroni by suggesting someone use another source of
information...?!?!

You really are stretching for a troll, Lenni. Stretching reeeeal
hard.

--
"It Could Be That Your Life's Only Meaning Is To Serve As A Warning To
Others Of How Bad It Could REALLY Be!"

PLEASE SEND PRIVATE E MAIL COMMENTS TO K4YZ@AOL.COM. RESPSONSES TO THE
DEJA MAY OR MAY NOT BE RETRIEVED IN A TIMELY FASHION.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2561. Re: Engineers, Technicians, and Appliance Operators

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-07 13:04:27 UTC
From: "Steven J Robeson", K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <95rh4o$99m$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2811

In article <20010207015601.02997.00001930@nso-mg.aol.com>,
lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:

> Supposedly this one-time USMC person evolved into a
> Purchasing Agent after "burn-out" as a Licensed
> Practical Nurse in civilian life. We don't know if said
> Purchasing Agent (his claim) is still employed as a
> Purchasing Agent. He hasn't identified the company
> where is is, or was, purchasing things.

I'll be more than glad to relate that information as soon as YOU
provide (as was requested MONTHS ago) names and other information of
verifyable sources that can validate YOUR many claims.

And more than one person here knows the name of the company...even
has my corporate addresses and phone numbers. You gonna call and chat,
Lenni? I'll give you the 800 number if you care.

And by the way, I AM doing both. Again, unlike you, I saw that
there were a great many things that I would like to do in my life. I
may never completely master any one of them, but I will do my best to
experience as many as I can.

No excuses as to why I didn't do it, other than I didn't do it.
No "elitists" holding me back, or failed excuses.

> What is more amusing is this person's claim to once
> being a "commissioned officer" in some state militia,
> ostensibly as THE radio officer of an entire infantry
> brigade...which would require at least a major rank.

Acutally, it requires a Captain. But I will pass on that in the
future the Adjutant General shall call you first before assigning TO.

> When queried on this, said person replied he "had
> the papers in his wallet." Apparently that is
> "confirmation" for everyone else.

Of which I offered a copy. You declined. Your loss.

> There's a four-letter word for persons like that

Which is one letter more than how we can describe you, Lenni.

--
"It Could Be That Your Life's Only Meaning Is To Serve As A Warning To
Others Of How Bad It Could REALLY Be!"

PLEASE SEND PRIVATE E MAIL COMMENTS TO K4YZ@AOL.COM. RESPSONSES TO THE DEJA MAY OR MAY NOT BE RETRIEVED IN A TIMELY FASHION.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2562. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-07 13:13:45 UTC
From: "Steven J Robeson", K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <95rhm4$9o1$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2812

In article <20010207015558.02997.00001925@nso-mg.aol.com>,
lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:

> > PROVE that there would BE a negative growth rate, Lennie.
>
> Do the following -

The exercise of which would be a theoretical exercise.

PROVE THAT THERE WOULD BE A NEGATIVE NUMBER TODAY.

To show a period of some negative growth and say "See See!" is
foolish. That's like trying to forecast all economy growth based on
the 1930's.

>.....FCC's preferred since they are to only agency ganting amateur
>radio licenses

How do you "gant" an Amamteur license.

And why do you insist on insulting Joe Speroni by abandoning his
database to look at others when it suits you?

> ...there, wasn't that simple? Even purchasing agents can do it.

Yep...sure was...and it still proves nothing. PROVE that the
Technician Class license is the ONLY reason there is any "growth" in
the Amatuer radio service.

PROVE that there was NO other viable option or that NOTHING else
would have occured to spur changes.

We're waiting.

--
"It Could Be That Your Life's Only Meaning Is To Serve As A Warning To
Others Of How Bad It Could REALLY Be!"

PLEASE SEND PRIVATE E MAIL COMMENTS TO K4YZ@AOL.COM. RESPSONSES TO THE
DEJA MAY OR MAY NOT BE RETRIEVED IN A TIMELY FASHION.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2563. Re: Novice CW

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-07 14:35:05 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <95rmepdva1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2813

In article <95q65k$7qu$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com> wrote:
> > I'd support that idea in a heartbeat, so long as FCC doesn't stuff
> > them away in some segregated ghetto like the current Novice
> > sub-bands.
>
> Hey Hans, who said you could start calling it a ghetto?

Brian,

Do you suffer from attention deficit disorder? I have been publicly calling it a ghetto for at least 10 years.

Even so, I don't expect I'll need permission from a dump huck like you.

With all good wishes,

Hans, K0HB

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2564. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-07 15:36:02 UTC
From: tlbryant@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <95rq1201sc@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 2822

In article <3A80BAA8.743A0DD6@uci.edu>, jwkelley@uci.edu says...

>> Same number as always -- one. That isn't the issue. The reason
>> for having a multi-tiered licensing system is to incentivize and
>> motivate continued, progressive learning with the reward of
>> progressive increases in operating privileges. It was a system that
>> worked for literally hundreds of thousands of people, until the
>> slouchers of the Welfare State finally managed to get the
>> notion of working toward desired goals deemed to be politically
>> incorrect, non-inclusive, and mean-spirited.
>
>From looking over the question pools Larry, the scope of material is the
>same as it was before restructuring. How would increasing the number of
>steps on the ladder increase the height of the ladder? Are you
>proposing an Extra Cum Laude or something? Is that something you need?
>I know I certainly don't.
>
>73, Jim AC6XG

Larry doesn't care whether or not hams have reached a certain level of technical proficiency. He only cares about how fast they can beep. He calls them "welfare hams", but welfare implies that something tangible is taken from someone who has, and is given to someone who doesn't have. Nothing tangible has been taken from Larry, but his blurred vision doesn't see things that way.

2565. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-07 15:39:21 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <95rq79$6u2$0@208.206.142.109>
Source record: 2814

Cecil wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Of course not, many of my friends are nocode techs. But would you allow
> > a loved one to die rather than use CW for a relief message?
>
> Of course not but I'm not saying that coded hams are unqualified. You
> are saying that nocode hams are unqualified. If they are so unqualified,
> why would you allow them to save your wife's life?
>
> > When I say that radiotelegraphy is the most basic, simple, easily
> > implemented radio communications mode yet devised? How is that?
>
> You went a lot farther than that, Dick. You said they were unqualified
> at basic radio communications. 2m FM *IS* basic radio communications.
> You contradict yourself.
>

Not in the least, Pal. Radiotelegraphy IS the basic radiocommunications mode, whether ham radio or whatever else. No other mode can be put to use with so little equipment requrements. ANY RF generator can be on-off keyed to form Morse characters. No other mode can do that. NONE. Any ham radio operator who is unable to make it work simply because he was to uninformed to cause himself to learn to be able to use it is thus unqualified by definition, as you are so fond of saying.
2meter FM is basic radio communication? On what planet?

2566. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-07 15:47:49 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <95rqn5$6u2$1@208.206.142.109>
Source record: 2815

"T. L. Bryant" wrote:
>
> In article <95q4t7slt0@208.207.71.146>, dixie@townsqr.com says...
>
>
> >> This already was done back in the sixties with the "incentive licensing"
> plan.
> >> All it did was piss off a lot of hams who lost priveleges because of it.
> >
> >
> > Son, you might have a bit of credibility if you'd make your statements
> >about that which you actually know something about.
>
> Don't be so ambiguous. Either prove me wrong or shut up.

That sure won't be hard to do: I am living evidence that you have no
clue as to what you're talking abouit.

2567. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-07 15:49:06 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A816E72.291F04E4@IEEE.org>
Source record: 2816

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> My question for you is -- what do you have against striving to
> achieve a lofty goal?

What do you have against not striving to achieve a lofty goal?
Do you have a PhD? What is wrong with live and let live?
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2568. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-07 15:53:11 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A816F67.39342AB2@IEEE.org>
Source record: 2817

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> >You have certainly equated lack of CW proficiency to lack of class.
>
> Wrong again, OM. I've equated whining about the code testing
> requirements to lack of class, ...

Oh? I don't recall you saying anything about whining in your
St. Valentines Massacre postings. It's the very existence of
nocode techs that you objected to.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2569. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-07 15:54:38 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A816FBE.8D74ABAE@IEEE.org>
Source record: 2818

Dick Carroll wrote:
> > You went a lot farther than that, Dick. You said they were unqualified
> > at basic radio communications. 2m FM *IS* basic radio communications.
> > You contradict yourself.
>
> Not in the least, Pal.

You are completely off your rocker, Dick, if you believe 2m FM is not
basic radio communications.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2570. Re: I heard a CB'er on 20 meters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-07 16:19:33 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <95rsi9jns1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2820
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

In article <wouff.hong@goodRadio>,
bummer-radio@licensing.org (smiley o'riley) wrote:

> And the son of a bitch had a restructured ham license.

The Armenian judges gave this a 9.8 on the Olympic Troll-O-Meter, but they were over-ruled by the umpires in instant replay, who award it a 2.6.

The Armenian judges lodged a formal protest!

It was sufficiently trollish, of course, but way too obvious. It was poorly written, poorly executed, and was so incredibly lame as to lack the true drawing power of a really masterful troll. Maybe as high as a 3.1 for the intense stupidity of the premise, but a 9.8? Never! The Armenian judges tear their hair out, throw their balalaikas down in dismay, and perform the traditional Armenian Dismay Chant! They demand a recount!

73, de Hans, K0HB
--

Hans' Second Law of Thermodenial:

"In any closed mind the amount of ignorance
remains constant or increases."

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2571. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-07 16:21:52 UTC
From: tlbryant@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <95rsn001g4l@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 2828

In article <20010207060504.03780.00001603@nso-ch.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam says...

>
>Well, to some, it's a whined about as a "worthless, outdated hazing
>ritual of high-speed code testing." To others, the relatively slow (even
>at 20 WPM) code tests provided the incentive to learn and master a
>useful communications skill in return for increased operating

Useful? Maybe useful for recreational purposes, but certainly not useful when there are far more efficient and reliable communications modes with the technology available today.

>privileges. I guess your mileage varies depending on your attitude
>toward being a fully-capable radio communications hobbyist. If
>all you want to pursue is the easy stuff, then code testing would
>make you, well, testy! It's too bad the requirements easily achieved
>by tens of thousands of people from all walks of life were such a
>problem for you, if that's the case.
>
>73 de Larry, K3LT

You're so predictable, Larry. I knew you'd make a comment about the poster not passing a code test if a callsign were left.

2572. Re: ROTMFFLMMFAO!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-07 16:33:23 UTC
From: "R.L. Tannehill, P.E." <rickw7rt@firstinter.net>
Message-ID: <3A8178D3.1A3E6870@firstinter.net>
Source record: 2821

K0HB wrote:
>
> In article <95pon0quh1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
> Steven J Robeson, K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com> wrote:
>
> > QUOTE:
> > Cell phone uses CW to signal incoming e-mail:
>
> It's a Nokia, and OH2BH is a VP there. Brian is gonna be ticked!
> Klose and Stevenson, et. al. are gonna take 'em straight to the
> ITU and put a stop to this pro-code crap in the Cell Phone business.
>
> 73, Hans, K0HB
> --
> "We are fellow travelers on a journey between two
> eternities, and it's a trip far too brief for me
> to be concerned about your speed at the Code of
> Morse."

Yea, but will it read the e-mail in Morse.....sounds too
primitive...still needs work :)

Rick T. W7RT
NCI #1394
Member, BOD

>
> Sent via Deja.com
> http://www.deja.com/

2573. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-07 16:35:31 UTC
From: tlbryant@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <95rtgj11g4l@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 2830

In article <95rqn5$6u2$1@208.206.142.109>, dixie@townsqr.com says...
>
>
>
>"T. L. Bryant" wrote:
>>
>> In article <95q4t7slt0@208.207.71.146>, dixie@townsqr.com says...
>>
>>
>> >> This already was done back in the sixties with the "incentive licensing"
>> plan.
>> >> All it did was piss off a lot of hams who lost priveleges because of it.
>> >
>> >
>> > Son, you might have a bit of credibility if you'd make your statements
>> >about that which you actually know something about.
>>
>> Don't be so ambiguous. Either prove me wrong or shut up.
>
>
> That sure won't be hard to do: I am living evidence that you have no
>clue as to what you're talking abouit.

Let me get this straight: Are you saying that just because you are happy, content, and all hunky-dorey, that there were not other hams who were vehement about losing priveleges to so-called incentive licensing? If this is the case, then you need a serious reality check.

2574. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-07 16:50:33 UTC
From: Bob Wex w2ilp <w2ilp@juno.com>
Message-ID: <95ruck$lr2$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2823

In article <95q8blqgl0@208.207.71.146>,
Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>
>
> "T. L. Bryant" wrote:
> >
> > Ye Olde Fahrtz have been preaching the concept of a "real ham" for years.
If present trends continue the only Hams left may be Olde Fartz.
Even if there are one Megafartz of old hams what will that mean if there are no new young hams to replace them in the future???

> > Despite this narrow-mindedness, the class of license doesn't prove whether or not the holder of said license is a "real ham".

IMHO the narrow-mindered are those who only consider their own interests and could care less about the survival of Ham Radio.

> No, but it beats hell all out of any nocode qualification seen to date.

I have recently joined an e-mail group for QCWA members (or old farts as some might say). The QCWA and its chapter clubs are struggling with the problem of decreased active membership and not enough new members to replace the silent keys...just as most of the ham clubs, who are honest about it, are ready to admit. I would bet that the membership in most ARRL affiliated ham clubs is also decreasing or will soon be decreasing. Some QCWA leaders want to open up membership to all hams who have not yet met the 25 year requirement. This is not unlike the Ham leaders who have been continuing to press for simplified ham license requirements. The trouble is that such changes can only lead to further disinterest and active participation in ham radio by those whop have previously qualified. It also leads to a loss of PRIDE...even a loss of prestige for ham radio as a hobby. People who might be considering becoming hams can not be positively influenced to enter a hobby which can not retain the kind of pride it has had in the past.

The USA and world cultures are changing. In the 1950s people thought that TV would take up so much of peoples' time that they wouldn't be active in clubs and hobbies. It didn't have as much of an effect as was feared on ham radio. BUT...today there are more options for people who are interested in using technology as a hobby. Unlike TV, but like Ham Radio, The Internet and cellular phones are interactive..That is, they are two way communication systems which offer the ability to make new friends and discuss stuff with individuals and with groups

worldwide..and to get and give opinions and education about any matter that might be of interest, technical or not. Today's young techie nerds, hackers and gurus are as interested in computers as we must have been interested in Ham Radio. They think that Ham Radio is just for old farts. They might join a computer club to learn more about their opertating systems or to swap software...but they won't have any time left for a Ham Club.

My opinion is if you want ham radio to survive and to eventually interest more people you have to make it more technically educational; not easier to advance to "Extra" class. Ham Radio is far behind modern communication technology and must be advanced to the relative point where it was in 1950. To do this we need more higher level technical requirements for the higher level hams...although we still need easy entry requirements to help get youngsters started. This is in opposition to the present ARRL policy. The ARRL leaders can not seem to get it into their heads that to attract new members and to keep some present hams active...you have to give some PRIDE back to all Hams, by encouraging those who want to, and can qualify for advanced modern technical ham ability (as real hams, if I may), to take more and better high level technical exams. Forget high speed CW, but make high technology the mark of a real Ham....If not the goal...If not just the BASIS anmd PURPOSE of the whole hobby!

Hams need more license classes.

Bob Wex w2ilp (Insure License Potential)

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2575. Re: I heard a CB'er on 20 meters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-07 17:03:16 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <95rv4dmgh1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2826
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

>All this means the fcc going to
> be forced to do more enforcement to control these assholes and that
going to
> hurt all of us.
>
> I wish there were an organization in America that would work to
improve ham
> radio, licensing, and improve the level of expertise of its
operators.
>
>
Congratulations you figured it out....to continue.....more enforcement
that then forces the FCC to decide to terminate ham radio because it is
out of control.

Wonder how much money 75 meters will bring?

Dan/W4NTI

--
"Just tellin the truth, and they cain't stand it."

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2576. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-07 17:04:32 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <95rv6nmht1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2825

In article <3A816E72.291F04E4@IEEE.org>,
Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:

> What is wrong with live and let live?

Some life forms are undeserving consumers of oxygen and a waste
perfectly good DNA.

73, de Hans, K0HB

--
"We are fellow travelers on a journey between two
eternities, and it's a trip far too brief for me
to be concerned about your speed at the Code of
Morse."

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2577. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-07 17:05:07 UTC
From: Bob Wex w2ilp <w2ilp@juno.com>
Message-ID: <95rv7q$mi7$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2824

In article <95qhuo2cu2@enews3.newsguy.com>,
tlbryant@my-deja.com (T. L. Bryant) wrote:
> In article <95q8blqgl0@208.207.71.146>, dixie@townsqr.com says...
>
> >"T. L. Bryant" wrote:
> >>
> >> Ye Olde Fahrtz have been preaching the concept of a "real ham" for
years.
> >> Despite this narrow-mindedness, the class of license doesn't prove
whether
> or
> >not the holder of said license is a "real ham".
> >
Yep...
We have discussed Segal's "The Amateur's Code" here before. It does
not mention CW, BUT the spirit of it is to say that a real ham is
technically qualified to be: -
PROGRESSIVE...with knowledge abreast of science...

How are we proving that real hams must be "abreast of science" by
reducing technical requirements for Extra class. by eliminating
Advanced Class, and by not making ham technology compatible with modern
electronic communication technologies?

> > No, but it beats hell all out of any nocode qualification seen to
date.

Agreed.

> I just looked at the Amateur's Code inside the ARRL handbook. It
doesn't say a
> thing about code/nocode qualifications. I give the author, Paul M.
Segal,
> W9EEA, a lot more consideration than anything you could possibly come
up with
> for defining a "real ham".
>
Please read comment above about the Real Ham's Code, not Morse Code
that is.

Hams need MORE license classes.
Bob Wex w2ilp (Insure License Potential)

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2578. Re: Code Quick RULEZ!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-07 17:05:33 UTC
From: jason_hsu@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <95rv8kmjo1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2827
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

In article <3A745399.7299DD6C@IEEE.org>,
Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
<Code Quick probably works well at 5wpm. I could be wrong, but seems to me, it wouldn't work above about 15wpm and would actually limit one's maximum code speed.>

Actually, many of the Code Quick users reported passing the 13wpm and 20wpm Morse Code exams before last year's restructuring. Also, many of the satisfied Code Quick users include people who ran into roadblocks using more conventional methods.

I will personally try moving up to faster Morse Code speeds. Maybe CW will allow me to work the 80m band, as SSB seems to be heavily distorted and/or noise-infested.

--
Jason Hsu, AG4DG
jason_hsu@@@@@@@@@@planetmail.com
http://www.bigfoot.com/~jason_hsu/

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2579. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-07 17:16:22 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <95rvsr$n6u$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2829

In article <95rv7q$mi7$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
Bob Wex w2ilp <w2ilp@juno.com> wrote:

> How are we proving that real hams must be "abreast of science" by
> reducing technical requirements for Extra class.

Which "technical requirements for Extra class" have been reduced?

Answer: None.

If you can't debate the issues on facts, I suppose it's OK for
you to make up arguments to suit your agenda, but of course
you risk being exposed as an insubstantial pompous windbag.

Blow on, Robert.

73, de Hans, K0HB
--
"We are fellow travelers on a journey between two
eternities, and it's a trip far too brief for me
to be concerned about your speed at the Code of
Morse."

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2580. Re: Novice CW

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-07 17:42:30 UTC
From: K0HB@qwest.net
Message-ID: <95s1e6$p7o$1@news.netmar.com>
Source record: 2819

In article <95r97b$3ik$1@nnrp1.deja.com>, Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
writes:
>In article <ccn18tgigv2g406luirgp125otrsg2p7f1@4ax.com>,
> Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com> wrote:
>> Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com> wrote:
>> >Ergo, I'm fully capable of self-testing other emission types as well.
>>
>> How fast can you send RTTY with a bug... :-)
>>
>
>I smell a dung beetle.
>

It's feeding on your upper lip.

----- Posted via NewsOne.Net: Free (anonymous) Usenet News via the Web -----
http://newsone.net/ -- Free reading and anonymous posting to 60,000+ groups
NewsOne.Net prohibits users from posting spam. If this or other posts
made through NewsOne.Net violate posting guidelines, email abuse@newsone.net

2581. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-07 18:17:29 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A819139.8ECBFDC5@uci.edu>
Source record: 2831

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> In article <3A80BAA8.743A0DD6@uci.edu>, Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> writes:
>
> >
> >From looking over the question pools Larry, the scope of material is the
> >same as it was before restructuring. How would increasing the number of
> >steps on the ladder increase the height of the ladder? Are you
> >proposing an Extra Cum Laude or something? Is that something you need?
> >I know I certainly don't.
>
> Jim:
>
> If there were such a thing as an "Extra Cum Laude," then I'm the kind
> of person who would just go out and achieve it -- without whining about
> it.

Me too. But I just can't think of anything that would be gained by it -
other than being able to say 'I'm better than you are'. I know that's
the sort of thing that appeals to some people. I just don't think that
government needs to get into that kind of business. The FCC administers
radio spectrum, not academic programs.

> My question for you is -- what do you have against striving to
> achieve a lofty goal?

What indication do you have that I don't strive to achieve lofty goals,
Larry?
I just don't feel obliged to demand the same thing of others that I
demand for myself. I figure I've got a better shot at achieving my
goals if I spend less time worrying about the other guy, and more time
concentrating on my own situation. Furthermore, I don't need the
government telling me what I need to do in the way of self-improvement.
I'm sorry if you do.

73, Jim AC6XG

2582. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-07 18:22:09 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A819251.2B71B488@uci.edu>
Source record: 2833

Len Over 21 wrote:

> Jim Kelley apparently wants to smokescreen the whole thread
> by concentrating on certain phrases to "prove his point" (which
> was not really explained except in trying to provoke something
> about phrase choices. :-)

It's not a smokescreen to point out that what you said contradicted the facts you presented. I can't help it if you didn't say what you meant.

jim

2583. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-07 18:27:13 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A819381.B46CF6FB@uci.edu>
Source record: 2832

Brian wrote:
> In article <3A80B04C.9E9A93A0@uci.edu>,
> Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote:
> > Brian wrote:
> > > Perhaps "the pendulum is swinging,"

> > Same thing. Ever actually SEE a balance scale, Brian?

> Yes, on Miami Vice.

Well then, that'd make you quite the expert on such things.

> > > or the
> > > actuarial tables have been invoked.

> > Hmmmm, that's profound. How does one "invoke" a table?

> By dying on time.

The table says that some people die before they're 40, Brian. Would
that be timely enough for you? ;-)

2584. Re: I heard a CB'er on 20 meters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-07 18:32:29 UTC
From: dconti2@bellatlantic.net
Message-ID: <3a8193d3.8547214@news5.bellatlantic.net>
Source record: 2834
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner

>>
>>I wish there were an organization in America that would work to improve ham
>>radio, licensing, and improve the level of expertise of its operators.
>
>
>What, exactly, did this person do that was so stupid? Did he say "10-4" instead
>of "QSL"? There's nothing illegal about that, you know.
>
>...and did you do anything to try to steer them in the right direction, or does
>it just make you feel better if you make posts, bitching and moaning about the
>state of amateur radio?
>
Yes, and all of this being done ON A SCANNER NEWSGROUP!!!!!

2585. Re: Code Quick RULEZ!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-07 18:37:11 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A8195D7.9337C279@IEEE.org>
Source record: 2835
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

jason_hsu@my-deja.com wrote:
> Actually, many of the Code Quick users reported passing the 13wpm and
> 20wpm Morse Code exams before last year's restructuring.

If they can think something like 'Clunky Clunky' when they hear a 'C'
in a word at 20wpm, they think a lot faster than I. At 20wpm, I would
consider 'Clunky Clunky' to be extremely distracting and limiting.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2586. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-07 18:49:39 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A8198C3.D6C207DC@uci.edu>
Source record: 2836

Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > > What's wrong with the incentive of being able to work DX in the
> > > > lower 25 kHz?

> > > Why, when they can clog it up at 5wpm?

> > Now you're worried about too many CW ops?

> No one wants to trip over them and hurt them.

Then I guess that means you ARE worried about there being too many CW
ops.

Anybody got any ideas on how to cut down on the number of CW ops for
poor ol' Dick here?

ac6xg

2587. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-07 19:16:42 UTC
From: tlbryant@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <95s6uq01si5@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 2840

In article <3A8198C3.D6C207DC@uci.edu>, jwkelley@uci.edu says...
>
>Dick Carroll wrote:
>> > > > What's wrong with the incentive of being able to work DX in the
>> > > > lower 25 kHz?
>
>> > > Why, when they can clog it up at 5wpm?
>
>> > Now you're worried about too many CW ops?
>
>> No one wants to trip over them and hurt them.
>
>Then I guess that means you ARE worried about there being too many CW
>ops.
>
>Anybody got any ideas on how to cut down on the number of CW ops for
>poor ol' Dick here?
>
>ac6xg

All you have to do is wait. Judging from the ages of most CW ops, a lot of them will be silent keys within the next ten years.

2588. Re: ROTMFFLMMFAO!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-07 19:28:45 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <hnhg6.108$HH5.794056@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 2837

K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org> wrote:

> It's a Nokia, and OH2BH is a VP there. Brian is gonna be ticked!
> Klose and Stevenson, et. al. are gonna take 'em straight to the
> ITU and put a stop to this pro-code crap in the Cell Phone business.

I don't think they will have a problem with Morse code use in the Cellular Service. They would only raise objections if people had to be tested on Morse code decoding before they could use a Cell phone.

I thought I heard Morse code emmanating from a cell phone while I was stranded at the Pittsburg airport earlier this week. Nice to know it was not my imagination. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2589. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-07 19:35:55 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <_thg6.109$HH5.794616@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 2838

Len Over 21 <lenover21@aol.com> wrote:

> Code-tested licensees are DIMINISHING in number. The
> trend is there, visible to all except those who wear blinders
> of old-time CW radio.

> Non-code-tested licensees are INCREASING in number.

Tech+ licensees are being renewed as Tech. They are being counted as
"non-coded" in the stats you publish.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2590. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-07 19:42:06 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A81A50E.61D1598E@uci.edu>
Source record: 2839

Cecil wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > So you don't believe that radiotelegraphy is the most simple, easily
> > implemented means of radio communication yet devised?
>
> It may be but that's not a good reason to make it a governmental
> requirement. What is wrong with a free choice of modes in a hobby
> in a free country? What is wrong with live and let live?

I think that a 2 meter HT is the simplest form of amateur
communication. And, I think there's reason for code to be a part of
amateur testing.

> What is wrong with live and let live?

There's a few things wrong with it. Foremost being that it isn't
universally applicapble.

73, Jim AC6XG

2591. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-07 19:58:15 UTC
From: tlbryant@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <95s9cn02ttj@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 2845

In article <95ruck$lr2$1@nnrp1.deja.com>, w2ilp@juno.com says...
>
>In article <95q8blqgl0@208.207.71.146>,
> Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>>
>>
>> "T. L. Bryant" wrote:
>> >
>> > Ye Olde Fahrtz have been preaching the concept of a "real ham" for
>years.
>If present trends continue the only Hams left may be Olde Fartz.
>Even if there are one Megafartz of old hams what will that mean if
>there are no new young hams to replace them in the future???

I suppose the FCC will auction the spectrum off to the highest bidder.

>
>> > Despite this narrow-mindedness, the class of license doesn't prove
>whether or not the holder of said license is a "real ham".
>
>IMHO the narrow-mindered are those who only consider their own
>interests and could care less about the survival of Ham Radio.

Which, from my experience, is about 90% of all licensed amateurs.

>> No, but it beats hell all out of any nocode qualification seen to
>date.
>
>I have recently joined an e-mail group for QCWA members (or old farts
>as some might say). The QCWA and its chapter clubs are struggling with
>the problem of decreased active membership and not enough new members
>to replace the silent keys...just as most of the ham clubs, who are
>honest about it, are ready to admit. I would bet that the membership
>in most ARRL affiliated ham clubs is also decreasing or will soon be
>decreasing. Some QCWA leaders want to open up membership to all hams
>who have not yet met the 25 year requirement. This is not unlike the
>Ham leaders who have been continuing to press for simplified ham
>license requirements. The trouble is that such changes can only lead
>to further disinterest and active participation in ham radio by those
>whop have previously qualified. It also leads to a loss of
>PRIDE...even a loss of prestige for ham radio as a hobby. People who
>might be considering becoming hams can not be positively influenced to
>enter a hobby which can not retain the kind of pride it has had in the
>past.
>

>The USA and world cultures are changing. In the 1950s people thought
>that TV would take up so much of peoples' time that they wouldn't be
>active in clubs and hobbies. It didn't have as much of an effect as
>was feared on ham radio. BUT...today there are more options for people
>who are interested in using technology as a hobby. Unlike TV, but like
>Ham Radio, The Internet and cellular phones are interactive..That is,
>they are two way communication systems which offer the ability to make
>new friends and discuss stuff with individuals and with groups
>worldwide..and to get and give opinions and education about any matter
>that might be of interest, technical or not. Today's young techie
>nerds, hackers and gurus are as interested in computers as we must have
>been interested in Ham Radio. They think that Ham Radio is just for
>old farts. They might join a computer club to learn more about their
>opertating systems or to swap software...but they won't have any time
>left for a Ham Club.

What the hell do you expect? Ham radio has stagnated since influx of the computer era. Nothing was done to rise to the challange. The Ancient Radio Relay League insisted on keeping high-speed code testing as a measure of someone worthy to receive a license. Commercial networks upgraded to 2400, 9600, 28.8k, and 56k througout the 90s, while packet radio was stuck at a pitiful 1200 baud.

>My opinion is if you want ham radio to survive and to eventually
>interest more people you have to make it more technically educational;
>not easier to advance to "Extra" class. Ham Radio is far behind modern
>communication technology and must be advanced to the relative point
>where it was in 1950. To do this we need more higher level technical
>requirements for the higher level hams...although we still need easy
>entry requirements to help get youngsters started. This is in
>opposition to the present ARRL policy. The ARRL leaders can not seem
>to get it into their heads that to attract new members and to keep some
>present hams active...you have to give some PRIDE back to all Hams, by
>encouraging those who want to, and can qualify for advanced modern
>technical ham ability (as real hams, if I may), to take more and better
>high level technical exams. Forget high speed CW, but make high
>technology the mark of a real Ham....If not the goal...If not just the
>BASIS anmd PURPOSE of the whole hobby!
>
>Hams need more license classes.
>
>Bob Wex w2ilp (Insure License Potential)

For someone who wants to pursue a career in communication technology, ham radio might serve as a springboard for that career. Even so, the drive and ambition to achieve technical knowlege will be there without the need for more license classes. Ham radio isn't for everybody.

2592. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-07 20:01:52 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A81A9B0.24B1260B@uci.edu>
Source record: 2841

"T. L. Bryant" wrote:

> In article <3A8198C3.D6C207DC@uci.edu>, jwkelley@uci.edu says...
> >
> >Dick Carroll wrote:
> >> > > > What's wrong with the incentive of being able to work DX in the
> >> > > > lower 25 kHz?
> >
> >> > > Why, when they can clog it up at 5wpm?
> >
> >> > Now you're worried about too many CW ops?
> >
> >> No one wants to trip over them and hurt them.
> >
> >Then I guess that means you ARE worried about there being too many CW
> >ops.
> >
> >Anybody got any ideas on how to cut down on the number of CW ops for
> >poor ol' Dick here?

> All you have to do is wait. Judging from the ages of most CW ops, a lot of them
> will be silent keys within the next ten years.

That's nice, T.L. It was more of a rhetorical question. But I guess I
asked for it.

acxg

2593. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-07 20:35:31 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <95sbij$3ad$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2843

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:

> Code-tested licensees declined by 9,531 while non-code-tested
> licensees increased by 13,132

You cannot determine that from the statistics at AH0A.

Some of the "growth" of the Technican class license consists of
code-tested licensees.

Since the April restructuring of last year, all code-tested
Tech Plus who renew are being renewed as simply "Technician". Thus
the "Technician" column now contains roughly 10% (minus attrition
and upgrades) of licensees from the old "Technician Plus" ranks.

73, de Hans, K0HB
--
"We are fellow travelers on a journey between two
eternities, and it's a trip far too brief for me
to be concerned about your speed at the Code of
Morse."

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2594. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-07 20:38:55 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A81B25F.A3171BE0@IEEE.org>
Source record: 2842

Jim Kelley wrote:
> Anybody got any ideas on how to cut down on the number of CW ops for
> poor ol' Dick here?

Raise the Morse code requirement for the lower 25kHz to 100wpm?
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2595. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-07 20:45:01 UTC
From: "Steven J Robeson", K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <95sc4a$3rk$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2844

In article <3A819251.2B71B488@uci.edu>,
Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote:

>It's not a smokescreen to point out that what you said contradicted the
>facts you presented. I can't help it if you didn't say what you meant.

And we're surprised by this...WHY...?!?!

73

Steve, K4YZ
--
"It Could Be That Your Life's Only Meaning Is To Serve As A Warning To
Others Of How Bad It Could REALLY Be!"

PLEASE SEND PRIVATE E MAIL COMMENTS TO K4YZ@AOL.COM. RESPSONSES TO THE
DEJA MAY OR MAY NOT BE RETRIEVED IN A TIMELY FASHION.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2596. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-07 21:23:33 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A81BCD5.B30DC604@uci.edu>
Source record: 2846

Cecil wrote:

> Jim Kelley wrote:
> > Anybody got any ideas on how to cut down on the number of CW ops for
> > poor ol' Dick here?

> Raise the Morse code requirement for the lower 25kHz to 100wpm?

I knew you guys would come up with some great ideas. But I think that nothing short of a federally mandated 'no lids, no kids, no space cadets' requirement would satisfy the malcontents out here.

ac6xg

2597. Re: Nomination for Troll of the month. Re: West Virginia farm boy comes of age

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-07 21:25:32 UTC
From: KC8JBO <roger_kc8jbo@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <95sefv$69i$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2847
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.test

"Stagger Lee" <SLee@houston.net> wrote in message news:95sa1u$8v7
$0@pita.alt.net...
>
> On Wed, 07 Feb 2001 01:52:46 GMT, KC8JBO <roger_kc8jbo@my-deja.com>
wrote:
<post editing corrected>
> : Too bad he plagiarized it..
>
> What is "plaglarized"?

Bad post editing, Staggering Peebrain.....or is it your ignorance
showing as usual?
Poor college dropout after 1 1/2 semesters.......which is it, post-edit
or typo pounce?
You useless piece of shit....

pla*gia*rise (v.t., v.i.) to steal (the language, ideas, or thoughts)
from another, representing them as
one's own original work.

That clear it up for you, strichjunge?

> I tried sounding it out ("pee lag larry zed")

A method your Severe Learning Disabled class had to learn, no?

> but still couldn't make sense of it.

The things You couln't make sense out of could fill the Encyclopedia
Brittanica, Shitling.

> Is it something you guys do in the dark in Glendale, WV?

It's something we do to your WHORE momma, after she sucks and swallows
all of the trucker cum down at the interstate truck stop, fuckwit. Lee,
you're so fucking stupid, you try to pay for drive-thru tacos with a
fucking check and you call 411 to get the number for information.

> Gimme a hint.

When you die, you should have your brain donated to science. I hear
they're trying to come up with the perfect vacuum.Now, get back to your
Twinkie before it melts, tubshitter. And no puking tonight. You're only
damaging your stomach and giving yourself bad breath, bucktoothed CHOAD.

--
73 de Roger, KC8JBO
EM99 |ARRL|VE [ARRL & W5YI]|ARES |RACES
Yaesu FT-920 |Inverted Vee @ 40 ft.
Yaesu FT-90R

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2598. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-07 21:39:38 UTC
From: tlbryant@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <95sfaq08hl@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 2851

In article <3A81BCD5.B30DC604@uci.edu>, jwkelley@uci.edu says...
>
>Cecil wrote:
>
>> Jim Kelley wrote:
>> > Anybody got any ideas on how to cut down on the number of CW ops for
>> > poor ol' Dick here?
>
>> Raise the Morse code requirement for the lower 25kHz to 100wpm?
>
>I knew you guys would come up with some great ideas. But I think that
>nothing short of a federally mandated 'no lids, no kids, no space
>cadets' requirement would satisfy the malcontents out here.
>
>ac6xg

Their screams a going unheard. Technology has left them in the dust. The cliches have changed; the squeeky wheel doesn't get the grease anymore. It gets replaced.

2599. Re: I heard a CB'er on 20 meters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-07 21:46:46 UTC
From: Zombie Wolf <zmbwf@acadia.net>
Message-ID: <t83gklsrh99ca1@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 2848
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner

Havent operated on the old ham bands for a couple years now. I keep the license up to date, but there are just too many idiots on the air for it to be anywhere near enjoyable any more. don`t worry. the FCC is selling them off piece by piece anyway. Ham radio has had its day, and the ARRL and FCC let it go down the drain. It is now going to die a well - deserved death, and leave us all in peace. We still have the internet, and we can easily talk round the world on it. I stopped putting up with CB pond scum years ago, and since that is what the Ham Bands are on their way to becoming, I think it derserves equal attention .....

"smiley o'riley" <bummer-radio@licensing.org> wrote in message news:wouff.hong@goodRadio...
> And the son of a bitch had a restructured ham license. I'll bet the bastards
> an ARRL member too. Probably got in on the League discount membership plan.
> All this started me wondering, What make a ham a ham? Is a ham someone
> that's working to improve their knowledge of radio theory, electronics and
> operating skills?
>
> Or is a ham someone with a radio license who doesn't care to improve, who only
> wants to sit around and talk, act like a CB'er hurting others enjoyment of the
> service, and not learn anything?
>
> God help us, I'm hearing more and more of these stupid assholes on the bands
> everyday. They don't know anything either and ask alot of stupid questions
> that if they had been compelled to study the licensing manual alittle more
> thoroughly that know the answers to all their questions. But I guess the point
> of restructured licenses is to give some fucking idiot a piece of paper with a
> callsign on it and not require anything more, All this means the fcc going to
> be forced to do more enforcement to control these assholes and that going to
> hurt all of us.
>
> I wish there were an organization in America that would work to improve ham
> radio, licensing, and improve the level of expertise of its operators.

>
>

2600. Re: REAL POSTING AND THE FINAL WORD

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-07 21:50:01 UTC
From: "The REAL N8WWM", "not the trashy fake.", N8WWM@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <95sfu5$7k4$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2849
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

In article <94q9oi$a7n$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
fatandgayn8wwm@my-deja.com wrote:
> In article <94q8qm$9fh$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
> www.kp82.com <kp82@my-deja.com> wrote:
> > This is not true. N8WWM the poster is NOT N8WWM the person.
> > To prove this, I propose a test. At QRZ.com there is a page for every
> > member that you can put personal information on. The REAL N8WWM will
> > change the page by putting a new first sentence in. Go there now to see
> > the original page. I challenge the fake n8wwm@my-deja.com or
> > N8WWM@yahoo.com to do that. Of course it will be impossible. If you
> > email n8wwm@arrl.net, within 24 hours of 2200Zulu on 1-25-01, the REAL
> > N8WWM will send you the exact wording of what that first sentence will
> > be. AFTER 2200Z on 1-26-01 the this address right here will post the
> > sentence change in the profile on QRZ.
> > The ONLY valid address for N8WWM that has his callsign in it is
> > N8WWM@arrl.net. The FAKE N8WWM can't change that.
> >
> > In article <94q7os$8e0$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
> > N8WWM@yahoo.com wrote:
> > > In article <94q46d$4tb$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
> > > www.kp82.com <kp82@my-deja.com> wrote:
> > > > N8WWM does post to newsgroups, but is not identified by his name or
> > > > callsign in his email address.
> > > > The individual posting to newsgroups as N8WWM is not him.
> > > >
> > > > Just so you know.
> > > >
> > > > Sent via Deja.com
> > > > http://www.deja.com/
> > > >
> > >
> > > www.kp82.com does not know enough about N8WWM to make this claim. He
> > just
> > > began posting to newsgroups and is not identified by a email address
> > or name.
> > > He has mistakenly been identified several times as me. While we share
> > some
> > > views, I have always posted under my call because I have nothing to
> > hide,
> > > unlike you ILLEGAL FAGGOT KEYCLOWNS! Insist on the original.
> > >
> > > Sent via Deja.com
> > > http://www.deja.com/

> > >
> >
> > --
> > http://members.theglobe.com/keyclownzsuk/EXP_SITE_PERSONAL_2/
> > http://www.geocities.com/antikeyclown/1mangayboy_and_NeboDweeb.html
> > http://www.geocities.com/aunteekeyklown/Keyclown_wedding.html
> > http://humor.easynews.com/
> > http://www.geocities.com/keyclownslappa/dweebrain.jpg
> >
> > Sent via Deja.com
> > http://www.deja.com/
> >
>
> No longer neccessary doug. I concede. I made my point. Just had to show
> someone in here that doubted who you were. Had to prove it. I'm gone!
>
> Sent via Deja.com
> http://www.deja.com/
>

I proved you were a phony before. This confirms it. The ILLEGAL FAGGOT KEYCLOWNS from rec.radio.cb have gotten me booted from several isps. All because I retaliate to their childish ways. Its ok for them to threaten me with physical harm, but if I say anything back they make me look like the bad guy, even some hams have sided with these criminals. I have no use for criminals. Check out my webpages of the ILLEGAL FAGGOT KEYCLOWNS. I will not stop and you can't do shit about it!

The REAL N8WWM., not the trashy fake!

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2601. Re: I heard a CB'er on 20 meters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-07 22:13:54 UTC
From: tlbryant@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <95shb202gvr@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 2860
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner

In article <t83gklsrh99ca1@corp.supernews.com>, zmbwf@acadia.net says...
>
>Havent operated on the old ham bands for a couple years now. I keep the
>license up to date, but there are just too many idiots on the air for it to
>be anywhere near enjoyable any more. don`t worry. the FCC is selling them
>off piece by piece anyway. Ham radio has had its day, and the ARRL and FCC
>let it go down the drain. It is now going to die a well - deserved death,
>and leave us all in peace. We still have the internet, and we can easily
>talk round the world on it. I stopped putting up with CB pond scum years
>ago, and since that is what the Ham Bands are on their way to becoming, I
>think it derserves equal attention .....

The downslide began well before the current license testing scheme was put into effect. If the bands are sold off, so be it. I'll take my entire share of the profits of such a sale down to the corner Starbucks and by myself tall caramel macchiato.

2602. Re: I heard a CB'er on 20 meters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-07 22:15:29 UTC
From: vlfiscus@mcn.net
Message-ID: <t83i81rnkk7537@news.supernews.com>
Source record: 2850
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

brianburke@my-deja.com (Brian) wrote in <95q3q8$5pm$1@nnrp1.deja.com>:

>I guess what makes a ham a real ham is the ability to pass judgement on
>whether others have a right to be a ham. The organization that you're
>looking for is the ARRL.
>

NOT! The ARRL gave up helping ham radio and improving things about two years ago. From what I see they're not planning to propose making things better in the future either. ARRL stratagy is like Outcome Based education, they don't want quality, only quantity.

KB7ADL

2603. A feeble attempt to be intelligent by a CB clown

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-07 22:23:55 UTC
From: twistedhed@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <95shtg$9mq$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2853
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

This poster is timnebo@aol.com, not N8WWM.

In article <95sfu5$7k4$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
The REAL N8WWM, not the trashy fake., <N8WWM@yahoo.com> wrote:
> In article <94q9oi$a7n$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
> fatandgayn8wwm@my-deja.com wrote:
> > In article <94q8qm$9fh$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
> > www.kp82.com <kp82@my-deja.com> wrote:
> > > This is not true. N8WWM the poster is NOT N8WWM the person.
> > > To prove this, I propose a test. At QRZ.com there is a page for
every
> > > member that you can put personal information on. The REAL N8WWM
will
> > > change the page by putting a new first sentence in. Go there now
to see
> > > the original page. I challenge the fake n8wwm@my-deja.com or
> > > N8WWM@yahoo.com to do that. Of course it will be impossible. If
you
> > > email n8wwm@arrl.net, within 24 hours of 2200Zulu on 1-25-01, the
REAL
> > > N8WWM will send you the exact wording of what that first sentence
will
> > > be. AFTER 2200Z on 1-26-01 the this address right here will post
the
> > > sentence change in the profile on QRZ.
> > > The ONLY valid address for N8WWM that has his callsign in it is
> > > N8WWM@arrl.net. The FAKE N8WWM can't change that.
> > >
> > > In article <94q7os$8e0$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
> > > N8WWM@yahoo.com wrote:
> > > > In article <94q46d$4tb$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
> > > > www.kp82.com <kp82@my-deja.com> wrote:
> > > > > N8WWM does post to newsgroups, but is not identified by his
name or
> > > > > callsign in his email address.
> > > > > The individual posting to newsgroups as N8WWM is not him.
> > > > >
> > > > > Just so you know.
> > > > >
> > > > > Sent via Deja.com
> > > > > http://www.deja.com/
> > > > >
> > > >

> > > > www.kp82.com does not know enough about N8WWM to make this
claim. He
> > > just
> > > > began posting to newsgroups and is not identified by a email
address
> > > or name.
> > > > He has mistakenly been identified several times as me. While we
share
> > > some
> > > > views, I have always posted under my call because I have
nothing to
> > > hide,
> > > > unlike you ILLEGAL FAGGOT KEYCLOWNS! Insist on the original.
> > > >
> > > > Sent via Deja.com
> > > > http://www.deja.com/
> > > >
> > >
> > > --
> > > http://members.theglobe.com/keyclownzsuk/EXP_SITE_PERSONAL_2/
> > >
http://www.geocities.com/antikeyclown/1mangayboy_and_NeboDweeb.html
> > > http://www.geocities.com/aunteekeyklown/Keyclown_wedding.html
> > > http://humor.easynews.com/
> > > http://www.geocities.com/keyclownslappa/dweebrain.jpg
> > >
> > > Sent via Deja.com
> > > http://www.deja.com/
> > >
> >
> > No longer neccessary doug. I concede. I made my point. Just had to
show
> > someone in here that doubted who you were. Had to prove it. I'm
gone!
> >
> > Sent via Deja.com
> > http://www.deja.com/
> >
>
> I proved you were a phony before. This confirms it. The ILLEGAL FAGGOT
> KEYCLOWNS from rec.radio.cb have gotten me booted from several isps.
All
> because I retaliate to their childish ways. Its ok for them to
threaten me
> with physical harm, but if I say anything back they make me look like
the bad
> guy, even some hams have sided with these criminals. I have no use for
> criminals. Check out my webpages of the ILLEGAL FAGGOT KEYCLOWNS. I
will not
> stop and you can't do shit about it!

>
> The REAL N8WWM., not the trashy fake!
>
> Sent via Deja.com
> http://www.deja.com/
>

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2604. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-07 22:28:00 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <95si5g$6m4$0@208.206.142.95>
Source record: 2852

"T. L. Bryant" wrote:
>
> In article <95rqn5$6u2$1@208.206.142.109>, dixie@townsqr.com says...
> >
> >
> >
> >"T. L. Bryant" wrote:
> >>
> >> In article <95q4t7slt0@208.207.71.146>, dixie@townsqr.com says...
> >>
> >>
> >> >> This already was done back in the sixties with the "incentive licensing"
> >> plan.
> >> >> All it did was piss off a lot of hams who lost priveleges because of it.
> >> >
> >> >
> >> > Son, you might have a bit of credibility if you'd make your statements
> >> >about that which you actually know something about.
> >>
> >> Don't be so ambiguous. Either prove me wrong or shut up.
> >
> >
> > That sure won't be hard to do: I am living evidence that you have no
> >clue as to what you're talking abouit.
>
> Let me get this straight: Are you saying that just because you are happy,
> content, and all hunky-dorey, that there were not other hams who were vehement
> about losing priveleges to so-called incentive licensing? If this is the case,
> then you need a serious reality check.

Lets get **THIS** straight - You said "All it (incentive licensing did
was piss off a lot of hams who lost privileges because of it".
I was a ham who lost privileges because of it. Rather than let it piss
me off, I, a mail order General class ham, shortly made the 260
miles-one-way trip to the FCC office and came away with an Extra class.
Just as many, many other hams did.
So, Pal, you don't know what you're talking about. And that surprises
no one.

2605. A feeble attempt to be intelligent by a CB clown

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-07 22:35:23 UTC
From: twistedhed@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <95sijbabi1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2858
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

This poster is timnebo@aol.com, not N8WWM.

In article <95sfu5$7k4$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
The REAL N8WWM, not the trashy fake., <N8WWM@yahoo.com> wrote:
> In article <94q9oi$a7n$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
> fatandgayn8wwm@my-deja.com wrote:
> > In article <94q8qm$9fh$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
> > www.kp82.com <kp82@my-deja.com> wrote:
> > > This is not true. N8WWM the poster is NOT N8WWM the person.
> > > To prove this, I propose a test. At QRZ.com there is a page for
every
> > > member that you can put personal information on. The REAL N8WWM
will
> > > change the page by putting a new first sentence in. Go there now
to see
> > > the original page. I challenge the fake n8wwm@my-deja.com or
> > > N8WWM@yahoo.com to do that. Of course it will be impossible. If
you
> > > email n8wwm@arrl.net, within 24 hours of 2200Zulu on 1-25-01, the
REAL
> > > N8WWM will send you the exact wording of what that first sentence
will
> > > be. AFTER 2200Z on 1-26-01 the this address right here will post
the
> > > sentence change in the profile on QRZ.
> > > The ONLY valid address for N8WWM that has his callsign in it is
> > > N8WWM@arrl.net. The FAKE N8WWM can't change that.
> > >
> > > In article <94q7os$8e0$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
> > > N8WWM@yahoo.com wrote:
> > > > In article <94q46d$4tb$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
> > > > www.kp82.com <kp82@my-deja.com> wrote:
> > > > > N8WWM does post to newsgroups, but is not identified by his
name or
> > > > > callsign in his email address.
> > > > > The individual posting to newsgroups as N8WWM is not him.
> > > > >
> > > > > Just so you know.
> > > > >
> > > > > Sent via Deja.com
> > > > > http://www.deja.com/
> > > > >
> > > >

> > > > www.kp82.com does not know enough about N8WWM to make this
claim. He
> > > just
> > > > began posting to newsgroups and is not identified by a email
address
> > > or name.
> > > > He has mistakenly been identified several times as me. While we
share
> > > some
> > > > views, I have always posted under my call because I have
nothing to
> > > hide,
> > > > unlike you ILLEGAL FAGGOT KEYCLOWNS! Insist on the original.
> > > >
> > > > Sent via Deja.com
> > > > http://www.deja.com/
> > > >
> > >
> > > --
> > > http://members.theglobe.com/keyclownzsuk/EXP_SITE_PERSONAL_2/
> > >
http://www.geocities.com/antikeyclown/1mangayboy_and_NeboDweeb.html
> > > http://www.geocities.com/aunteekeyklown/Keyclown_wedding.html
> > > http://humor.easynews.com/
> > > http://www.geocities.com/keyclownslappa/dweebrain.jpg
> > >
> > > Sent via Deja.com
> > > http://www.deja.com/
> > >
> >
> > No longer neccessary doug. I concede. I made my point. Just had to
show
> > someone in here that doubted who you were. Had to prove it. I'm
gone!
> >
> > Sent via Deja.com
> > http://www.deja.com/
> >
>
> I proved you were a phony before. This confirms it. The ILLEGAL FAGGOT
> KEYCLOWNS from rec.radio.cb have gotten me booted from several isps.
All
> because I retaliate to their childish ways. Its ok for them to
threaten me
> with physical harm, but if I say anything back they make me look like
the bad
> guy, even some hams have sided with these criminals. I have no use for
> criminals. Check out my webpages of the ILLEGAL FAGGOT KEYCLOWNS. I
will not
> stop and you can't do shit about it!

>
> The REAL N8WWM., not the trashy fake!
>
> Sent via Deja.com
> http://www.deja.com/
>

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2606. A feeble attempt to be intelligent by a CB clown

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-07 22:35:50 UTC
From: twistedhed@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <95sik6$ac1$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2859

This poster is timnebo@aol.com, not N8WWM.

In article <95sfu5$7k4$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
The REAL N8WWM, not the trashy fake., <N8WWM@yahoo.com> wrote:
> In article <94q9oi$a7n$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
> fatandgayn8wwm@my-deja.com wrote:
> > In article <94q8qm$9fh$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
> > www.kp82.com <kp82@my-deja.com> wrote:
> > > This is not true. N8WWM the poster is NOT N8WWM the person.
> > > To prove this, I propose a test. At QRZ.com there is a page for
every
> > > member that you can put personal information on. The REAL N8WWM
will
> > > change the page by putting a new first sentence in. Go there now
to see
> > > the original page. I challenge the fake n8wwm@my-deja.com or
> > > N8WWM@yahoo.com to do that. Of course it will be impossible. If
you
> > > email n8wwm@arrl.net, within 24 hours of 2200Zulu on 1-25-01, the
REAL
> > > N8WWM will send you the exact wording of what that first sentence
will
> > > be. AFTER 2200Z on 1-26-01 the this address right here will post
the
> > > sentence change in the profile on QRZ.
> > > The ONLY valid address for N8WWM that has his callsign in it is
> > > N8WWM@arrl.net. The FAKE N8WWM can't change that.
> > >
> > > In article <94q7os$8e0$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
> > > N8WWM@yahoo.com wrote:
> > > > In article <94q46d$4tb$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
> > > > www.kp82.com <kp82@my-deja.com> wrote:
> > > > > N8WWM does post to newsgroups, but is not identified by his
name or
> > > > > callsign in his email address.
> > > > > The individual posting to newsgroups as N8WWM is not him.
> > > > >
> > > > > Just so you know.
> > > > >
> > > > > Sent via Deja.com
> > > > > http://www.deja.com/
> > > > >
> > > >
> > > > www.kp82.com does not know enough about N8WWM to make this

claim. He
> > > just
> > > > began posting to newsgroups and is not identified by a email
address
> > > or name.
> > > > He has mistakenly been identified several times as me. While we
share
> > > some
> > > > views, I have always posted under my call because I have
nothing to
> > > hide,
> > > > unlike you ILLEGAL FAGGOT KEYCLOWNS! Insist on the original.
> > > >
> > > > Sent via Deja.com
> > > > http://www.deja.com/
> > > >
> > >
> > > --
> > > http://members.theglobe.com/keyclownzsuk/EXP_SITE_PERSONAL_2/
> > >
http://www.geocities.com/antikeyclown/1mangayboy_and_NeboDweeb.html
> > > http://www.geocities.com/aunteekeyklown/Keyclown_wedding.html
> > > http://humor.easynews.com/
> > > http://www.geocities.com/keyclownslappa/dweebrain.jpg
> > >
> > > Sent via Deja.com
> > > http://www.deja.com/
> > >
> >
> > No longer neccessary doug. I concede. I made my point. Just had to
show
> > someone in here that doubted who you were. Had to prove it. I'm
gone!
> >
> > Sent via Deja.com
> > http://www.deja.com/
> >
>
> I proved you were a phony before. This confirms it. The ILLEGAL FAGGOT
> KEYCLOWNS from rec.radio.cb have gotten me booted from several isps.
All
> because I retaliate to their childish ways. Its ok for them to
threaten me
> with physical harm, but if I say anything back they make me look like
the bad
> guy, even some hams have sided with these criminals. I have no use for
> criminals. Check out my webpages of the ILLEGAL FAGGOT KEYCLOWNS. I
will not
> stop and you can't do shit about it!
>

> The REAL N8WWM., not the trashy fake!
>
> Sent via Deja.com
> http://www.deja.com/
>

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2607. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-07 22:38:37 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A81CE6D.89829ADB@uci.edu>
Source record: 2855

"T. L. Bryant" wrote:
> Their screams a going unheard. Technology has left them in the dust. The
> cliches have changed; the squeeky wheel doesn't get the grease anymore. It gets
> replaced.

And now we've got folks who couldn't fix a squeeky wheel if their life
depended on it.

2608. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-07 22:39:44 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <95sirg$8co$0@208.206.142.95>
Source record: 2854

"T. L. Bryant" wrote:
>
> In article <3A8198C3.D6C207DC@uci.edu>, jwkelley@uci.edu says...
> >
> >Dick Carroll wrote:
> >> > > > What's wrong with the incentive of being able to work DX in the
> >> > > > lower 25 kHz?
> >
> >> > > Why, when they can clog it up at 5wpm?
> >
> >> > Now you're worried about too many CW ops?
> >
> >> No one wants to trip over them and hurt them.
> >
> >Then I guess that means you ARE worried about there being too many CW
> >ops.
> >
> >Anybody got any ideas on how to cut down on the number of CW ops for
> >poor ol' Dick here?
> >
> >ac6xg
>
> All you have to do is wait. Judging from the ages of most CW ops, a lot of them
> will be silent keys within the next ten years.

Well you can always wish. There is more and more CW activity as time
goes by, instead of less. If you were interested enough to listen you'd
know that. And lots of young people on CW as well. Yesterday I worked a
24year old CW op who had been licensed since age 13. His calsign suffix
was even "CW".
I know, that goes against your wishes but that's surely not the only
thing that goes against your wishes. Wishing just won't make it come
true. Sorry.

2609. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-07 22:44:41 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <95sj4p$8co$1@208.206.142.95>
Source record: 2856

Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> Cecil wrote:
>
> > Jim Kelley wrote:
> > > Anybody got any ideas on how to cut down on the number of CW ops for
> > > poor ol' Dick here?
>
> > Raise the Morse code requirement for the lower 25kHz to 100wpm?
>
> I knew you guys would come up with some great ideas. But I think that
> nothing short of a federally mandated 'no lids, no kids, no space
> cadets' requirement would satisfy the malcontents out here.
>

You couldn't be more wrong, and it is really curious how you managed to
come to that conclusion. There's littlein ham radio I enjoy more than a
CW QSO with a young ham, and his code speed is not an issueat all.

2610. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-07 22:47:09 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <95sj9d$8co$2@208.206.142.95>
Source record: 2857

"T. L. Bryant" wrote:
>
> In article <3A81BCD5.B30DC604@uci.edu>, jwkelley@uci.edu says...
> >
> >Cecil wrote:
> >
> >> Jim Kelley wrote:
> >> > Anybody got any ideas on how to cut down on the number of CW ops for
> >> > poor ol' Dick here?
> >
> >> Raise the Morse code requirement for the lower 25kHz to 100wpm?
> >
> >I knew you guys would come up with some great ideas. But I think that
> >nothing short of a federally mandated 'no lids, no kids, no space
> >cadets' requirement would satisfy the malcontents out here.
> >
> >ac6xg
>
> Their screams a going unheard. Technology has left them in the dust. The
> cliches have changed; the squeeky wheel doesn't get the grease anymore. It gets
> replaced.

It's plain as day- you have no clue. You haven't had even a receiver on
the ham bands lately, if ever.

2611. Re: QCWA TELLS FCC TO END INCENTIVE LICENSING

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-07 22:51:32 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <wlkg6.114$HH5.811627@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 2861

Bob Wex w2ilp <w2ilp@juno.com> wrote:
> Some of the "experts" who talk about what are considered RF hazard
> levels are no more scientific than old grandmothers who think that
> chicken soup will cure any illness.

I know most of the members of the IEEE SCC-28, Bob; their expertise is much less like chicken soup than some of the posts in this thread, yours and mine included.

I do not believe that you are qualified to pass judgement on their expertise, nor do I believe that you know anything about their expertise than what your imagination tells you might be true.

<chicken soup analysis deleted>

> I admit that I dunno at this point in time... nor does N9GL. Let us
> leave it at that.

Can you tell us what you believe to be lacking in N9GL's CV that makes you conclude that he is not qualified to make the statements that you "dunno?" If it helps, see:

http://www.arrl.org/rfsafety/index.html
http://www.arrl.org/rfsafety/whoweare.html

and for Mr Lapin personally, see:

http://www.arrl.org/rfsafety/n9gl_cv.html

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2612. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-07 23:01:04 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <rukg6.115$HH5.812522@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 2863

Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

> > I'm telling you, Dick, if you don't learn DSP techniques, you are going
> > to be a technically obsolete/ignorant ham in the not too distant future.
> > All filtering and detection functions will soon be done with DSP.

> ***NO***!!! Maybe *most* newly manufactured SSB and some other gear
> will incorporate DSP functions. Not homebrew nor kitted gear which is
> becoming so popular with so many hams these days. Your statement is
> simply untrue. Stop trying to remake the ARS to your own personal
> specifications.

Cecil is not the one remaking technology, Dick; the technological world is evolving. IMHO, the very survival of our Service could depend on the number of hams who learn enough about new technology to stay relevant. Our survival may also depend on the number of hams who say "***NO***!!!" to learning that new technology, too.

Riley Hollingsworth has been telling hams that we should not let Amateur Radio become obsolete under our watch. What do you think he means by that and why do you think he is saying that to his fellow hams?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2613. Re: I heard a CB'er on 20 meters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-07 23:01:46 UTC
From: h <not@aol.com>
Message-ID: <t83kpq1pc5fc25@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 2862
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner

If he had a license he is a HAM not a CB'er
Frankly Freebanders are like the Hams of old. If you look at the FCC
enforcement logs The Hams are out of control and need enforcement while
Freebanders are mature and working to improver thier knowledge, save lives,
promote freedom and democracy, and gernerally aid and improve the geneneral
welfare or thier comunities.

--
Sincerely,
Ken
pwrguy@intergrafix.net
"smiley o'riley" <bummer-radio@licensing.org> wrote in message
news:wouff.hong@goodRadio...
> And the son of a bitch had a restructured ham license. I'll bet the
bastards
> an ARRL member too. Probably got in on the League discount membership
plan.
> All this started me wondering, What make a ham a ham? Is a ham someone
> that's working to improve their knowledge of radio theory, electronics and
> operating skills?
>
> Or is a ham someone with a radio license who doesn't care to improve, who
only
> wants to sit around and talk, act like a CB'er hurting others enjoyment of
the
> service, and not learn anything?
>
> God help us, I'm hearing more and more of these stupid assholes on the
bands
> everyday. They don't know anything either and ask alot of stupid questions
> that if they had been compelled to study the licensing manual alittle more
> thoroughly that know the answers to all their questions. But I guess the
point
> of restructured licenses is to give some fucking idiot a piece of paper
with a
> callsign on it and not require anything more, All this means the fcc
going to
> be forced to do more enforcement to control these assholes and that going
to
> hurt all of us.
>
> I wish there were an organization in America that would work to improve
ham

> radio, licensing, and improve the level of expertise of its operators.
>
>

2614. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-07 23:03:08 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <owkg6.116$HH5.812768@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 2864

Larry Roll K3LT <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote:

> Well, then, when the "noise floor" reaches the ceiling, I hope you enjoy
> the challenge of operating CW among all those high-powered, over-
> compressed, over processed phone signals!

Doesn't CW get through when nothing else will? ;-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2615. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-07 23:04:13 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <vxkg6.117$HH5.812673@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 2865

Larry Roll K3LT <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote:

> >- . -. ..-. --- ..- .-. --. ..- -.. -... ..- -.. -.. -.--

> Since I never served in the Navy, and have always used the Morse/CW
> in its aural form, you're gonna have to send this as a .WAV file so I
> can copy it properly.

Are you really saying that you can't piece that together? :-)

73.
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2616. Re: I heard a CB'er on 20 meters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-07 23:06:33 UTC
From: t glenn <ab7rs@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <95skdi$c1c$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2867
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

In article <95q3q8$5pm$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com> wrote:
> >
> > I wish there were an organization in America that would work to
> improve ham
> > radio, licensing, and improve the level of expertise of its
> operators.

The organization that you're looking for is the ARRL.
>

The ARRL is the problem...not the solution.--
AB7RS,Tracy

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2617. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-07 23:14:15 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <PGkg6.118$HH5.813653@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 2866

Bob Wex w2ilp <w2ilp@juno.com> wrote:

>> I don't find myself feeling limited by the number of
>> license classes in the ARS.

> Maybe that is because YOU are not meeting the Basis and Purpose of Ham
> Radio yourself.

I have not been limited by the number of license classes in the ARS; the things I have done within Amateur Radio have exceeded the scope of any exam I have ever taken. Do you believe that I am not meeting the basis and purpose of ham radio?

> > You want that type of license=respect, then get a college
> > degree or a tech school certificate.

> I have a BSEE...but when I did not have a BSEE my ham license meant
> more to some employers than a BSEE because I had been able to show that
> as a Ham I had been able to build my own equipment from scratch.

I would hold a ham who had a demonstrated ability to construct his or her own equipment over a BSEE for most electronics technician jobs. I would hold an experienced electronics technician over such a ham, though.

Are you now proposing that hams be tested on their ability to build their own equipment from scratch?

> <snip> My answer is by drastically changing their attitudes.

> past)...BUT let it not be too late to attract new hams into our ranks
> by offering more modern challenging exams that can not only give more
> pride but can prove more value.

If the unlimited challenges of being permitted to do all the things you feel hams "must" be tested for is not enough, you vision of chaning the attitudes of all these potential newcomers is just a pipe dream.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2618. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-07 23:20:19 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <wMkg6.119$HH5.814125@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 2868

<K0HB@qwest.net> wrote:

> The amateur community begged for an allocation for high speed digital
> interconnect circuits. ARRL lobbied FCC and won a new allocation at
> 219-220 MHz, reserved solely for high speed digital backbone circuits.

> It is virtually unused!

Part of the reason, Hans, is that amateur stations within 80 km of an AMTS station cannot operate without the express permission of the AMTS station. Some have been willing to grant such permission; others routinely deny it. With major holes in what was hoped would be reasonably seamless backbones, it is a chicken-egg situation.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2619. Re: ARRL HQ "Attitude" (Was: Re: Pride)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-07 23:28:59 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <DUkg6.120$HH5.814810@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 2869

Larry Roll K3LT <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote:

> What I write in this newsgroup is not the way I treat people in
> person; and I've never made any claim that there was any such
> connection.

Do you not see that there is a person connected to the other end of the things you say here, Larry? I have seen you make plenty of statements that were very clearly personally directed.

> With the notable exceptions of Steve Mendelsohn and Ed Hare,
> virtually every ARRL HQ staffer I've come into personal
> contact with has treated me like something that they found
> on the bottom of their shoe -- and I've heard plenty of
> anecdotal evidence proving that my experience isn't
> unique.

ARRL HQ has a staff of about 120 people. Mendelsohn is not an HQ staffer, btw; your dealings with him have been in his role as a volunteer. What percentage of those 120 people who work at HQ have you actually has personal contact with?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2620. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-07 23:32:06 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <zXkg6.121$HH5.814949@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 2870

Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

> When the Extras of today are commonly licensed with no more technical
> nor code qualifications than Novices of old, and nothing has changed but
> some vaporous "artificial pecking order"??

The Novice test I took had no questions on antennas, propagation, feed lines, tubes,... well, the list goes on for quite a bit.

If you are saying that a test that requires an applicant to study over 1200 questions is not as "qualifying" as that dirt-simple Novice test I took, you are incorrect.

> You know the appropriate descriptive word - and it isn't bullfeathers.

I will simply use the word incorrect and let it go at that.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2621. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-07 23:34:55 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <c_kg6.122$HH5.815207@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 2871

Larry Roll K3LT <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote:

> Hmmm. Just what *are* the "contributions" of these newly
> licensed hams you're talking about? Specifics, please -- include
> any relevant documentation -- news articles, media releases,
> etc.

I was first licensed in 1963. My first QST article was, if memory serves,
in 1987. I sure am glad I didn't have some old timer telling me how
worthless I was all those years.

73,
Ed Hare,W 1RFI

2622. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-07 23:42:23 UTC
From: billsohl@mindspring.com
Message-ID: <3a81dc24.7871681@news.mindspring.com>
Source record: 2872

On 7 Feb 2001 15:39:21 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

>Cecil wrote:
>>
>> Dick Carroll wrote:
>> > Of course not, many of my friends are nocode techs. But would you allow
>> > a loved one to die rather than use CW for a relief message?
>>
>> Of course not but I'm not saying that coded hams are unqualified. You
>> are saying that nocode hams are unqualified. If they are so unqualified,
>> why would you allow them to save your wife's life?
>>
>> > When I say that radiotelegraphy is the most basic, simple, easily
>> > implemented radio communications mode yet devised? How is that?
>>
>> You went a lot farther than that, Dick. You said they were unqualified
>> at basic radio communications. 2m FM *IS* basic radio communications.
>> You contradict yourself.
>>
>
> Not in the least, Pal. Radiotelegraphy IS the basic radiocommunications
>mode, whether ham radio or whatever else. No other mode can be put to
>use with so little equipment requrements. ANY RF generator can be on-off
>keyed to form Morse characters. No other mode can do that. NONE.

Yet, in spie of that fundamental "basicness", that great simplicity,
no one in the commercial sector puts ANY value o its use in an
emergency. Indeed, it has been abondoned by just about all
except some ham use for enjoyment.

>Any ham
>radio operator who is unable to make it work simply because he was to
>uninformed to cause himself to learn to be able to use it is thus
>unqualified by definition, as you are so fond of saying.

In your not so humble opinion perhaps, but other than
yourself and a handful of others that think like you, there
is no one saying a non-code ham is thus unqualified. Point
us to even ONE credible proponent, other than some hams,
of CW as an emergency mode.

> 2meter FM is basic radio communication? On what planet?

Given the ease and common place existence of a
preponderance of 2m FM, it is, indeed a basic mode today.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2623. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-07 23:44:33 UTC
From: tlbryant@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <95sml10ion@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 2879

In article <95si5g$6m4$0@208.206.142.95>, dixie@townsqr.com says...

> Lets get **THIS** straight - You said "All it (incentive licensing did
>was piss off a lot of hams who lost privileges because of it".
> I was a ham who lost privileges because of it. Rather than let it piss
>me off, I, a mail order General class ham, shortly made the 260
>miles-one-way trip to the FCC office and came away with an Extra class.

...uphill, both ways, through six feet of snow, yadda yadda...

Did I say it pissed off *all* the hams that lost privileges? No. But it did piss off a lot. I can't speak for the sheeple, such as yourself, that go along with whatever the ARRL says and does.

2624. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-07 23:48:34 UTC
From: tlbryant@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <95smsi1ion@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 2887

In article <95sirg$8co$0@208.206.142.95>, dixie@townsqr.com says...
>> All you have to do is wait. Judging from the ages of most CW ops, a lot of
the
>m
>> will be silent keys within the next ten years.
>
> Well you can always wish. There is more and more CW activity as time
>goes by, instead of less. If you were interested enough to listen you'd
>know that. And lots of young people on CW as well. Yesterday I worked a
>24year old CW op who had been licensed since age 13. His calsign suffix
>was even "CW".
> I know, that goes against your wishes but that's surely not the only
>thing that goes against your wishes. Wishing just won't make it come
>true. Sorry.

Would you mind filling me in as to what it is I wished for? I made an
observation. I don't recall making any wishes.

2625. Re: I heard a CB'er on 20 meters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-07 23:56:37 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <95snbhelm1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2873
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <t83i81rnkk7537@news.supernews.com>,
vlfiscus@mcn.net (Vince Fiscus, KB7ADL) wrote:
> brianburke@my-deja.com (Brian) wrote in <95q3q8$5pm$1@nnrp1.deja.com>:
>
> >I guess what makes a ham a real ham is the ability to pass judgement
on
> >whether others have a right to be a ham. The organization that
you're
> >looking for is the ARRL.
> >
>
> NOT! The ARRL gave up helping ham radio and improving things about two
> years ago. From what I see they're not planning to propose making
things
> better in the future either. ARRL stratagy is like Outcome Based
> education, they don't want quality, only quantity.
>
> KB7ADL

Vince, be pragmatic. If it means the survival of the ARS, then we do
the quantity thing, and let Riley handle the guys that think they own
the ARS. If there's not a real breakthrough on the actuarial tables
soon, the ARS is in trouble.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2626. Re: I heard a CB'er on 20 meters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 00:01:08 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <95snk0epo1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2874
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

In article <95skdi$c1c$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
t glenn <ab7rs@arrl.net> wrote:
> In article <95q3q8$5pm$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
> Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com> wrote:
> > >
> > > I wish there were an organization in America that would work to
> > improve ham
> > > radio, licensing, and improve the level of expertise of its
> > operators.
>
> The organization that you're looking for is the ARRL.
> >
>
> The ARRL is the problem...not the solution.--
> AB7RS,Tracy

Tracy, pretend for a moment that I know nothing of the ARRL and the ARS.
Now explain your position WRT the ARRL, and identify the organization
that you believe to be the solution, and state why.

Thanks, Brian

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2627. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 00:11:25 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A81E42D.C02FF8DA@uci.edu>
Source record: 2877

Dick Carroll wrote:
> You couldn't be more wrong, and it is really curious how you managed to
> come to that conclusion. There's littlein ham radio I enjoy more than a
> CW QSO with a young ham, and his code speed is not an issueat all.

Long as he isn't clogging up the band?

jim

2628. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 00:13:37 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <95sobbfim1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2878

In article <95rfqq$8co$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
Steven J Robeson, K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com> wrote:
> In article <95q4m7$6n2$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
> Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com> wrote:
>
> > Would you deny them vanity calls? Why else abandon a spiffy KC
call?
>
> Probably because in THIS case, Twitless, the calls are expiring
> due to non-renewal.
>
> These were NOT calls vacated due to Vanity options. And NO, I
> would not deny anyone, even you, a Vanity call.

Well, gooooooood. Then you can pick yerself one of those spiffy KC
calls for a vanity call, once you wait the appropriate length of time.
Or you can go for one of Mike Deignan's multiple callsigns. They
were turned in sooner.

Anyhow, its been great hearing from you again.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2629. Re: I heard a CB'er on 20 meters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 00:17:36 UTC
From: TR@sky.net
Message-ID: <3a81e560.3717149@news.idsi.net>
Source record: 2875
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner

On Wed, 7 Feb 2001 16:46:46 -0500, "Zombie Wolf" <zmbwf@acadia.net>
wrote:

>Havent operated on the old ham bands for a couple years now. I keep the
>license up to date, but there are just too many idiots on the air for it to
>be anywhere near enjoyable any more.

Mostly wrong. IT depends on what frequency you are talking
about....

>don`t worry. the FCC is selling them
>off piece by piece anyway. Ham radio has had its day, and the ARRL and FCC
>let it go down the drain. It is now going to die a well - deserved death,
>and leave us all in peace.

Wrong again....

>We still have the internet, and we can easily
>talk round the world on it. I stopped putting up with CB pond scum years
>ago, and since that is what the Ham Bands are on their way to becoming, I
>think it derserves equal attention .....

Wrong again, 2 1/2 to 3.....

2630. Re: I heard a CB'er on 20 meters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 00:18:35 UTC
From: TR@sky.net
Message-ID: <3a81e5c5.3817813@news.idsi.net>
Source record: 2876
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner

On Wed, 7 Feb 2001 18:01:46 -0500, "h" <not@aol.com> wrote:

>If he had a license he is a HAM not a CB'er
>Frankly Freebanders are like the Hams of old. If you look at the FCC
>enforcement logs The Hams are out of control and need enforcement while
>Freebanders are mature and working to improver thier knowledge, save lives,
>promote freedom and democracy, and gernerally aid and improve the geneneral
>welfare or thier comunities.
>
>--
>Sincerely,
>Ken

Total BULLSHIT. You know and I know it.

2631. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 00:20:52 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <95soos$fq5$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2880

In article <3A819381.B46CF6FB@uci.edu>,
Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote:
> Brian wrote:
> > In article <3A80B04C.9E9A93A0@uci.edu>,
> > Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote:
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > Perhaps "the pendulum is swinging,"
>
> > > Same thing. Ever actually SEE a balance scale, Brian?
>
> > Yes, on Miami Vice.
>
> Well then, that'd make you quite the expert on such things.

So now one needs to be an expert in scaleology to be able to state that the numbers of coded hams are dropping and the number of no-coders is increasing. This must mean that the Postmaster General knows more about ham radio than you.

> > > > or the
> > > > actuarial tables have been invoked.
>
> > > Hmmmm, that's profound. How does one "invoke" a table?
>
> > By dying on time.
>
> The table says that some people die before they're 40, Brian. Would
> that be timely enough for you? ;-)

Too late Jim.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2632. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 00:26:38 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <95sp3k$g71$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2881

```
In article <20010207015600.02997.00001929@nso-mg.aol.com>,
lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
> In article <95q4u1$6pl$1@nnrp1.deja.com>, Brian
<brianburke@my-deja.com>
> writes:
>
> >In article <3A8046F3.F64732A6@uci.edu>,
> > Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote:
> >>
> >> Len Over 21 wrote:
> >> >
> >> > In article <3A7F4E46.19F92C22@uci.edu>, Jim Kelley
> ><jwkelley@uci.edu> writes:
> >> >
> >> > >I just know how scales work, Len. The scale gets tipped in the
> >> > >direction of the heavier side. Your scale was tipped the other
way
> >- by
> >> > >YOU.
> >> >
> >> > Noo, noo, noo, Jim. I said the "scales are tipping." I didn't
say
> >> > that they had tipped the other way.
> >> >
> >> > Why do you deny they are tipping?
> >>
> >> I don't deny they are tipped. Perhaps 'untipping' would be a
better
> >> choice of words for you to use.
> >
> >Not a very good choice. Perhaps "the pendulum is swinging," or the
> >actuarial tables have been invoked.
>
> Jim Kelley apparently wants to smokescreen the whole thread
> by concentrating on certain phrases to "prove his point" (which
> was not really explained except in trying to provoke something
> about phrase choices. :-)
>
> The REAL point is that the number of US ARS code-tested
> licensees are declining and the number of US ARS licensees
> not code-tested are increasing.
>
> Perhaps Jim has an English Major rank in his militia or
> something...?
```

>
> :-)
>
> didit

Major sumptin.

But nothing suprises me anymore. Why just the other day, Dick admitted that CW was doomed without the government forced testing. Seems it isn't worthwhile enough to learn it on its own merits. After all those years of claiming PEEU.

I just wish these other guys would come clean and quit the smokescreens and diversions.

73, Brian

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2633. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 00:31:07 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <95spcbgbp1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2883

In article <3A819251.2B71B488@uci.edu>,
Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote:
> Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> > Jim Kelley apparently wants to smokescreen the whole thread
> > by concentrating on certain phrases to "prove his point" (which
> > was not really explained except in trying to provoke something
> > about phrase choices. :-)
>
> It's not a smokescreen to point out that what you said contradicted
the
> facts you presented. I can't help it if you didn't say what you
meant.
>
> jim

I knew what Len meant. What was your excuse again?

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2634. Re: I heard a CB'er on 20 meters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 00:31:10 UTC
From: Buckeye Web Design <arcweb@bnnorth.net>
Message-ID: <3A81E8CE.5E13E72F@bnnorth.net>
Source record: 2888
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

kj7gs5788@my-deja.com wrote:
>
> <snip>
> What make a ham a ham? Is a ham someone that's working to improve
> their knowledge of radio theory, electronics and operating skills?
>
> Or is a ham someone with a radio license who doesn't care to improve,
> who only wants to sit around and talk, act like a CB'er hurting others
> enjoyment of the service, and not learn anything?
> ---------------------
> A ham is many things, and if you don't like it, change it. And it
> starts with YOU. Elmer someone. Teach them how to be a ham and
> improve their knowledge of theory, electronics, and operating skills.
>
> <snip>
> But I guess the point of restructured licenses is to give some fucking
> idiot a piece of paper with a callsign on it and not require anything
> more
>
> ---------------------------
> And if the license is so simple to get, encourage a youngster to get
> involved. Take advantage of the restructuring!
>
> <snip>
> All this means the fcc going to be forced to do more enforcement to
> control these assholes and that going to hurt all of us.
>
> ----------------------------
> Absolutely right, the FCC is the police, you're not. You're not
> required to talk to the "problem children" of amateur radio. QSY to
> something you like, or join a club and head up a volunteer event or
> foxhunt or a thousand other opportunities out there. THAT'S hamming.
>
> <snip>
> I wish there were an organization in America that would work to improve
> ham radio, licensing, and improve the level of expertise of its
> operators.
> ------------------
> That makes you an organization of 1. Start improving things!
>
> Sent via Deja.com
> http://www.deja.com/
I couldn;t agree more myself. while I won;t disagree that there are some

bad eggs in both CB and Amateur. the are not ALL bad. And improvements can be made if you go about it in the right way.

I am in the proccess of getting my ticket. and I feel that I am a responsible and LEGAL CB operator and I will continue to be courtious and respectfull on the amateur bands when I finally have the priviledge to use them. I have friends here in town that are hams, sometimes I go over to their house for coffee and they share their wisdom and experiance with me. I just hope that someday I can do the same with a new radio operator.

WebDoc

2635. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 00:34:04 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <95sphs$gl0$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2882

In article <95sc4a$3rk$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
Steven J Robeson, K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com> wrote:
> In article <3A819251.2B71B488@uci.edu>,
> Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote:
>
> >It's not a smokescreen to point out that what you said contradicted
the
> >facts you presented. I can't help it if you didn't say what you
meant.
>
> And we're surprised by this...WHY...?!?!

Why do phrase everything in MTV-slang?

> 73
>
> Steve, K4YZ
> --
> "It Could Be That Your Life's Only Meaning Is To Serve As A Warning To
> Others Of How Bad It Could REALLY Be!"
>
> PLEASE SEND PRIVATE E MAIL COMMENTS TO K4YZ@AOL.COM. RESPSONSES TO
THE
> DEJA MAY OR MAY NOT BE RETRIEVED IN A TIMELY FASHION.

I really care how often you read your deja-mail.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2636. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 00:40:00 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <95spsvgqf1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2886

In article <3A812DBB.ABB6D7C6@ovis.net>,
Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net> wrote:
> Len Over 21 wrote:
> >
> > In article <3A7F4E46.19F92C22@uci.edu>, Jim Kelley
<jwkelley@uci.edu> writes:
> >
> > >I just know how scales work, Len. The scale gets tipped in the
> > >direction of the heavier side. Your scale was tipped the other way
- by
> > >YOU.
> >
> > Noo, noo, noo, Jim. I said the "scales are tipping." I didn't say
> > that they had tipped the other way.
> >
> > Why do you deny they are tipping?
> >
> > didit
>
> Scales don't tip until the weight on one side exceeds the weight on
the
> other side. There are still far greater numbers of code tested hams
> than non-code tested hams. If you said that the scales are tipping,
you
> are wrong. Why couldn't you just say that there is a good growth rate
in
> the ____ class of license?
>
> Dave Heil K8MN

Of course, you assume that all hams, coded and codeless, weigh the same.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2637. Re: ROTMFFLMMFAO!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 00:43:29 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <95sq3f$h61$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2885

In article <95qfakfgf1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org> wrote:
> In article <95q46g$675$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
> Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com> wrote:
> > > 73, Hans, K0HB
> > > --
> > > "We are fellow travelers on a journey between two
> > > eternities, and it's a trip far too brief for me
> > > to be concerned about your speed at the Code of
> > > Morse."
> >
> > Really? Was it always so?
>
> Has been so for at least as long as I've been a ham.

Oh, when did you let your license lapse?

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2638. Re: I heard a CB'er on 20 meters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 00:44:09 UTC
From: Helmut Sweenie <helmu@hone.con>
Message-ID: <tZlg6.38058$49.6730514@news1.rdc2.pa.home.com>
Source record: 2884
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner

Good Job Brenda Ann ... i have also been a ham since 1978 code never interested me at all i passed every element of the theory more than once in hopes that one day i would get my speed up to 12 wpm ... well i never did study anymore code and now thanxs to the fcc i am a general. and the same as you i know more electronic theory and amatuer operating principles etc than many extra, advanced and general class hams who have been able to pass the code portion. for what its worth.

"Brenda Ann" <brendaannd@uswest.net> wrote in message
news:95r1m5rng1@news1.kornet.net...
> Hey... I'm glad to see that there are so many hams out there that are not
> judgemental. I was lucky enough to get my General ticket thanks to the
most
> recent restructuring. I had gotten my Technician class about 18 years ago,
> before there was a No-Code Tech license, and have never been able to get
> over about 7 wpm since.. I would never have made General if not for the
> change. I am also a broadcast engineer by trade, so I could pass the
higher
> grades' technical tests no problem, but I'm content now just to have
access
> to the HF bands at long last. Thanks for showing that not only are not
all
> hams assholes, but in fact, very few are. *S*M*I*L*E*S* Brenda Ann KA7OUM
>
> "W6DKN" <w6dkn@qsl.net> wrote in message
> news:LR6g6.3702$vp2.456548@paloalto-snr1.gtei.net...
> More anonymous drivel...
>
> "smiley o'riley" <bummer-radio@licensing.org> wrote in message
> news:wouff.hong@goodRadio...
> > And the son of a bitch had a restructured ham license. I'll bet the
> bastards
> > an ARRL member too. Probably got in on the League discount membership
> plan.
> > All this started me wondering, What make a ham a ham? Is a ham someone
> > that's working to improve their knowledge of radio theory, electronics
and
> > operating skills?
> >
> > Or is a ham someone with a radio license who doesn't care to improve,
who
> only
> > wants to sit around and talk, act like a CB'er hurting others enjoyment

of
> the
> > service, and not learn anything?
> >
> > God help us, I'm hearing more and more of these stupid assholes on the
> bands
> > everyday. They don't know anything either and ask alot of stupid
questions
> > that if they had been compelled to study the licensing manual alittle
more
> > thoroughly that know the answers to all their questions. But I guess the
> point
> > of restructured licenses is to give some fucking idiot a piece of paper
> with a
> > callsign on it and not require anything more, All this means the fcc
> going to
> > be forced to do more enforcement to control these assholes and that
going
> to
> > hurt all of us.
> >
> > I wish there were an organization in America that would work to improve
> ham
> > radio, licensing, and improve the level of expertise of its operators.
> >
> >
>
>
>

2639. Re: Novice CW

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 00:52:58 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <95sql6hes1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2890

In article <95rmepdva1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org> wrote:
> In article <95q65k$7qu$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
> Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com> wrote:
> > > I'd support that idea in a heartbeat, so long as FCC doesn't stuff
> > > them away in some segregated ghetto like the current Novice
> > > sub-bands.
> >
> > Hey Hans, who said you could start calling it a ghetto?
>
> Brian,
>
> Do you suffer from attention deficit disorder? I have been publicly
> calling it a ghetto for at least 10 years.

Gee, you were strangely absent when I was set upon by the virulent
pro-coders for saying there was no one on the novice subbands 13 years
ago. Oh, lemme see, "at least 10 years, (but not more than 12 years)."
That must splain it.

> Even so, I don't expect I'll need permission from a dump huck like
> you.

You and Steve have the nicest manners. Must be a 20M thing.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2640. My name is Timmy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 00:53:43 UTC
From: "www.kp82.com" <nebodapussyass@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <95sqmjhmc1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2891

My name is Timmy, a punk-ass little fag
Keyclowns rely on me to lick your jizz filled bag
I sit in my chair and play with my dick all day long
At night I go to truckstops, to suck some keyclown dong!

My sister is abnormal, and I know that of course
I watched her last night in the barn
Happily fellating a horse

Yes, I'm Dimmy the drunk ass super fag
A peter pupper of the first degree
Just say the word and I'll go down
Upon my gayboy knees!

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2641. My name is Timmy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 00:54:14 UTC
From: "www.kp82.com" <nebodapussyass@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <95sqnihmm1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2892

My name is Timmy, a punk-ass little fag
Keyclowns rely on me to lick your jizz filled bag
I sit in my chair and play with my dick all day long
At night I go to truckstops, to suck some keyclown dong!

My sister is abnormal, and I know that of course
I watched her last night in the barn
Happily fellating a horse

Yes, I'm Dimmy the drunk ass super fag
A peter pupper of the first degree
Just say the word and I'll go down
Upon my gayboy knees!

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2642. Re: Novice CW

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 00:56:27 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <95sqrn$hp9$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2893

In article <95s1e6$p7o$1@news.netmar.com>,
K0HB@qwest.net wrote:
> In article <95r97b$3ik$1@nnrp1.deja.com>, Brian
<brianburke@my-deja.com>
> writes:
> >In article <ccn18tgigv2g406luirgp125otrsg2p7f1@4ax.com>,
> > Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com> wrote:
> >> Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com> wrote:
> >> >Ergo, I'm fully capable of self-testing other emission types as
well.
> >>
> >> How fast can you send RTTY with a bug... :-)
> >>
> >
> >I smell a dung beetle.
> >
>
> It's feeding on your upper lip.

You're a swell ham. I recommend Prep-H.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2643. Re: I heard a CB'er on 20 meters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 01:02:09 UTC
From: h <not@aol.com>
Message-ID: <t83rrg5hedt400@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 2889
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner
Body handling: HTML body converted to readable text

It's true look at your own foul and filthy mouth!
Ham's always use foul language and filthy talk on the radio just like they
do on this newsgroup. Freebanders know better. Freebanders are mature and
can express themselves without spewing forth filthy language.

--
Sincerely,
Ken
pwrguy@intergrafix.net
wrote in message news:3a81e5c5.3817813@news.idsi.net...
> On Wed, 7 Feb 2001 18:01:46 -0500, "h" wrote:
>
> >If he had a license he is a HAM not a CB'er
> >Frankly Freebanders are like the Hams of old. If you look at the FCC
> >enforcement logs The Hams are out of control and need enforcement while
> >Freebanders are mature and working to improver thier knowledge, save
lives,
> >promote freedom and democracy, and gernerally aid and improve the
geneneral
> >welfare or thier comunities.
> >
> >--
> >Sincerely,
> >Ken
>
> Total BULLSHIT. You know and I know it.
>

2644. Re: Nomination for Troll of the month. Re: West Virginia farm boy comes of age

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 01:12:40 UTC
From: offbreed@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <95srq1$ie4$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2894
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <95q9pcaqs1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
KC8JBO <roger_kc8jbo@my-deja.com> wrote:
> In article <95q12g$3dh$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
> Inbred halfbreed@my-deja.com wrote:
> > In article <3A79EFCE.2A8C8D9E@houston.net>,
> > Stagger Lee <SLee@houston.net> wrote:
>
> <flush!>
>
> > Congratulations. I have seldom seen such an extreme reaction from
> > anyone. Hook line sinker, and part of the fishing pole.
>
> Too bad he plaglarized it.. But that't the best he and YOU could ever
> hope to do.

You've seen "Hook line sinker, and part of the fishing pole" before?

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2645. Re: Morse Code replacement? Bigtime flame war article!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 01:21:21 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <95ssaaisk1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2895

Since I was invited back, maybe I'll give this one a shot.

In article <20010128085117.21683.00001754@ng-mj1.aol.com>,
w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:
> >From: "Richard McCollum"
>
> >I think (or methinks if you like) the key phrase is 'easier to
learn' than
> >Morse. Perhaps my feelers are set a bit tight but escaping a code
test
> >sure seemed to be the object of the game.
>
> If that is the object of the game, the game has been lost. If legal,
it can be
> used on VHF by those who have not passed a code test (so can Morse
code), but
> to use a digital mode on HF, under the present rules, one would
require a
> Technician license and the HF endorsement granted by passing a 5 wpm
test.
>
> > providing a path for the 5wpm contingent to get to journeyman
levels is
> > far more important to the hobby than defending the medium from
> > bleating cattle.
>
> If those of us who enjoy Morse code want to see newcomers use and
enjoy the
> mode, too, you are quite right -- ways of getting people from 5 wpm
to higher
> speeds are pretty important.

Of course. But the whole assumption that Morse must be learned slow and
the speed built up is a faulty one. Koch showed that as early as 1936.
He was able to get groups of people from no Morse at all to 12 wpm in
under 20 hours.
>
> I am NOT impressed with the methods being used. To the contrary, I
believe
> that the anger, the bitterness and the name calling that is being
done by some
> to "defend" the mode is setting the stage for failure.

What about the anger, bitterness and name calling on the other side?

> Telling newcomers that
> Morse code is a difficult task that will test their character and
help keep the
> riff-raff out of ham radio will not send a message that this is
something they
> can use and enjoy.

Agreed.

>A message that explains why it is enjoyable, why it is
> effective and letting them see love of the mode in your eyes and in
your words
> will be much more likely to gain converts that much of what I have
seen here.

Better yet - let them see the mode IN USE. By skilled operators. Don't
tell them - SHOW them.
>
> I think most of us realize that, sooner, or later, the Morse code
requirement
> for testing will either be dropped or significantly changed.

Already has. What's left is hardly a test at all.

> If it is, many of
> those things that are being said right now by people who claim to be
Morse code
> proponents will be more likely to keep people away from the mode than
to
> encourage them to use it. Think for a minute about what you will say
to
> encourage new hams to use code if the code test is no longer part of
the the
> requirements. THOSE words are the ones you should be using right
now, to the
> large number of hams who have not yet passed a code test and to the
ones who
> have passed a code test, but are not yet trying out the mode.

Yup.

> I have seen the
> collective memory of the Amateur Radio Service over incentive
licensing. Over a
> quarter of a century later, the ill will still echoes in our
circles.

Most of it is based on false information, too. And many of the most
angry were not hams then, either.

>Don't
> doubt for a minute that this next generation of hams will remember
what was
> said today, whether they have to remember if 3 years hence, or 10.

>
> Those who really want to preserve the use of Morse code on the ham bands should
> be encouaging new hams to give it a try.

We are.

> They should be forming slow-code
> nets, and looking for those 5 wpm CQs and giving them a nice QSO and some
> affirmation that this is a fun mode that will bring value and enjoyment to
> their use of it.

We are.

>Where are these things?

All over the place. But you have to know where to look.

>Has ARRL done them?

NO. Not in many many years. The closest thing to it is the slow speed NTS nets and W1AW code practice, both of which are excellent. But they are about the limit.

> Has FISTS?

Yep - for years. Try a CQ on the FISTS freqs at 5 wpm and see what happens.

> Have you?

For the past 33 years.

> All I see by those who may think they are "defending" Morse code is
> posturing and name calling.

Some of us are trying to combat false information with facts.

> IMHO, taking real steps to get people from 5 wpm
> to what you term "journeyman" levels is more valuable than the use of the term
> "bleating cattle" on rrap.

How about "electronic paintball wars"? ;-)
>
> I noted in the ARRL Board minutes that the Board has directed ARRL HQ staff to
> take steps to promote the use of Morse code on the bands. At this point, I
> don't know what those steps will be, nor am I sure that ARRL will actually pull
> this one off, but I sure intend to offer my input to what may be needed to make

> that happen. Although at this time, I have a very short list of
what will
> help, perhaps the first thing on the list is to drop all the name
calling and
> bring back the fun.

The fun never left. We just need to stop hiding our light under a
bushel.

I'll show you my list if you show me yours. ;-)

73 de Jim, N2EY
--
FISTS #4360
BIT #0001

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2646. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 01:35:20 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010207203520.14954.00001478@ng-ff1.aol.com>
Source record: 2896

>From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

>until the slouchers of the Welfare State finally managed to get the
>notion of working toward desired goals deemed to be politically
>incorrect, non-inclusive, and mean-spirited.

Larry, it is not working that has been seen as being mean spirited.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2647. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 01:39:40 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010207203940.14954.00001479@ng-ff1.aol.com>
Source record: 2897

>From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

>> Are you proposing an Extra Cum Laude or something?

>If there were such a thing as an "Extra Cum Laude," then I'm the kind
>of person who would just go out and achieve it -- without whining about
>it.

Yes, but are you proposing that having such an exam structure is appropriate?
How many exam steps do you think are necessary and appropriate between the
granting of minimal Amateur Priveleges and the granting of the whole set?

>My question for you is -- what do you have against striving to
>achieve a lofty goal?

Do you see everything through the filter of striving, or a lack thereof?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2648. Re: QCWA TELLS FCC TO END INCENTIVE LICENSING

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 01:46:05 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010207204605.14954.00001480@ng-ff1.aol.com>
Source record: 2898

>From: jwill@AstraGate.net

>One of the obvious mechanisms is creation of standing waves by
>body organ boundaries. The flesh is absorptive, so the pattern
>creates a net DC potential.

I know of no human tissue that is non-linear, so an RF field would not create a
DC potential.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2649. Re: Nomination for Troll of the month. Re: West Virginia farm boy comes of age

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 01:48:18 UTC
From: KC8JBO <roger_kc8jbo@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <95stt0$k8t$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2954
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

```
In article <95srq1$ie4$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
offbreed@my-deja.com wrote:
> In article <95q9pc$aqs$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
> KC8JBO <roger_kc8jbo@my-deja.com> wrote:
> > In article <95q12g$3dh$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
> > Inbred halfbreed@my-deja.com wrote:
> > > In article <3A79EFCE.2A8C8D9E@houston.net>,
> > > Stagger Lee <SLee@houston.net> wrote:
> >
> > <flush!>
> >
> > > Congratulations. I have seldom seen such an extreme reaction from
> > > anyone. Hook line sinker, and part of the fishing pole.
> >
> > Too bad he plaglarized it.. But that't the best he and YOU could
ever
> > hope to do.
>
> You've seen "Hook line sinker, and part of the fishing pole" before?

No, but you've seen the head of your daddy's dick before haven't you?

--
73 de Roger, KC8JBO
EM99 |ARRL|VE [ARRL & W5YI]|ARES |RACES
Yaesu FT-920 |Inverted Vee @ 40 ft.
Yaesu FT-90R

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/
```

2650. Re: Novice CW

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 01:50:07 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010207205007.14968.00001260@ng-ff1.aol.com>
Source record: 2899

>From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

>>> For some reason I can not open this.

>Ditto.

The email he sent wrapped the link onto two lines. If you cut and paste the
link with the next line, it will work fine.

Maybe you were just being lazy? :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2651. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 01:53:21 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010207205321.14968.00001261@ng-ff1.aol.com>
Source record: 2900

>From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

>> If an emergency occurred, would you allow your wife to die rather than
>> accept help from a nocode tech on the local 2m FM repeater?

> Of course not, many of my friends are nocode techs. But would you allow
>a loved one to die rather than use CW for a relief message?

Do either of you seriously think this is at all related to whether code should be tested in the Amateur Radio Service? It looks to me like two rrapers carrying an argument to any extreme necessary to outpoint the other.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2652. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 01:55:19 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010207205519.14968.00001262@ng-ff1.aol.com>
Source record: 2951

>From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

>ANY RF generator can be on-off keyed to form Morse characters.

What percentage of Morse-code communications do you believe is accomplished
with only a simple RF generator on-off keyed?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2653. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 01:57:19 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010207205719.14968.00001263@ng-ff1.aol.com>
Source record: 2952

>From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

>ANY RF generator can be on-off keyed to form Morse characters.

A single diode will allow that same generator to be FM'ed, too.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2654. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 02:01:41 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010207210141.14968.00001265@ng-ff1.aol.com>
Source record: 2953

>From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

>> What's wrong with the incentive of being able to work DX in the
>> lower 25 kHz?

> Why, when they can clog it up at 5wpm?

How many 5 wpm QSOs have you heard in the lower 25 kHz of the HF ham bands?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2655. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 02:03:04 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010207210304.14968.00001266@ng-ff1.aol.com>
Source record: 2955

>From: Jim Kelley jwkelley@uci.edu

>Anybody got any ideas on how to cut down on the number of CW ops for
>poor ol' Dick here?

It appears that Dick has a number of ideas on how to cut down on the number of CW ops. His constantly denigrating the mode and those who might want to use it are his start.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2656. Re: I heard a CB'er on 20 meters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 02:10:38 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010207211038.14968.00001267@ng-ff1.aol.com>
Source record: 2956

>From: Dan/W4NTI w4nti@my-deja.com

>Congratulations you figured it out....to continue.....more enforcement
>that then forces the FCC to decide to terminate ham radio because it is
>out of control.

Can you offer any examples of other Services for which the FCC took the action you describe?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2657. Re: I heard a CB'er on 20 meters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 02:11:21 UTC
From: Bill Nelson <billn@spock.peak.org>
Message-ID: <95sv89$8au$1@bashir.peak.org>
Source record: 2962
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

In rec.radio.cb Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@my-deja.com> wrote:

: Wonder how much money 75 meters will bring?

The whole of the HF band would bring very little. The inconsistant
propogation characteristics guarantee that.

--
Bill Nelson (billn@peak.org)

2658. Re: The League's latest dues hike announcement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 02:17:24 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010207211724.14968.00001269@ng-ff1.aol.com>
Source record: 2957

>From: George McCouch geomac@hopkinsville.net

>I really do not know if it was available then, but the yearly membership of
>$5.00 for me was two weeks allowance and seemed very reasonable at the time.

A few years ago, my wife and I gave her teen-age kids $20 a week allowance.
The kids are 25 and 28 now.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2659. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 02:18:01 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccoll@radiks.net>
Message-ID: <ljng6.95$05.62647@nntp1.onemain.com>
Source record: 2958

"K0HB" <K0HB@arrl.org> wrote in message
news:95sbij$3ad$1@nnrp1.deja.com...
> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
>
> > Code-tested licensees declined by 9,531 while non-code-tested
> > licensees increased by 13,132
>
> You cannot determine that from the statistics at AH0A.
>
> Some of the "growth" of the Technican class license consists of
> code-tested licensees.
>
> Since the April restructuring of last year, all code-tested
> Tech Plus who renew are being renewed as simply "Technician". Thus
> the "Technician" column now contains roughly 10% (minus attrition
> and upgrades) of licensees from the old "Technician Plus" ranks.
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB

If it really disturbs you, you can safely assume that any Technician
renewal from April thru January is actually a Tech Plus. This crutch is
about to disappear however.

Dick NBK

2660. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 02:18:58 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010207211858.14968.00001270@ng-ff1.aol.com>
Source record: 2959

>From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

>Hmmm. Just what *are* the "contributions" of these newly
>licensed hams you're talking about? Specifics, please -- include
>any relevant documentation -- news articles, media releases,
>etc.

What percentage of the oldly licensed hams have such relevant new articles or media releases? Have you written and published any articles yourself?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2661. Re: Morse Code replacement? Bigtime flame war article!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 02:21:00 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010207212100.14968.00001271@ng-ff1.aol.com>
Source record: 2960

>From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

>The "government welfare" program is the reduction/elimination of
>code testing, not the other way around.

Clearly, Cecil believes that shoring up a mode that you believe cannot stand on its own by the artificial use of testing is welfare. Kind of like sending money to those who are unable to earn a living on their own.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2662. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 02:33:31 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010207213331.14968.00001275@ng-ff1.aol.com>
Source record: 2961

>From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

>>I truly wonder what percent of all hams have ever made even
>>a single contact on any frequency (ham frequency) above
>>500 MHz?

>Probably around .05 percent, and that's being generous.

The ARRL web-page survey (admittedly unscientific) says that you are off by about 2 orders of magnitude. The number of hams who report that their highest QSO was above the 70 cm band was 19.6%.

See:

http://www.arrl.org/survey.php3?pollnr=25

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2663. Re: Morse Code replacement? Bigtime flame war article!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 02:46:15 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010207214615.14968.00001276@ng-ff1.aol.com>
Source record: 2963

>From: n2ey@aol.com

>> I am NOT impressed with the methods being used. To the contrary, I
>believe
>> that the anger, the bitterness and the name calling that is being
>done by some
>> to "defend" the mode is setting the stage for failure.

>What about the anger, bitterness and name calling on the other side?

I have never seen the other side use anger, bitterness or name calling to defend the mode. :-)

More seriously, I recall many a conversation with some on the "other" side about their "debating style." Look back a few years to see the ongoing discussions between me and WA6VSE.

>> All I see by those who may think they are "defending" Morse code is
>> posturing and name calling.

>Some of us are trying to combat false information with facts.

I must apologize for not including the words "some of" in front ot the word "those" in my sentence.

>> IMHO, taking real steps to get people from 5 wpm
>> to what you term "journeyman" levels is more valuable than the use of
>the term
>> "bleating cattle" on rrap.

>How about "electronic paintball wars"? ;-)

Yup, I remember giving good ol' Carl a particular hard time about that one. :-)

>The fun never left. We just need to stop hiding our light under a
>bushel.

Agreed.

>I'll show you my list if you show me yours. ;-)

I readily concede that your list is bigger. Good for you, Jim. I am sorry that my choice of words may have painted you with a bigger brush than I intended.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2664. Re: I heard a CB'er on 20 meters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 02:48:52 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010207214852.14968.00001277@ng-ff1.aol.com>
Source record: 2964

>From: t glenn ab7rs@arrl.net

>The ARRL is the problem...not the solution.--

What do you think ARRL should be doing differently that they are doing now?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2665. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 02:50:31 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010207215031.14968.00001278@ng-ff1.aol.com>
Source record: 2970

>From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

>Yet, after all this time, I can not send a wireless
>message over strictly amateur-based circuits any further than my
>own county line -- and most of the time, I can't even get that far!

Have you tried the amateur packet satellites?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2666. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 02:50:46 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010207215046.00714.00005778@nso-md.aol.com>
Source record: 2965

In article <owkg6.116$HH5.812768@news.ntplx.net>, "Ed Hare, W1RFI"
<w1rfi@arrl.net> writes:

>Doesn't CW get through when nothing else will? ;-)
>

Ed:

A QRP CW signal usually won't get through in the same passband
being occupied by dozens of high-power phone signals. CW is an
extraordinarily robust mode, but it is not infallible.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2667. Re: Code Quick RULEZ!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 02:50:46 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010207215046.00714.00005776@nso-md.aol.com>
Source record: 2969

In article <95rv8kmjo1@nnrp1.deja.com>, jason_hsu@my-deja.com writes:

>
>I will personally try moving up to faster Morse Code speeds. Maybe CW
>will allow me to work the 80m band, as SSB seems to be heavily
>distorted and/or noise-infested.

Jason:

Just as well; you can't use anything BUT CW in the 80-meter band
here in North America! BTW -- SSB *is* heavily distorted and/or
noise infested on all HF bands!

73 de Larry, K3LT

2668. Re: ARRL HQ "Attitude" (Was: Re: Pride)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 02:50:46 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010207215046.00714.00005777@nso-md.aol.com>
Source record: 2971

In article <DUkg6.120$HH5.814810@news.ntplx.net>, "Ed Hare, W1RFI"
<w1rfi@arrl.net> writes:

>
>ARRL HQ has a staff of about 120 people. Mendelsohn is not an HQ staffer,
>btw; your dealings with him have been in his role as a volunteer. What
>percentage of those 120 people who work at HQ have you actually has personal
>contact with?

Ed:

More than enough to give me a generally negative impression of
the attitude of the ARRL HQ staff toward members -- and that's
all that matters.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2669. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 02:50:47 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010207215047.00714.00005779@nso-md.aol.com>
Source record: 2966

In article <vxkg6.117$HH5.812673@news.ntplx.net>, "Ed Hare, W1RFI"
<w1rfi@arrl.net> writes:

>
>> >- . -. ..-. --- ..- .-. --. ..- -.. -... ..- -.. -.. -.--
>
>> Since I never served in the Navy, and have always used the Morse/CW
>> in its aural form, you're gonna have to send this as a .WAV file so I
>> can copy it properly.
>
>Are you really saying that you can't piece that together? :-)

Ed:

Actually, no. I can't discern the spaces between the letters/words;
it looks a lot like the way most CW being sent these days sounds --
run-together gibberish. 10-4, good buddy? (I cleaned up the spelling,
sorry!) Yep. How appropriate!

73 de Larry, K3LT

2670. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 02:50:47 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010207215047.00714.00005780@nso-md.aol.com>
Source record: 2967

In article <c_kg6.122$HH5.815207@news.ntplx.net>, "Ed Hare, W1RFI"
<w1rfi@arrl.net> writes:

>
>> Hmmm. Just what *are* the "contributions" of these newly
>> licensed hams you're talking about? Specifics, please -- include
>> any relevant documentation -- news articles, media releases,
>> etc.
>
>I was first licensed in 1963. My first QST article was, if memory serves,
>in 1987. I sure am glad I didn't have some old timer telling me how
>worthless I was all those years.

Ed:

As well you should be. My own standard of what would be a
significant "contribution" to the ARS would not come close to
requiring the publication of an article in QST. Or 73, even! I'd
settle for new hams that can read the owner's manuals that
come with their off-the-shelf appliances, and can figure out for
themselves how to store a PL tone in a memory channel, without
needing someone else to show them which button to push,
how long to hold it, and what to do afterwards. As far as I'm
concerned, you could have rested on your laurels permanently
after publishing your first article, but you didn't. I wish we had
more hams like you, and no more of the kind we're getting with
the dumbing-down of licensing requirements.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2671. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 02:50:48 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010207215048.00714.00005782@nso-md.aol.com>
Source record: 2968

In article <20010207203940.14954.00001479@ng-ff1.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>
>Yes, but are you proposing that having such an exam structure is appropriate?
>
>How many exam steps do you think are necessary and appropriate between the
>granting of minimal Amateur Priveleges and the granting of the whole set?

Ed:

I believe that what was in place prior to April 15, 2000 was just about perfect. I would have been quite willing to change that structure in accordance with my proposed structure stated in my comments to the FCC on the Restructuring NPRM: eliminate the Novice class, alter the written tests slightly, and give 100% of HF voice privileges to the 12/13 WPM Advanced class license, leaving the CW DX windows and the 1x2 and 2x1 callsigns as the only remaining incentives with a 20 WPM code test attached to them.

>>My question for you is -- what do you have against striving to
>>achieve a lofty goal?
>
>Do you see everything through the filter of striving, or a lack thereof?

An even better question would be why do you see nothing through such a "filter?" What in the bloody blue blazes is wrong with establishing and maintaining a set of reasonable requirements, geared toward obtaining practical communications skills, to be achieved in order to attain valuable operating privileges? Do you really think the clients of the Welfare State will flock to the ARRL en masse once the bar is dropped to the ground? The truth is, a lot of those foot draggers will trip over it anyway, so you may as well do what you want to do, and bury it totally! Then you'll have a perfectly level, politically correct playing field!

73 de Larry, K3LT

2672. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 02:50:48 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010207215048.00714.00005781@nso-md.aol.com>
Source record: 2972

In article <20010207203520.14954.00001478@ng-ff1.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>>until the slouchers of the Welfare State finally managed to get the
>>notion of working toward desired goals deemed to be politically
>>incorrect, non-inclusive, and mean-spirited.
>
>Larry, it is not working that has been seen as being mean spirited.

Ed:

You've obviously never had to manage an office staffed with a
significant number of people hired under Affirmative Action programs.
Ever heard of "broken rifle" syndrome?

73 de Larry, K3LT

2673. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 02:57:59 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A820B37.AF42451C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 2973

Dick Carroll wrote:
> I was a ham who lost privileges because of it. Rather than let it piss
> me off, I, a mail order General class ham, shortly made the 260
> miles-one-way trip to the FCC office and came away with an Extra class.
> Just as many, many other hams did.

It didn't pi$$ you off when you lost privileges but it did pi$$ you off
when you didn't lose any privileges on April 15? That's weird, Dick, even
for you.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2674. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 03:01:46 UTC
From: billsohl@mindspring.com
Message-ID: <3a820ab9.19799016@news.mindspring.com>
Source record: 2974

On 7 Feb 2001 05:42:54 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

>Bill Sohl wrote:
>>
>> On 7 Feb 2001 01:11:10 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>> > Any ham who cannot perform minimally at Morse code, the most basic
>> >radio communications mode, is inherently unqualified at basic radio
>> >communications.
>>
>> Let me resort to calling this statement exactly what it is: Pure bunk!
>>
>> >When one is unqualified at the basics, how can he claim to be fully
>> >accomplished?
>>
>> The statement can be made because your claim as to morse
>> being a basic mode is based on the misguided belief that to
>> be accomplished requires knowing all that went before.
>> In radio operations, one needs NO knowledge of morse to
>> be accomplished...anymore than engineers today need no
>> knowledge of the slide rule to be accomplished, or that
>> a driver needs no knowledge of a manual gearbox to be
>> accomplished.
>>
>> Morse knowledge is NOT a building block to being
>> competent in any other mode.
>>
>> > You really don't get it at all, it's plain to see. This isn't about
>> >me, nor you, except that you would join them for reasons of your own.
>> >It's about those who prefer to ignore reality. That is: The most basic
>> >radio communications mode is radiotelegraphy. Find one that you can show
>> >to be more basic and we'll look again. I won't stay up late waiting.
>>
>> Do you need to know how to use a bow and arrow to be
>> accomplished as a had gun user?
>>
>> Dick, it appears to me that you are getting desparate in
>> your cause.
>
> So you don't believe that radiotelegraphy is the most simple, easily
>implemented means of radio communication yet devised?

Not so at all. I agree with that statement, I don't agree that
anyone needs to be knowledgeable in the USE of morse
to be considered accomplished in the radio arts (be it
technically or on an operational basis). Indeed, for Dick's

claim to be valid one would then want to question why
engineering schools have never required even a working knowledge
of the morse code itself before graduating engineers.

>Why are we not
>surprised? Of course you wouldn't see any reason for anyone to be able
>to use it.

You misread once again. I see no reason to REQUIRE anyone
to be able to use it. I have absolutely no problem with anyone
using it as their personal choice.

> Poetic justice would be served if you were to find yourself in dire
>circumstances where your voice mode just couldn't quite cut the mustard,
>and you were left with nothing but a PTT to key as CW.....

A yes, the good old morse myth #27 once again. If the need
was of any consequence, then why doesn't the military
require it anymore?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2675. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 03:04:43 UTC
From: tlbryant@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <95t2cb0vdn@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 2991

In article <95sj9d$8co$2@208.206.142.95>, dixie@townsqr.com says...

> It's plain as day- you have no clue. You haven't had even a receiver on
>the ham bands lately, if ever.

I've heard enough. Most of it is weather reports, health problems, and/or "RIG HR IS..., ANT HR IS..." which I couldn't care any less about. DX is nothing more than a callsign and signal report exchange, with no meaningful conversations because so many other vultures want their precious wallpaper. If I'd want to turn a young person off to ham radio, all I have to do is turn my receiver on, and not say a word. The average QSO speaks for itself.

2676. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 03:08:43 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A820DBB.729AACA1@IEEE.org>
Source record: 2976

Dick Carroll wrote:
> There is more and more CW activity as time goes by, instead of less.

There were wall-to-wall CW QSOs in the 40m Novice band in 1953.
Now sometimes, I don't hear a single CW signal on that band.
But I hope you are right overall.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2677. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 03:12:44 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A820EAC.C2127D8A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 2977

W1RFI wrote:
>
> >From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
>
> >> What's wrong with the incentive of being able to work DX in the
> >> lower 25 kHz?
>
> > Why, when they can clog it up at 5wpm?
>
> How many 5 wpm QSOs have you heard in the lower 25 kHz of the HF ham bands?

Hey Ed, wanna try one? :-)
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2678. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 03:18:23 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A820FFF.F089B580@IEEE.org>
Source record: 2979

Bill Sohl wrote:
> > 2meter FM is basic radio communication? On what planet?
>
> Given the ease and common place existence of a
> preponderance of 2m FM, it is, indeed a basic mode today.

Yep, on your and my planet, Bill, but not on Dick's planet. Signals
from his planet takes 75 years to get here. That's why he thinks
they are still using nothing but Morse code.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2679. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 03:18:58 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <95t372liu0@208.207.71.156>
Source record: 2975

Richard McCollum wrote:
>
> "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:95qojh$5pc$0@208.207.71.168...
> >
> >
> > >
> > > There is a place for ham radio to relay a message during a disaster to
> > > nieces and nephews that Aunt Suzy is safe. That`s worthwhile and
> > > memorable.
> >
> >
> > And when the infrastructure goes out- and contrary to your dreams, it
> > DOES go out, authorities are more than pleased to utilize ham radio for
> > serious purposes when needed, even if you don't believe it.
>
> Having been thru two earthquakes including one with an epicenter in metro
> St. Louis in my days there, there is nothing in this world more
> terrifying.

I have copies of some old first person accounts from survivors of the
1811-1812 series that lasted from Dec 16 through March. Several were
major quakes at 8.0 or higher. That must have been quite a ride.

Earthquakes in the mid-Continent are not the localized
> (however severe) California type but cover vast areas. It is said that
> the big one in the early 19th century rang the church bells in Washington
> DC with aftershocks for months.

Yep, the underlying substructure throughout the Midwest and East is
quite different from California. The Midwest was once an ocean floor and
the limestone rock is deep and extends most everywhere. It carries the
shock waves much more efficiently than the West Coast substructure. The
1811 New Madrid shake rang church bells in Boston and cracked chimney in
DC and South Carolina.
BTW, I heard on TV a week or so ago that there was a 4.0, I believe it
was, in New York City. Most people there don't know it, but they, too
have a serious fault system and are at substantial seismic risk.

Should another New Madrid occur, you can
> write off St. Louis, Memphis, and pretty much everything in between.
>
> Two questions:
>
> 1. Dick, if you were involved in planning just what did the plan entail?

> How do you plan for Swampeast Missouri to essentially disappear?

It's not an easy one, fer sure. The conclusion was soon reached that there will be nothing in the affected region that could be depended upon to function as a normal asset, including any surviving critical personnel who would be faced with the same disaster conditions as everyone else, with their families, homes and pesonal affairs to attend to. So whatever relief happens will be assumed to come from the outside. Initial reports of what happend where, to whom and with what resulting needs and demands in what quantities will be crucial to timely dispatch of effective relief efforts. Frankly, the planning solution must be much more general than specific for those very reasons.

BTW, I read once that there are 100,000 masonary buildings in St.Louis that are earthqhuake risks. Seemed a high number to me, but there are still no codes for construction there that mandate sufficient hardening. Memphis is in even worse condition, that entire city is built on a mudflat several hundred feet deep which will liquify when the shaking starts, and what doesn't disintegrate will sink in the muck.

> 2. For numbers alone, the amateur service cannot be planned for in any
> disaster scenario. The history is that we fortuitously appear like the
> gnomes in the night.

Exactly. And the fact that hams are so widely dispersed throughout the populace, with stations which generally can easily be utilized apart from the normal unmbilicle of the gridded infrastructure makes them vitally obvious first/early response communications assets. The instant need post-event is what hams will be able to provide-the who, what, where, when, how much and why that is always the hanging question and without which no efficient, well planned response by relief columns can be intiated. Effective respoonse can be begun only after sufficient accurate information is received that can be worked up onto a set of opertional plans. Information is vital as to surviving roads, bridges, airport runways, hospitals- will field hospitals be needed, etc etc. LOTS of details surface. Of course agency information gathering overflights from outside will begin as soon as possible, but even these need preliminary information to work with.

> The most obvious is H&W traffic which sort of
> implies a National Traffic System if things are not going to turn into a
> cluster. What sort of shape is it in?

I'm not up to speed these days on much of this since I've been retired for nearly 7 years now, and am really out of the loop. I wasn't a bit unhappy to leave all that to another generation.
Maybe that's why I advocate not abandoning CW as an actual communications asset, kept as a backup for the times when other modes can't do the job.It's no big deal to switch from SSB to CW when needed if operators are capable, and there can always be an additional CW circuit set up if needed, that happens at times as a routine matter. Of course the first choice would be some good digital mode, maybe PACTOR,

but the overhead needed is such that many hams who don't use it aren't equipped. It can't be depended upon tobe available when and where needed.
There is not a strict necessity to have a full CW practice net, at least for those who are familiar with traffic handling, and that's one thing I did a bunch in my years with MHP. It would be nice if most hams who see this as something beyond 'just a hobby' would get interested enough to work on that side of things a bit. And I DON'T mean only CW.

In Guatemala many years ago, the
> H&W traffic was flown into New Orleans on Pan Am and NTS from there.
> Still possible?

I'd expect so. For sure the Internet/email will play into any future such activity, but of course no one knows how it would be affected, either.

Good solution for the remaining amateurs in Guatemala had
> better things to do and a long-term working relationship with the Red
> Cross was put into use to do H&W. The question is whether anyone at any
> level has even the barest outline of a sketch to handle anything like
> this?

Again, I'm not current on the disaster relief comm. scene, but the last I knew ARC had ham volunteers being sent on most every disaster team package they sent out. I knew some hams from Springfield who went on Hurricane Hugo.

Dick W0EX

2680. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 03:21:52 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A8210D0.E95949EA@IEEE.org>
Source record: 2980

W1RFI wrote:
>
> >From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
>
> >ANY RF generator can be on-off keyed to form Morse characters.
>
> A single diode will allow that same generator to be FM'ed, too.

And a single diode/cap will allow demodulation of an AM signal without
all the complex additional BFO electronics required for CW. :-)
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2681. Re: I heard a CB'er on 20 meters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 03:23:10 UTC
From: t glenn <ab7rs@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <95t3epolt1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2978
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

In article <95snk0epo1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com> wrote:
> In article <95skdi$c1c$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
> t glenn <ab7rs@arrl.net> wrote:
> > In article <95q3q8$5pm$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
> > Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com> wrote:
> > > >
> > > > I wish there were an organization in America that would work to
> > > improve ham
> > > > radio, licensing, and improve the level of expertise of its
> > > operators.
> > >
> > > The organization that you're looking for is the ARRL.
> > > >
> > >
> > > The ARRL is the problem...not the solution.--
> > AB7RS,Tracy
> >
> Tracy, pretend for a moment that I know nothing of the ARRL and the
ARS.
> Now explain your position WRT the ARRL, and identify the organization
> that you believe to be the solution, and state why.
>
> Thanks, Brian
>
> Sent via Deja.com
> http://www.deja.com/
>
There is no organization that is "the solution" more hams put thier
faith in the ARRL than any other organization and the ARRL threw it all
away,trampling the traditions of this once great pursuit one by one.TG
--
AB7RS,Tracy

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2682. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 03:32:19 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A821343.C398020D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 2981

W1RFI wrote:
> It looks to me like two rrapers
> carrying an argument to any extreme necessary to outpoint the other.

That's what I like to do, Ed - deliberately reflect a mirror
image of the lunatic fringe with which I'm conversing. It's an
educational technique I learned during my education degree and
is supposed to slowly sink in and reveal the illogic being used
by the other side. It sinks in at an infinitesimally small rate
with Dick but I am a very patient person.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2683. Re: QCWA TELLS FCC TO END INCENTIVE LICENSING

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 03:36:59 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A82145B.D87C83A8@IEEE.org>
Source record: 2982

W1RFI wrote:
> I know of no human tissue that is non-linear, ...

Some of the brains behind the keyboards on this newsgroup seem
rather non-linear to me. :-)
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2684. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 03:40:11 UTC
From: tlbryant@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <95t4er05om@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 3002

In article <3A820B37.AF42451C@IEEE.org>, Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org says...
>
>Dick Carroll wrote:
>> I was a ham who lost privileges because of it. Rather than let it piss
>> me off, I, a mail order General class ham, shortly made the 260
>> miles-one-way trip to the FCC office and came away with an Extra class.
>> Just as many, many other hams did.
>
>It didn't pi$$ you off when you lost privileges but it did pi$$ you off
>when you didn't lose any privileges on April 15? That's weird, Dick, even
>for you.
>--
>http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

Seems more like he has a martyr complex. He "suffered" a 260 mile drive and
feels that others owe him an offering.

2685. Re: Morse Code replacement? Bigtime flame war article!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 03:40:44 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A82153C.92407C03@IEEE.org>
Source record: 2993

W1RFI wrote:
>
> >From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
>
> >The "government welfare" program is the reduction/elimination of
> >code testing, not the other way around.
>
> Clearly, Cecil believes that shoring up a mode that you believe cannot stand on
> its own by the artificial use of testing is welfare. Kind of like sending
> money to those who are unable to earn a living on their own.

It reminds me of the government paying my uncle to build a lake
on his land. He used the lake to irrigate the corn the government
paid him not to plant.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2686. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 03:47:05 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <95t4rpppc0@208.207.71.156>
Source record: 2983

"Ed Hare, W1RFI" wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>
> > > I'm telling you, Dick, if you don't learn DSP techniques, you are going
> > > to be a technically obsolete/ignorant ham in the not too distant future.
> > > All filtering and detection functions will soon be done with DSP.
>
> > ***NO***!!! Maybe *most* newly manufactured SSB and some other gear
> > will incorporate DSP functions. Not homebrew nor kitted gear which is
> > becoming so popular with so many hams these days. Your statement is
> > simply untrue. Stop trying to remake the ARS to your own personal
> > specifications.
>
> Cecil is not the one remaking technology, Dick; the technological world is
> evolving. IMHO, the very survival of our Service could depend on the number
> of hams who learn enough about new technology to stay relevant. Our
> survival may also depend on the number of hams who say "***NO***!!!" to
> learning that new technology, too.
>
> Riley Hollingsworth has been telling hams that we should not let Amateur
> Radio become obsolete under our watch. What do you think he means by that
> and why do you think he is saying that to his fellow hams?
>

ED just what are you saying? I already know, and have known for a long
time, how a digitized signal process works, where it samples an analog
wave, digitizes it and later reconstitutes it as analog once again, sans
noise. That's not new, nor is understanding the process equivalent to
rocket science.
BUT--- if, like Cecil, you're telling me that Riley and his buddy Dale
Hatfield insist that I and any serious percentage of ham radio licensees
must become digital designers just to assure the survival of the ARS,
you might as well go ahead and pass the word to them that they can begin
the Big Shutdown anytime now. It ain't gonna happen. No such educational
revolution is in the offing nor shall it ever be.
I for one am damn tired of being told what we "must" do to insure ham
radio's survival, all the while the written tests are made dead-easy to
pass without any effective learning of the material being absorbed by
the entrant. And that's not just my opinion, rather dead on fact as
evidenced by so many so clueless who aren't even bashful about admitting
it publicly.

The whole situation looks more and more like a scheme to ease us out of
our most commercially valuable spectrum segments, and that is something

that I consider to be inevitable anyway. They WILL be taken from us as commercial demand for them reaches critical mass, as has always been done, and logically so. But with hams having become so dumbed down they'll have the perfect rejoinder to our protestations- "We told you if you'all didn't become rocket scientists you'd lose frequencies...."

Dick W0EX

2687. Re: I heard a CB'er on 20 meters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 03:47:22 UTC
From: John
Message-ID: <eFog6.25402$dC2.713601@newsfeed.intelenet.net>
Source record: 2984
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner
Body handling: HTML body converted to readable text

guess what freebander! your breaking the law!!! OH but youre so mature and
can express yourself. Why not express yourself to the FCC office and tell
them what and where you operate.
"h" wrote in message news:t83rrg5hedt400@corp.supernews.com...
> It's true look at your own foul and filthy mouth!
> Ham's always use foul language and filthy talk on the radio just like they
> do on this newsgroup. Freebanders know better. Freebanders are mature and
> can express themselves without spewing forth filthy language.
>
> --
> Sincerely,
> Ken
> pwrguy@intergrafix.net
> wrote in message news:3a81e5c5.3817813@news.idsi.net...
> > On Wed, 7 Feb 2001 18:01:46 -0500, "h" wrote:
> >
> > >If he had a license he is a HAM not a CB'er
> > >Frankly Freebanders are like the Hams of old. If you look at the FCC
> > >enforcement logs The Hams are out of control and need enforcement while
> > >Freebanders are mature and working to improver thier knowledge, save
> lives,
> > >promote freedom and democracy, and gernerally aid and improve the
> geneneral
> > >welfare or thier comunities.
> > >
> > >--
> > >Sincerely,
> > >Ken
> >
> > Total BULLSHIT. You know and I know it.
> >
>
>

2688. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 03:48:23 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <95t4u7ppc1@208.207.71.156>
Source record: 2985

"Ed Hare, W1RFI" wrote:
>
> Larry Roll K3LT <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote:
>
> > >- . -. ..-. --- ..- .-. --. ..- -.. -... ..- -.. -.. -.--
>
> > Since I never served in the Navy, and have always used the Morse/CW
> > in its aural form, you're gonna have to send this as a .WAV file so I
> > can copy it properly.
>
> Are you really saying that you can't piece that together? :-)

He's probably like me- not interested enough to bother. That is nothing
whatever like copying code off the air.

2689. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 03:50:30 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <fm548tsclodlqidtia00ob6mic73uomppc@4ax.com>
Source record: 2986

w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:
>What percentage of Morse-code communications do you believe is accomplished
>with only a simple RF generator on-off keyed?

I made lots of contacts with my old Meissner Signal Shifter...

2690. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 03:50:33 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <bl548t8o64bedbcun0uo9nrn3gl3aolp3l@4ax.com>
Source record: 2987

Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
> Lets get **THIS** straight - You said "All it (incentive licensing did
>was piss off a lot of hams who lost privileges because of it".
> I was a ham who lost privileges because of it. Rather than let it piss
>me off, I, a mail order General class ham, shortly made the 260
>miles-one-way trip to the FCC office and came away with an Extra class.
>Just as many, many other hams did.
> So, Pal, you don't know what you're talking about. And that surprises
>no one.

I think he is right Dick. Incentive licensing did anger a lot of hams.
I was one of them. I remember talking to lots of hams who thought as I
did about the unfairness of removing privileges once granted. I
finally used a Bash book to memorize my way to an Advanced, but I was
too lazy to get my speed up for the Extra. (I was not a CW buff at the
time.) Ironically now that I do work all CW, my Advanced is useless...
:-)

2691. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 03:50:35 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <mj548t493ko2robmaf4pafgq7evitgggvm@4ax.com>
Source record: 2988

Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote:
>And now we've got folks who couldn't fix a squeeky wheel if their life
>depended on it.

I'll bet even you couldn't fix my TS-870 if certain parts
in it started squeaking... :-)

2692. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 03:50:37 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <4j548t8jdd6va6js9apifd82k3ka1in5d8@4ax.com>
Source record: 2989

Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
> There is more and more CW activity as time goes by, instead of less.

80 meters is virtually dead at night here now. I seldom hear more than one or two people on the whole band. It wasn't that way just 10 years ago. 40 years ago it was wall to wall. And so was the Novice band...

2693. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 03:50:40 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <ih548toldfcd8792epomrot59apcte22h2@4ax.com>
Source record: 2990

"Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net> wrote:
> IMHO, the very survival of our Service could depend on the number
>of hams who learn enough about new technology to stay relevant.

Unless you intend to leave out the lay people, it is unrealistic to
believe that average hams can keep up with current technology to the
extent that they can advance the state of the art, or be of any value
to the military. And if they can't do those things, what good are they
to the government (as they once were)...

>survival may also depend on the number of hams who say "***NO***!!!" to
>learning that new technology, too.

These non-technical hams just might save the hobby by providing
emergency communications, something that is still valuable to the
government...

>Riley Hollingsworth has been telling hams that we should not let Amateur
>Radio become obsolete under our watch.

Unfortunately Riley has been trying to get us to stop fighting amongst
ourselves and to stop profaning the airwaves. Technical stuff seems to
be a secondary problem for him these days..

2694. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 03:50:42 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <3h548ts75v84u3t8ehch12u9fgbvpih9jd@4ax.com>
Source record: 2992

w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:
>How many 5 wpm QSOs have you heard in the lower 25 kHz of the HF ham bands?

I can't remember the last time I heard a 5 wpm QSO on any band...

2695. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 03:57:21 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <95t5f1ppc2@208.207.71.156>
Source record: 2994

Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > You couldn't be more wrong, and it is really curious how you managed to
> > come to that conclusion. There's littlein ham radio I enjoy more than a
> > CW QSO with a young ham, and his code speed is not an issueat all.
>
> Long as he isn't clogging up the band?
>
No. As long as he doesn't get down below .25 and cause everyone down
there to have to stumble over him.
Did you miss the point earlier? I can't see authorizing nocoders to
work CW without any training in code whatver, and that's why. It's
strange so many of you seem willing to overlook that.

2696. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 03:59:48 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <95t5jkppc3@208.207.71.156>
Source record: 2995

"T. L. Bryant" wrote:
>
> In article <95si5g$6m4$0@208.206.142.95>, dixie@townsqr.com says...
>
> > Lets get **THIS** straight - You said "All it (incentive licensing did
> >was piss off a lot of hams who lost privileges because of it".
> > I was a ham who lost privileges because of it. Rather than let it piss
> >me off, I, a mail order General class ham, shortly made the 260
> >miles-one-way trip to the FCC office and came away with an Extra class.
>
> ...uphill, both ways, through six feet of snow, yadda yadda...
>
> Did I say it pissed off *all* the hams that lost privileges? No. But it did
> piss off a lot. I can't speak for the sheeple, such as yourself, that go along
> with whatever the ARRL says and does.

And I guess you're one of the clowns they're trying to recruit. Good
luck, to them-and you.

2697. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 04:08:29 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <95t63tppc4@208.207.71.156>
Source record: 2996

W1RFI wrote:
>
> >From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
>
> >ANY RF generator can be on-off keyed to form Morse characters.
>
> What percentage of Morse-code communications do you believe is accomplished
> with only a simple RF generator on-off keyed?

Not the point, nor should it be. The point is the availability of more
communications assets.

2698. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 04:10:23 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <95t67fppc5@208.207.71.156>
Source record: 2999

W1RFI wrote:
>
> >From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
>
> >ANY RF generator can be on-off keyed to form Morse characters.
>
> A single diode will allow that same generator to be FM'ed, too.

Ah, but the *receiver*......No one lunger will suffice there.
And what you planning to use for a transmitting transducer?

2699. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 04:10:52 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A821C4C.DC2E21D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3001

Dick Carroll wrote:
> BUT--- if, like Cecil, you're telling me that Riley and his buddy Dale
> Hatfield insist that I and any serious percentage of ham radio licensees
> must become digital designers just to assure the survival of the ARS,
> you might as well go ahead and pass the word to them that they can begin
> the Big Shutdown anytime now. It ain't gonna happen. No such educational
> revolution is in the offing nor shall it ever be.

I remember a lot of old farts saying exactly the same thing about SSB,
Dick. Progress happens. Time marches on. Ostriches bury their heads
in the sands of time.

> I for one am damn tired of being told what we "must" do to insure ham
> radio's survival, ...

Nobody screams, "The Sky is Falling", more often than you do.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2700. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 04:11:24 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <95t69cppc6@208.207.71.156>
Source record: 2997

W1RFI wrote:
>
> >From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
>
> >> What's wrong with the incentive of being able to work DX in the
> >> lower 25 kHz?
>
> > Why, when they can clog it up at 5wpm?
>
> How many 5 wpm QSOs have you heard in the lower 25 kHz of the HF ham bands?

What does that matter? You saying that if I haven't heard any then
none are coming?

2701. Re: I heard a CB'er on 20 meters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 04:12:25 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <95t6b9ppc7@208.207.71.156>
Source record: 2998

W1RFI wrote:
>
> >From: Dan/W4NTI w4nti@my-deja.com
>
> >Congratulations you figured it out....to continue.....more enforcement
> >that then forces the FCC to decide to terminate ham radio because it is
> >out of control.
>
> Can you offer any examples of other Services for which the FCC took the action
> you describe?

Well they TRIED on 27 mhz...

2702. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 04:14:05 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A821D0D.F41BF57E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3004

Dick Carroll wrote:
> He's probably like me- not interested enough to bother.

Now you know how a lot of people feel about CW.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2703. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 04:14:55 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <95t6fvppc8@208.207.71.156>
Source record: 3000

W1RFI wrote:
>
> >From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
>
> >>I truly wonder what percent of all hams have ever made even
> >>a single contact on any frequency (ham frequency) above
> >>500 MHz?
>
> >Probably around .05 percent, and that's being generous.
>
> The ARRL web-page survey (admittedly unscientific) says that you are off by
> about 2 orders of magnitude. The number of hams who report that their highest
> QSO was above the 70 cm band was 19.6%.
>

Yeah, right. I sent CW with a flashlight.

2704. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 04:21:18 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A821EBE.550D0541@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3007

Dick Carroll wrote:
> I have copies of some old first person accounts from survivors of the
> 1811-1812 series that lasted from Dec 16 through March. Several were
> major quakes at 8.0 or higher.

Tell us about how Morse code saved the day. :-)
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2705. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 04:22:55 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <95t6uvppc9@208.207.71.156>
Source record: 3003

Bill Sohl wrote:
>

> > So you don't believe that radiotelegraphy is the most simple, easily
> >implemented means of radio communication yet devised?
>
> Not so at all. I agree with that statement, I don't agree that
> anyone needs to be knowledgeable in the USE of morse
> to be considered accomplished in the radio arts (be it
> technically or on an operational basis). Indeed, for Dick's
> claim to be valid one would then want to question why
> engineering schools have never required even a working knowledge
> of the morse code itself before graduating engineers.

Ah, so now because engineers aren't required to know Morse code is
reason enough for hams to not know it either. Pure logic, we see.

2706. Re: I heard a CB'er on 20 meters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 04:29:45 UTC
From: Helmut Sweenie <helmu@hone.con>
Message-ID: <Zgpg6.38414$49.6855308@news1.rdc2.pa.home.com>
Source record: 3005
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner
Body handling: HTML body converted to readable text

```
I guess you do everything buy the book huh John ..
"John" wrote in message
news:eFog6.25402$dC2.713601@newsfeed.intelenet.net...
> guess what freebander! your breaking the law!!! OH but youre so mature and
> can express yourself. Why not express yourself to the FCC office and tell
> them what and where you operate.
> "h" wrote in message
news:t83rrg5hedt400@corp.supernews.com...
> > It's true look at your own foul and filthy mouth!
> > Ham's always use foul language and filthy talk on the radio just like
they
> > do on this newsgroup. Freebanders know better. Freebanders are mature
and
> > can express themselves without spewing forth filthy language.
> >
> > --
> > Sincerely,
> > Ken
> > pwrguy@intergrafix.net
> > wrote in message news:3a81e5c5.3817813@news.idsi.net...
> > > On Wed, 7 Feb 2001 18:01:46 -0500, "h" wrote:
> > >
> > > >If he had a license he is a HAM not a CB'er
> > > >Frankly Freebanders are like the Hams of old. If you look at the FCC
> > > >enforcement logs The Hams are out of control and need enforcement
while
> > > >Freebanders are mature and working to improver thier knowledge, save
> > lives,
> > > >promote freedom and democracy, and gernerally aid and improve the
> > geneneral
> > > >welfare or thier comunities.
> > > >
> > > >--
> > > >Sincerely,
> > > >Ken
> > >
> > > Total BULLSHIT. You know and I know it.
> > >
> >
> >
>
>
```

2707. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 04:33:21 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <95t7ih$2sl$0@208.207.71.156>
Source record: 3006

Cecil wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > There is more and more CW activity as time goes by, instead of less.
>
> There were wall-to-wall CW QSOs in the 40m Novice band in 1953.
> Now sometimes, I don't hear a single CW signal on that band.
> But I hope you are right overall.

Maybe it's the winter season, but there is a lot of CW on these days. I don't know about the Novice segment, when I tune through there it's vacant, so I don't hang around.
Yes, I clearly remember the 40 meter novice band in the spring of '57. My old BC454, I think it was, heard most of them together at any dial setting, and from that experience I learned to dig a single signal out of the bedlam, a valuable skill that I still have to this day.

2708. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 04:33:38 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A8221A2.DACCF570@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3013

Dick Carroll wrote:
> On a single-device regen rx?

Those were so complex that I never got one working right. :-)
A superhet is much more forgiving.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2709. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 04:34:51 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A8221EB.7424CCEE@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3012

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Ah, so now because engineers aren't required to know Morse code is
> reason enough for hams to not know it either. Pure logic, we see.

Is anybody except hams required to know Morse code in the 21st century?
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2710. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 04:35:05 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <95t7lp$2sl$1@208.207.71.156>
Source record: 3008

```
Cecil wrote:
>
> W1RFI wrote:
> >
> > >From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
> >
> > >ANY RF generator can be on-off keyed to form Morse characters.
> >
> > A single diode will allow that same generator to be FM'ed, too.
>
> And a single diode/cap will allow demodulation of an AM signal without
> all the complex additional BFO electronics required for CW. :-)

On a single-device regen rx?
```

2711. Re: QCWA TELLS FCC TO END INCENTIVE LICENSING

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 04:36:11 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <95t7nr$2sl$2@208.207.71.156>
Source record: 3009

Cecil wrote:
>
> W1RFI wrote:
> > I know of no human tissue that is non-linear, ...
>
> Some of the brains behind the keyboards on this newsgroup seem
> rather non-linear to me. :-)

Starting at home

2712. Re: I heard a CB'er on 20 meters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 04:36:19 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A822243.CF606AA4@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3014

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> W1RFI wrote:
> > Can you offer any examples of other Services for which the FCC took the action
> > you describe?
>
> Well they TRIED on 27 mhz...

What would happen if the FCC tried to terminate the Citizen's Band?
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2713. Re: QCWA TELLS FCC TO END INCENTIVE LICENSING

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 04:39:54 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A82231A.5C24E0A4@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3015

```
Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> Cecil wrote:
> >
> > W1RFI wrote:
> > > I know of no human tissue that is non-linear, ...
> >
> > Some of the brains behind the keyboards on this newsgroup seem
> > rather non-linear to me. :-)
>
> Starting at home

Where is your home nowadays, Dick?
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca
```

2714. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 04:41:29 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <95t81p$3t9$0@208.207.71.156>
Source record: 3010

Aaron Jones wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
> > Lets get **THIS** straight - You said "All it (incentive licensing did
> >was piss off a lot of hams who lost privileges because of it".
> > I was a ham who lost privileges because of it. Rather than let it piss
> >me off, I, a mail order General class ham, shortly made the 260
> >miles-one-way trip to the FCC office and came away with an Extra class.
> >Just as many, many other hams did.
> > So, Pal, you don't know what you're talking about. And that surprises
> >no one.
>
> I think he is right Dick. Incentive licensing did anger a lot of hams.
> I was one of them. I remember talking to lots of hams who thought as I
> did about the unfairness of removing privileges once granted. I
> finally used a Bash book to memorize my way to an Advanced, but I was
> too lazy to get my speed up for the Extra. (I was not a CW buff at the
> time.) Ironically now that I do work all CW, my Advanced is useless...
> :-)

Ok, so it did piss off a goodly number of hams. He said that was "all
it did" and that clearly is false. At the beginning of Incentive
Licensing there were around 4,000 Extra class hams. Ten years later
there were ten times that many.

2715. Re: Morse Code replacement? Bigtime flame war article!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 04:44:31 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <95t87f$3t9$1@208.207.71.156>
Source record: 3011

```
Cecil wrote:
>
> W1RFI wrote:
> >
> > >From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
> >
> > >The "government welfare" program is the reduction/elimination of
> > >code testing, not the other way around.
> >
> > Clearly, Cecil believes that shoring up a mode that you believe cannot stand on
> > its own by the artificial use of testing is welfare. Kind of like sending
> > money to those who are unable to earn a living on their own.
>
> It reminds me of the government paying my uncle to build a lake
> on his land. He used the lake to irrigate the corn the government
> paid him not to plant.

How was he able to cash that government check that didn't come?
```

2716. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 04:52:55 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <95t8n7$5hr$0@208.207.71.156>
Source record: 3016

Cecil wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > BUT--- if, like Cecil, you're telling me that Riley and his buddy Dale
> > Hatfield insist that I and any serious percentage of ham radio licensees
> > must become digital designers just to assure the survival of the ARS,
> > you might as well go ahead and pass the word to them that they can begin
> > the Big Shutdown anytime now. It ain't gonna happen. No such educational
> > revolution is in the offing nor shall it ever be.
>
> I remember a lot of old farts saying exactly the same thing about SSB,
> Dick.

BS, I was there too, remember? The big bitch was about the "donald
duck" sounding audio and the fact that rigs of the day drifted so much
that keepinga station tuned in was near impossible as compared to the
"broadcast quality"of AM and the absense of drift-caused problems.

> Progress happens. Time marches on. Ostriches bury their heads
> in the sands of time.

Forever things just got to keep moving, forever and ever, without even
a pause? Yeah, right. I do believe that was the common beliefd in Roman
days,too.

> > I for one am damn tired of being told what we "must" do to insure ham
> > radio's survival, ...

> Nobody screams, "The Sky is Falling", more often than you do.

So I'm the anchor on your butt.

2717. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 05:02:16 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <95t98m$t9q$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 3017

In article <ljng6.95$05.62647@nntp1.onemain.com>,
"Richard McCollum" <rmccoll@radiks.net> wrote:

> If it really disturbs you, you can safely assume ......

Doesn't disturb me, but it ruins Lens lame calculations about
ratios between coded and non-coded hams.

73, Hans, K0HB

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2718. Re: I heard a CB'er on 20 meters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 05:27:39 UTC
From: "George, W5YR" <w5yr@att.net>
Message-ID: <3A822E12.43F35147@att.net>
Source record: 3018
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Now, let's back up in time to when the Generals *got* privileges they had
not worked for, when they were given phone privileges on 75 and 20 which
were formerly restricted to Class A operators. No exam, no
operating/license time restriction, no nothing - just fire up and operate.

Never seem to read much about that end of the stick, do we?

72/73, George W5YR - the Yellow Rose of Texas QRP-L 1373 NETXQRP 6
Fairview, TX 30 mi NE of Dallas in Collin county EM13qe
Amateur Radio W5YR, in the 55th year and it just keeps getting better!
Icom IC-756PRO #02121 Kachina #91900556 IC-765 #02437

Cecil wrote:
>
> Brian wrote:
> > Which restructuring? The one where Generals lost priveleges?
>
> The one where Generals lost privileges was called incentive licensing.
> I got my Advanced during incentive licensing. I got my Extra during
> the latest restructuring.
> --
> http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

--

2719. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 06:05:13 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <dqd48t02k6f7b2j4d9vnrf0uf3ohut3ok9@4ax.com>
Source record: 3019

Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>At the beginning of Incentive
>Licensing there were around 4,000 Extra class hams. Ten years later
>there were ten times that many.

And ten years from now the Extra Class will likely have increased
another tenfold due to the current restructuring. That too made many
hams angry... :-)

2720. Re: I heard a CB'er on 20 meters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 07:09:42 UTC
From: Cap'n Crunch <kcfamily@tir.com>
Message-ID: <Gzrg6.184$05.146594@nntp1.onemain.com>
Source record: 3020
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

George, W5YR" <w5yr@att.net> wrote in message
news:3A822E12.43F35147@att.net...
> Now, let's back up in time to when the Generals *got* privileges they had
> not worked for, when they were given phone privileges on 75 and 20 which
> were formerly restricted to Class A operators. No exam, no
> operating/license time restriction, no nothing - just fire up and operate.
>
> Never seem to read much about that end of the stick, do we?

1952, I believe..... I've done quite a bit of research into the changes in
Amateur licensing over the years... some big changes in 1924,1928, 1934,
1952,1967-69, 1990, 2000 (dates may not be 'right on' the money, but then
many of the changes were phased in over a period of time.)
--
__/__ __ /__
__ /__ __/__
_____/_____/___ /~
\ Cap'n Crunch /
~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~
~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~

2721. Ham Radio Operator caught Jamming Police Frequencies.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 09:06:25 UTC
From: Keith <kewyatt@apexmail.com>
Message-ID: <q9o48tkt8s5o44ev1jsr6bhbd9rrvv66pa@news>
Source record: 3021

http://www.channel4000.com/news/stories/news-44929020010206-170254.html

Hacker Crossed Police Wires
Suspect Arrested At Scene Of Ambulance Call
BURNSVILLE, Minn., 6:13 p.m. CST February 6, 2001 -- Police have pulled the plug on a police radio hacker.

Hacking Over And Out

Police said Tuesday that a 31-year-old ham radio operator in Burnsville has been broadcasting on police radios around the Twin Cities for nearly two years.

The suspect was spotted near the scene of an ambulance call Sunday. Authorities said that he might have been transmitting the call on their frequency from his car.

"Our frequency is aired over another frequency, thus severely hampering communications on both frequencies," Capt. Dan Johnson said.
[snip]

--
Best Regards,

Keith (Use Reply-to for email)

Where do you discover free software for Windows? Strongsignals DOT COM is a great place to start: http://Strongsignals.com "Where would Christianity be if Jesus got eight to fifteen years with time off for good behavior?" NY State Senator James Donovan, speaking in support of capital punishment.

2722. Re: Nomination for Troll of the month. Re: West Virginia farm boy comes of age

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 09:22:50 UTC
From: offbreed@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <95toh5$980$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 3022
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <95stt0$k8t$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
KC8JBO <roger_kc8jbo@my-deja.com> wrote:
>
> No, but you've seen the head of your daddy's dick before haven't you?

How did a CB'r ever get a Ham license?

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2723. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 11:56:35 UTC
From: "Steven J Robeson", K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <95u1hhflr1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 3023

In article <95sphs$gl0$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com> wrote:

> Why do phrase everything in MTV-slang?

I didn't realize that MTV had it's own dictionary.

> I really care how often you read your deja-mail.

Well good....then if I happen to see your name in there, I will
just automatically delete it as an error. Thankfully, you are not the
only person who may have occassion to send e mail.

Of course, I will have a pretty good clue as you would be only one
of three people to send e mail written in crayon.

Steve
--
"It Could Be That Your Life's Only Meaning Is To Serve As A Warning To
Others Of How Bad It Could REALLY Be!"

PLEASE SEND PRIVATE E MAIL COMMENTS TO K4YZ@AOL.COM. RESPSONSES TO THE
DEJA MAY OR MAY NOT BE RETRIEVED IN A TIMELY FASHION.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2724. Re: Nomination for Troll of the month. Re: West Virginia farm boy comes of age

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 12:34:18 UTC
From: KC8JBO <roger_kc8jbo@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <95u3obhbf1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 3024
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.test

INBRED <offbreed@my-deja.com> whined in message
news:95toh5$980$1@nnrp1.deja.com...
> In article <95stt0$k8t$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
> KC8JBO <roger_kc8jbo@my-deja.com> wrote:
> >
> > No, but you've seen the head of your daddy's dick before haven't
you?
>
> How did a CB'r ever get a Ham license?

How did a half-breed simian-human hybrid such as offbreed/inbred get a
computer?

--
73 de Roger, KC8JBO
EM99 |ARRL|VE [ARRL & W5YI]|ARES |RACES
Yaesu FT-920 |Inverted Vee @ 40 ft.
Yaesu FT-90R

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2725. Re: I heard a CB'er on 20 meters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 14:10:38 UTC
From: RiK Larson <Rick__Larson@Hotmail.Com>
Message-ID: <t85a5d7n8a81f2@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 3025
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner
Body handling: HTML body converted to readable text

```
Freebanders are generally unexperienced in electronics and not sanctioned by
any country in the world.
Rick

Helmut Sweenie wrote in message
news:Zgpg6.38414$49.6855308@news1.rdc2.pa.home.com...
> I guess you do everything buy the book huh John ..
> "John" wrote in message
> news:eFog6.25402$dC2.713601@newsfeed.intelenet.net...
> > guess what freebander! your breaking the law!!! OH but youre so mature
and
> > can express yourself. Why not express yourself to the FCC office and
tell
> > them what and where you operate.
> > "h" wrote in message
> news:t83rrg5hedt400@corp.supernews.com...
> > > It's true look at your own foul and filthy mouth!
> > > Ham's always use foul language and filthy talk on the radio just like
> they
> > > do on this newsgroup. Freebanders know better. Freebanders are mature
> and
> > > can express themselves without spewing forth filthy language.
> > >
> > > --
> > > Sincerely,
> > > Ken
> > > pwrguy@intergrafix.net
> > > wrote in message news:3a81e5c5.3817813@news.idsi.net...
> > > > On Wed, 7 Feb 2001 18:01:46 -0500, "h" wrote:
> > > >
> > > > >If he had a license he is a HAM not a CB'er
> > > > >Frankly Freebanders are like the Hams of old. If you look at the
FCC
> > > > >enforcement logs The Hams are out of control and need enforcement
> while
> > > > >Freebanders are mature and working to improver thier knowledge,
save
> > > lives,
> > > > >promote freedom and democracy, and gernerally aid and improve the
> > > geneneral
> > > > >welfare or thier comunities.
> > > > >
> > > > >--
```

> > > > >Sincerely,
> > > > >Ken
> > > > >
> > > > Total BULLSHIT. You know and I know it.
> > > > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > >
> > >
>
>

2726. Re: Novice CW

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 15:05:09 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <95ucit$p3l$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 3026

In article <95sql6hes1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com> wrote:

> Gee, you were strangely absent when I was set upon by the virulent
> pro-coders for saying there was no one on the novice subbands 13 years
> ago.

You only started cyber-stalking me a couple years ago. I never heard
of you until about 1998, so I didn't know I was supposed to come
protect you from "virulent pro-coders" -- poor baby, I bet you were
really traumatized. Splains a lot.

73, Hans, K0HB
--
"We are fellow travelers on a journey between two
eternities, and it's a trip far too brief for me
to give a shit about who picked on you 13 years
ago."

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2727. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 15:09:47 UTC
From: tlbryant@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <95ucrr01600@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 3037

In article <95t81p$3t9$0@208.207.71.156>, dixie@townsqr.com says...

> Ok, so it did piss off a goodly number of hams. He said that was "all
>it did" and that clearly is false. At the beginning of Incentive
>Licensing there were around 4,000 Extra class hams. Ten years later
>there were ten times that many.

That doesn't prove anything. How many of those Extras weren't even licensed when the incentive licensing scheme was put into place? How many hams dropped out of ham radio altogether because the felt the ARRL screwed them?

2728. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 15:12:33 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A82B761.7EED4203@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3028

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> Cecil wrote:
> > I remember a lot of old farts saying exactly the same thing about SSB,
> > Dick.
>
> BS, I was there too, remember? The big bitch was about the "donald
> duck" sounding audio ...

Do you remember the derogatory remarks about the "Single Sidewinders",
the jamming, and the open hostility? I remember some of the hams at the
time saying SSB was the work of the Devil and they would never use it.
During every time of progress, there are always the lazy laggards.

> Forever things just got to keep moving, forever and ever, without even
> a pause? Yeah, right. I do believe that was the common beliefd in Roman
> days,too.

Yep, and history proves it to be true every time. There's a book out now
entitled, "The End of Time". It suggests that time doesn't even exist and
all we are seeing is change.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2729. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 15:19:42 UTC
From: tlbryant@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <95udee11600@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 3041

In article <4j548t8jdd6va6js9apifd82k3ka1in5d8@4ax.com>, nomail@nomail.com says...

>Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>> There is more and more CW activity as time goes by, instead of less.
>
>80 meters is virtually dead at night here now. I seldom hear more than
>one or two people on the whole band. It wasn't that way just 10 years
>ago. 40 years ago it was wall to wall. And so was the Novice band...

I was listening to 80 meters last night. The only CW I heard was a pile-up on 3.505Mhz. There's a bit more activity during a contest, but I get bored with those after about a half-hour.

2730. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 15:20:51 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <TQyg6.126$HH5.862354@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 3027

Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:

> W1RFI wrote:

> > It looks to me like two rrapers
> > carrying an argument to any extreme necessary to outpoint the other.

> That's what I like to do, Ed - deliberately reflect a mirror
> image of the lunatic fringe with which I'm conversing.

She made me beat her?

> It's an educational technique I learned during my education degree and
> is supposed to slowly sink in and reveal the illogic being used
> by the other side.

Was this really taught at a college-level course?

> It sinks in at an infinitesimally small rate with Dick but I am a very
patient person.

I have not seen a single example here where your college-learned technique has changed the mind of anyone on whom you have used it. Have you actually seen it work? You seem reasonably intelligent; perhaps you could choose a technique that does not "slowly" sink in.

Is there any way we can tell whether you are deliberately using this technique, as opposed to just being in your own lunatic fringe?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2731. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 15:23:19 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <aTyg6.127$HH5.862568@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 3029

Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

> Not the point, nor should it be. The point is the availability of more
> communications assets.

Would you recommend a rules change that requires that hams are required to have a specific number of communications assets available at their stations, then? If that really is your goal, that would be a much more certain way of accomplishing it. How many communications modes would you propose be required?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2732. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 15:25:01 UTC
From: tlbryant@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <95udod21600@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 3040

In article <95t5f1ppc2@208.207.71.156>, dixie@townsqr.com says...
>Jim Kelley wrote:
>>
>> Dick Carroll wrote:
>> > You couldn't be more wrong, and it is really curious how you managed to
>> > come to that conclusion. There's littlein ham radio I enjoy more than a
>> > CW QSO with a young ham, and his code speed is not an issueat all.
>>
>> Long as he isn't clogging up the band?
>>
> No. As long as he doesn't get down below .25 and cause everyone down
>there to have to stumble over him.
> Did you miss the point earlier? I can't see authorizing nocoders to
>work CW without any training in code whatver, and that's why. It's
>strange so many of you seem willing to overlook that.

Who, in their right mind, would even try to work CW if they had no knowlege of code whatsoever?

2733. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 15:25:07 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <TUyg6.128$HH5.862873@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 3030

Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

> Ah, but the *receiver*......No one lunger will suffice there.

If I recall, a regen slope detects FM pretty nicely.

> And what you planning to use for a transmitting transducer?

Do you mean a microphone?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2734. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 15:29:17 UTC
From: tlbryant@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <95ue0d31600@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 3042

In article <95t5jkppc3@208.207.71.156>, dixie@townsqr.com says...

> And I guess you're one of the clowns they're trying to recruit. Good
>luck, to them-and you.

Translation: If you don't post a callsign, your opinion dosen't matter, and has
no credibilty.

2735. Re: Nomination for Troll of the month. Re: West Virginia farm boy comes of age

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 15:30:48 UTC
From: JR <jr@some.net>
Message-ID: <3A82AC06.E2F9638A@some.net>
Source record: 3031
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

kc8jbo = cber

offbreed@my-deja.com wrote:

> In article <95stt0$k8t$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
> KC8JBO <roger_kc8jbo@my-deja.com> wrote:
> >
> > No, but you've seen the head of your daddy's dick before haven't you?
>
> How did a CB'r ever get a Ham license?
>
> Sent via Deja.com
> http://www.deja.com/

2736. Re: Nomination for Troll of the month. Re: West Virginia farm boy comes of age

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 15:31:08 UTC
From: JR <jr@some.net>
Message-ID: <3A82AC1A.83CC1A8A@some.net>
Source record: 3032
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.test

kc8jbo = cber

KC8JBO wrote:

> INBRED <offbreed@my-deja.com> whined in message
> news:95toh5$980$1@nnrp1.deja.com...
> > In article <95stt0$k8t$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
> > KC8JBO <roger_kc8jbo@my-deja.com> wrote:
> > >
> > > No, but you've seen the head of your daddy's dick before haven't
> you?
> >
> > How did a CB'r ever get a Ham license?
>
> How did a half-breed simian-human hybrid such as offbreed/inbred get a
> computer?
>
> --
> 73 de Roger, KC8JBO
> EM99 |ARRL|VE [ARRL & W5YI]|ARES |RACES
> Yaesu FT-920 |Inverted Vee @ 40 ft.
> Yaesu FT-90R
>
> Sent via Deja.com
> http://www.deja.com/

2737. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 15:33:48 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A82BC5C.343C1389@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3035

"Ed Hare, W1RFI" wrote:
> > It's an educational technique I learned during my education degree and
> > is supposed to slowly sink in and reveal the illogic being used
> > by the other side.
>
> Was this really taught at a college-level course?

Yep, it was a common educational technique in the early 60's. The
purpose was to expose the illogic of one side by adopting the same
illogic on the other side.

> Is there any way we can tell whether you are deliberately using this
> technique, as opposed to just being in your own lunatic fringe?

If it's not obvious, I usually provide a smiley face.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2738. Re: ARRL HQ "Attitude" (Was: Re: Pride)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 15:33:55 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <71zg6.129$HH5.863162@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 3033

Larry Roll K3LT <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote:

> >ARRL HQ has a staff of about 120 people. Mendelsohn is not an HQ staffer,
> >btw; your dealings with him have been in his role as a volunteer. What
> >percentage of those 120 people who work at HQ have you actually has personal
> >contact with?

> More than enough to give me a generally negative impression of
> the attitude of the ARRL HQ staff toward members -- and that's
> all that matters.

I believe you, Larry, but I am curious -- how many was it? You made a pretty power blanket condemnation of a group of people and I am just wondering about your sample size.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2739. Re: I heard a CB'er on 20 meters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 15:38:12 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <75zg6.130$HH5.863257@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 3034

Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

> > >Congratulations you figured it out....to continue.....more enforcement
> > >that then forces the FCC to decide to terminate ham radio because it is
> > >out of control.

> > Can you offer any examples of other Services for which the FCC took the
action
> > you describe?

> Well they TRIED on 27 mhz...

When did the FCC try to terminate the Citizens Band Service?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2740. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 15:44:55 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <qbzg6.131$HH5.863309@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 3036

Larry Roll K3LT <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote:

> A QRP CW signal usually won't get through in the same passband
> being occupied by dozens of high-power phone signals. CW is an
> extraordinarily robust mode, but it is not infallible.

A single high-powered phone signal won't get through in a passband occupied
by "dozens" of high-pass phone signals, either, Larry.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2741. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 15:49:56 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <8gzg6.132$HH5.863537@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 3038

Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

> > >> What's wrong with the incentive of being able to work DX in the
> > >> lower 25 kHz?

> > > Why, when they can clog it up at 5wpm?

> > How many 5 wpm QSOs have you heard in the lower 25 kHz of the HF ham
bands?

> What does that matter? You saying that if I haven't heard any then
> none are coming?

Okay, as long as we all agree that we are discussing what "might" happen.

Did your comments or reply comments to the FCC suggest that a minimum code speed should be allowed in the lower 25 kHz of the band, or is that a new requirement you believe should be put on the plate?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2742. Re: I heard a CB'er on 20 meters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 15:56:41 UTC
From: Jon Johnson <CJJ@TNFinancialResources.com>
Message-ID: <3A82C1B9.E4C3A5F1@TNFinancialResources.com>
Source record: 3039
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Ed Cregger wrote:
>
> I just got back into amateur radio after a three to four
> year layoff. The language has changed a bit since I was last
> active.
>
> For instance, where did saying "QSL" or "Contact" come from?
>
> Q codes are for CW, not phone. Saying QSL is the same as
> saying 10-4 to my ears.

Welcome back. You are correct that the shorthand Q-codes originated for CW but have also been used extensively on phone for at least the 30 years I've been licensed.

You may use "who is calling" if you wish...I prefer the shorter QRZ?

You may say "I have received/have you received my transmission"...but QSL is certainly shorter and easier...especially in a contest.

If the Q-codes offend your ears, don't use them...simple as that.

QSL??

NU4JJ

2743. Re: Ham Radio Operator caught Jamming Police Frequencies.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 16:38:43 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <B6A835C3.C06%stewartx@sccoast.net>
Source record: 3043

Keith at kewyatt@apexmail.com wrote:

> Hacker Crossed Police Wires
> Suspect Arrested At Scene Of Ambulance Call
> BURNSVILLE, Minn., 6:13 p.m. CST February 6, 2001
> -- Police have pulled the plug on a police
> radio hacker.

A little weak on the details, isn't it? For example, not one mention of the suspect's name. I wonder if this guy was a real ham, or a guy they just tagged a ham because he used a radio.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net

2744. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 16:48:12 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <95uik9$v4p$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 3045

In article <95udod21600@enews2.newsguy.com>,
tlbryant@my-deja.com (T. L. Bryant) wrote:

> Who, in their right mind, would even try to work CW if they had no
knowlege of
> code whatsoever?

I guess we all did, originally. Never heard of anyone born with their
brain already hardwired with Morse.

73, Hans, K0HB

--
"We are fellow travelers on a journey between two
eternities, and it's a trip far too brief for me
to be concerned about your speed at the Code of
Morse."

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2745. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 16:57:58 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <95uj6mjnt0@208.207.71.142>
Source record: 3044

"Ed Hare, W1RFI" wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>
> > > >> What's wrong with the incentive of being able to work DX in the
> > > >> lower 25 kHz?
>
> > > > Why, when they can clog it up at 5wpm?
>
> > > How many 5 wpm QSOs have you heard in the lower 25 kHz of the HF ham
> bands?
>
> > What does that matter? You saying that if I haven't heard any then
> > none are coming?
>
> Okay, as long as we all agree that we are discussing what "might" happen.
>
> Did your comments or reply comments to the FCC suggest that a minimum code
> speed should be allowed in the lower 25 kHz of the band, or is that a new
> requirement you believe should be put on the plate?

No I did not. I was confident that there was enough common sense left
at FCC for them to know better than to do what they did. Silly me, I was
wrong.

Wake up, Ed. I'm saying that no one should be allowed on the lower 25kc
(actually anywhere on the CW segments) unless he has learned to work
Morse code, and that knowledge tested at licensing. Nocoders mucking
around in the CW segments doing what they should do with a code practice
oscillator and W1AW code practice won't cut it.

When FCC gets around to repartitioning the bands there should be a
CW-only segment that requires a CW test to use.

"Ed Hare, W1RFI" wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>
> > > >> What's wrong with the incentive of being able to work DX in the
> > > >> lower 25 kHz?
>
> > > > Why, when they can clog it up at 5wpm?
>
> > > How many 5 wpm QSOs have you heard in the lower 25 kHz of the HF ham
> bands?

>
> > What does that matter? You saying that if I haven't heard any then
> > none are coming?
>
> Okay, as long as we all agree that we are discussing what "might" happen.
>
> Did your comments or reply comments to the FCC suggest that a minimum code
> speed should be allowed in the lower 25 kHz of the band, or is that a new
> requirement you believe should be put on the plate?
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI
Digital should get its own segment, since digital and W do not mix that
well. And analog voice should get its own.

2746. Re: I heard a CB'er on 20 meters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 17:04:48 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <B6A83BE0.C07%stewartx@sccoast.net>
Source record: 3046
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner

Ed Cregger at ecregger@earthlink.net wrote:

> I just got back into amateur radio after
> a three to four year layoff. The language
> has changed a bit since I was last
> active.
>
> For instance, where did saying "QSL" or
> "Contact" come from? [snip]

The same place that other slang comes from, Ed. Years ago, we had very different meanings for "cool," "gay," "bad," and a long list of other slang words used in our everyday language. Since everyday language continuously evolves, it is a little unrealistic to expect radio language to remain static. In fact, I'm fairly sure you were using some words four years ago that hams didn't use twenty years ago.

> [snip] After all, the rules for telephony
> state that we are to use plain language,
> not codes or ciphers. [snip]

But for anyone who uses a ham radio, QSL is about as plain language as it gets. And, the last time I checked, "contact" was in the english dictionary.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net

2747. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 17:08:27 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <95ujqb$l3i$0@208.207.71.142>
Source record: 3047

Cecil wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > Cecil wrote:
> > > I remember a lot of old farts saying exactly the same thing about SSB,
> > > Dick.
> >
> > BS, I was there too, remember? The big bitch was about the "donald
> > duck" sounding audio ...
>
> Do you remember the derogatory remarks about the "Single Sidewinders",
> the jamming, and the open hostility? I remember some of the hams at the
> time saying SSB was the work of the Devil and they would never use it.

There's always controversy on the bands, and today is no exception.
And I see there were trolls like you even in those days.

> During every time of progress, there are always the lazy laggards.

Much more factually, most hams don't wish to devote their passtime to
continually reinventing communications with the "mode of the week" sort
of nonsense seen in your circle. The fact is that history is littered
with "better ideas" that didn't make the cut. Humans are above all else
practical. If we have no pressing need for optimized highest throughput
methods with which to conduct our communications during times mostly
devoted to relaxed recreation, it does no good to browbeat us into your
personal point of view. Even if you really believe you've solved the
world's communications problems.
Evolution takes place at its own speed, and pushing and shoving does
nothing but help to impede it.
>
> > Forever things just got to keep moving, forever and ever, without even
> > a pause? Yeah, right. I do believe that was the common beliefd in Roman
> > days,too.
>
> Yep, and history proves it to be true every time.

Yep, out of every several hundred or so inventions, one or two is
actually adopted as benefial and helpful to real live people, instead of
some company's bottom line thus the paychecks of their design engineers.

There's a book out now
> entitled, "The End of Time". It suggests that time doesn't even exist and
> all we are seeing is change.

Well OB you can invest your remaining *time* in attempting to make
time stand still so you can hope to garner more *time* for yourself.
I plan to use mine more constructively.

2748. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 17:10:10 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <95ujti$l3i$1@208.207.71.142>
Source record: 3048

"Ed Hare, W1RFI" wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>
> > Not the point, nor should it be. The point is the availability of more
> > communications assets.
>
> Would you recommend a rules change that requires that hams are required to
> have a specific number of communications assets available at their stations,
> then? If that really is your goal, that would be a much more certain way of
> accomplishing it. How many communications modes would you propose be
> required?

Come on, Ed, surely you know more about the ARS than that. The day when regulators can convince themselves that we have no value as a real operational communications asset is the day when our allocations are on the market for sure.

2749. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 17:10:52 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <95ujus$l3i$2@208.207.71.142>
Source record: 3049

"Ed Hare, W1RFI" wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>
> > Ah, but the *receiver*......No one lunger will suffice there.
>
> If I recall, a regen slope detects FM pretty nicely.
>
> > And what you planning to use for a transmitting transducer?
>
> Do you mean a microphone?
>

That's what I always called my voice transmitting transducer.

2750. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 17:12:27 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <95uk1r$l3i$3@208.207.71.142>
Source record: 3050

"T. L. Bryant" wrote:
>
> In article <95t5f1ppc2@208.207.71.156>, dixie@townsqr.com says...
> >Jim Kelley wrote:
> >>
> >> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >> > You couldn't be more wrong, and it is really curious how you managed to
> >> > come to that conclusion. There's littlein ham radio I enjoy more than a
> >> > CW QSO with a young ham, and his code speed is not an issueat all.
> >>
> >> Long as he isn't clogging up the band?
> >>
> > No. As long as he doesn't get down below .25 and cause everyone down
> >there to have to stumble over him.
> > Did you miss the point earlier? I can't see authorizing nocoders to
> >work CW without any training in code whatver, and that's why. It's
> >strange so many of you seem willing to overlook that.
>
> Who, in their right mind, would even try to work CW if they had no knowlege of
> code whatsoever?

Who indeed???? "Just as long as I don't have to pass a hazing-ritual
test".

2751. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 17:14:40 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <95uk60$l3i$4@208.207.71.142>
Source record: 2901

"T. L. Bryant" wrote:
>
> In article <4j548t8jdd6va6js9apifd82k3ka1in5d8@4ax.com>, nomail@nomail.com
> says...
>
> >Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
> >> There is more and more CW activity as time goes by, instead of less.
> > >
> > >80 meters is virtually dead at night here now. I seldom hear more than
> > >one or two people on the whole band. It wasn't that way just 10 years
> > >ago. 40 years ago it was wall to wall. And so was the Novice band...
> >
> > I was listening to 80 meters last night. The only CW I heard was a pile-up on
> > 3.505Mhz. There's a bit more activity during a contest, but I get bored with
> > those after about a half-hour.

80 meters is probably the most underused band these days.
Try it on weekends, and more to the point, go to 40 meters,even 30 or 20
are much more active.

2752. Re: Ham Radio Operator caught Jamming Police Frequencies.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 17:20:49 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <95ukh4$1a4$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2905

In article <B6A835C3.C06%stewartx@sccoast.net>,
Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote:
> Keith at kewyatt@apexmail.com wrote:
>
> > Hacker Crossed Police Wires
> > Suspect Arrested At Scene Of Ambulance Call
> > BURNSVILLE, Minn., 6:13 p.m. CST February 6, 2001
> > -- Police have pulled the plug on a police
> > radio hacker.
>
> A little weak on the details, isn't it? For example, not one
> mention of the suspect's name. I wonder if this guy was a real
> ham, or a guy they just tagged a ham because he used a radio.

Nope, the alleged perp is a licensed ham, licensed for about five
years. He has not yet been formally charged, so there is no mention of
his name in printed news reports, although his name was mentioned on at
least one radio report. This guy has been at it for over a year,
faking "officer down" calls, cross-linking different police and sheriff
services, and similar crap. Technically smart, and has been able to
avoid being located by being mobile -- he got caught because an officer
noticed his vehicle antenna at the scene of a false-alarm ambulance
call. He has reportedly admitted everything to the cops.

73, Hans, K0HB
--
"We are fellow travelers on a journey between two
eternities, and it's a trip far too brief for me
to be concerned about your speed at the Code of
Morse."

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2753. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 17:23:00 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A82D5F4.54E5D6C8@uci.edu>
Source record: 2904

Brian wrote:
> So now one needs to be an expert in scaleology to be able to state that
> the numbers of coded hams are dropping and the number of no-coders is
> increasing.

I don't recall you saying that. And I don't recall having said you
NEEDED to be anything, Brian. Still trying to figure out what, if
anything, you ARE expert at though.

ac6xg

2754. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 17:25:04 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A82D670.908ECF5B@uci.edu>
Source record: 2902

Brian wrote:
> I knew what Len meant. What was your excuse again?

My excuse for what? Len was trying to make a mountain out of a mole hill - as usual.

ac6xg

2755. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 17:27:15 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A82D6F3.1A6411CF@uci.edu>
Source record: 2903

Aaron Jones wrote:
>
> Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote:
> >And now we've got folks who couldn't fix a squeeky wheel if their life
> >depended on it.

> I'll bet even you couldn't fix my TS-870 if certain parts
> in it started squeaking... :-)

I've got a big enough hammer for just about any job. ;-)

ac6xg

2756. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 17:30:22 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <jrj58toqcf4bvm9et8p2d9di3151vme3as@4ax.com>
Source record: 2906

tlbryant@my-deja.com (T. L. Bryant) wrote:
>In article <95t81p$3t9$0@208.207.71.156>, dixie@townsqr.com says...
>
>>At the beginning of Incentive
>>Licensing there were around 4,000 Extra class hams. Ten years later
>>there were ten times that many.
>
>That doesn't prove anything. How many of those Extras weren't even licensed
>when the incentive licensing scheme was put into place

I think that Dick is right. When I got my General in 1959 most hams probably thought like me: Why put in a lot of extra work for an Extra ticket when it didn't get you much extra. But when Incentive Licensing came along, many thousands of hams did go ahead and get their Extra who wouldn't normally have done so without the added frequency incentive. Some like me grumbled about it and some like Dick upgraded. There's no doubt that Dick's method is the best way to go. However the unfairness of the situation doesn't change...

>How many hams dropped out of ham radio altogether because
> the felt the ARRL screwed them?

I remember that lots of hams threatened to quit the ARRL over Incentive Licensing, but only someone with membership data would know if a large number of hams actually did. Ed? I personally don't know of a single ham who actually quit the hobby as a result of Incentive Licensing. Grumbling may be silly, but quitting would be real dumb... :-)

2757. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 17:30:55 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A82D7CF.A40EE0FD@uci.edu>
Source record: 2907

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> Jim Kelley wrote:
> >
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > You couldn't be more wrong, and it is really curious how you managed to
> > > come to that conclusion. There's littlein ham radio I enjoy more than a
> > > CW QSO with a young ham, and his code speed is not an issueat all.
> >
> > Long as he isn't clogging up the band?
> >
> No. As long as he doesn't get down below .25 and cause everyone down
> there to have to stumble over him.

Please explain to me the exact mechanism by which this "stumbling" can
occur?

> Did you miss the point earlier? I can't see authorizing nocoders to
> work CW without any training in code whatver, and that's why. It's
> strange so many of you seem willing to overlook that.

You seem to have forgotten something along the way here Dick. Follow
the thread back a ways and re-read what I have written to you. Read
only what it says. There is no hidden text between any of the lines.
We have been discussing operating at 5 WPM in the lower 25.

Thanks and 73,

Jim AC6XG

2758. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 17:31:42 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <95ul5u$207$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2908

In article <95uj6mjnt0@208.207.71.142>,
Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

> Digital should get its own segment, since digital and W do
> not mix that well. And analog voice should get its own.

Do you feel that CW should be banned from those segments? In the US it currently is authorized on all ham frequencies, except perhaps 219MHz.

Or should we continue the long-standing gentlemens agreement that CW operators use the bottom portions of most bands, even though they legally can operate Morse from the top to bottom of each band. I think it's interesting that most countries, except the US, do not chop the bands up into mode-specific segments, but rather let dynamic "market forces" of the hams themselves determine how much gets "allocated" for each mode.

73, Hans, K0HB
--
"We are fellow travelers on a journey between two
eternities, and it's a trip far too brief for me
to be concerned about your speed at the Code of
Morse."

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2759. Re: Novice CW

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 17:47:29 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010208124729.17535.00002131@nso-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 2910

In article <20010207205007.14968.00001260@ng-ff1.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>>From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
>
>>>> For some reason I can not open this.
>
>>Ditto.
>
>The email he sent wrapped the link onto two lines. If you cut and paste the
>link with the next line, it will work fine.
>
>Maybe you were just being lazy? :-)

I don't think so...tRoll is so wrapped up in his CW thing
that he can't work Internet yet. :-)

The FCC link is an interesting letter in support of Joe Speroni's
proposal. Joe's proposal is found on his own website
www.speroni.com.

didit

2760. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 17:47:29 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010208124729.17535.00002132@nso-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 2911

In article <vxkg6.117$HH5.812673@news.ntplx.net>, "Ed Hare, W1RFI"
<w1rfi@arrl.net> writes:

>Larry Roll K3LT <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote:
>
>> >- . -. ..-. --- ..- .-. --. ..- -.. -... ..- -.. -.. -.--
>
>> Since I never served in the Navy, and have always used the Morse/CW
>> in its aural form, you're gonna have to send this as a .WAV file so I
>> can copy it properly.
>
>Are you really saying that you can't piece that together? :-)

Probably not, Ed, since he can't even Cut and Paste a web
address properly. Maybe it's the early stages of Alzheimers?

I'm not an amateur radio licensee and I decoded

T E N F O U R G U D B U D D Y

just fine. :-)

...how quickly they forget...

didit

2761. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 17:47:30 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010208124730.17535.00002133@nso-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 2909

In article <95rtgj11g4l@enews2.newsguy.com>, tlbryant@my-deja.com (T. L. Bryant) writes:

>> That sure won't be hard to do: I am living evidence that you have no
>>clue as to what you're talking abouit.
>
>Let me get this straight: Are you saying that just because you are happy,
>content, and all hunky-dorey, that there were not other hams who were
>vehement
>about losing priveleges to so-called incentive licensing? If this is the
>case, then you need a serious reality check.

...he couldn't cash it... :-)

didit

2762. Re: Engineers, Technicians, and Appliance Operators

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 17:47:32 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010208124732.17535.00002134@nso-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 2919

In article <95rh4o$99m$1@nnrp1.deja.com>, Steven J Robeson, K4YZ
<k4yz@my-deja.com> writes:

>In article <20010207015601.02997.00001930@nso-mg.aol.com>,
> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
>
>> Supposedly this one-time USMC person evolved into a
>> Purchasing Agent after "burn-out" as a Licensed
>> Practical Nurse in civilian life. We don't know if said
>> Purchasing Agent (his claim) is still employed as a
>> Purchasing Agent. He hasn't identified the company
>> where is is, or was, purchasing things.
>
> I'll be more than glad to relate that information as soon as YOU
>provide (as was requested MONTHS ago) names and other information of
>verifyable sources that can validate YOUR many claims.

Fine, just contact KD6JG or W6MJN and ask them. They don't
know I am using them as references so they aren't prompted by
me. Want some magazine article references? Go to HAM
RADIO magazine indexes (there's at least one web site for them
if you don't have index issues) and read the articles. You might
learn something from them. Note: Check the Masthead for HR
to see if I've been listed as an Associate Editor. You need some
industry experience? Check with personnel departments at
Rocketdyne Division of Boeing (it was of Rockwell International
when I worked there), Teledyne Electronics of Newbury Park,
CA, General Electric Co. past records of RCA Corporation,
Electromagnetic and Aviation Systems Division, Van Nuys, CA,
Hughes Aircraft Co. Missle Systems Division of Canoga Park,
CA, and Hughes Aircraft Co. Aviation Radar Division of El
Segundo, CA, Electro-Optical Systems division of Xerox
Corporation, Pasadena, CA. Since 1956 those corporate
entities have undergone some name and location changes so
be patient. I think John Memmen of Teledyne is SK (?) but
Harry Terraneau should be still alive...both are/were licensed
radio amateurs. Micro-Radionics Inc., of Van Nuys, CA, got
acquired by a succession of larger microwave houses but
Stan Wolf of MRI (long licensed as a ham) was my boss way
back when that was a stand-alone microwave company.

You want patent information? No problem, connect to the old
IBM patent site and do a search for my name. Only one patent
granted. You can also search the Patent Gazeteer for 1974 if
you have access to a printed copy. Want to check academic

records? OK, contact California State University at Northridge (CSUN) or University of California at Los Angeles (UCLA). You can find me listed in the Northwestern directory of the Los Angeles telephone book with the address printed with my HR bylines (anyone trying to telephone-stalk will find Pacific Bell security folks unhelpful). I am in the FCC ULS, by the way, although you keep saying I'm not. :-)

None of the above references I've listed has been created or put there by myself. Those are all third-party references. Such are impossible to forge, exaggerate, or lie about such as with some "personal" web page or vague newsgroup ramblings.

You won't like any of them and respond by "curriculum vitae" whining and bitching plus other sneering noises. :-)

> And more than one person here knows the name of the company...even
>has my corporate addresses and phone numbers. You gonna call and chat,
>Lenni? I'll give you the 800 number if you care.

Why is it so difficult to name one's employer? Company policy against it? If so, why do "more than one person" (outside the company) know it? Do you spend your employer's time "chatting with others" presumably not about company business?

> And by the way, I AM doing both.

"Both what?" Spending company time chatting about personal subjects? Spending company Internet time posting over the Internet? Naughty, naughty... :-)

>Again, unlike you, I saw that
>there were a great many things that I would like to do in my life.

Steebie baby, I've done lots of things in my life but you will never ever say they are good enough...because all you want to do, indeed are obsessed with the subject, is "get back" at someone you feel slighted your royal rank, status in the USARMCC in a newsgroup. :-)

>I may never completely master any one of them, but I will do my best to
>experience as many as I can.

For starters, try to become civil in a newsgroup. I know that is very hard, but you can do it with lots of patient hard work.

> No excuses as to why I didn't do it, other than I didn't do it.
>No "elitists" holding me back, or failed excuses.

Steebie...the main subject of this newsgroup is the Retention or Elimination of the US amateur radio license code test. That subject can be argued on its own and NO ONE need be licensed in order to discuss that part of Part 97, Title 47 CFR.

>> What is more amusing is this person's claim to once
>> being a "commissioned officer" in some state militia,
>> ostensibly as THE radio officer of an entire infantry
>> brigade...which would require at least a major rank.
>
> Acutally, it requires a Captain. But I will pass on that in the
>future the Adjutant General shall call you first before assigning TO.

A Brigade is 4 Battalions. A Battalion is 4 Companies. A
Company is 4 Platoons. A Platoon is 4 Squads of 12 men
each plus two more. A Brigade would have around 3000+
personnel. Only a Captain is THE radio officer of a Brigade?

Not in any Table of Organization of regular Army or National
Guard units I've seen. How is the "E" of TO&E? Still using
horse-mobile tube transceivers or something? :-)

>> When queried on this, said person replied he "had
>> the papers in his wallet." Apparently that is
>> "confirmation" for everyone else.
>
> Of which I offered a copy. You declined. Your loss.

You didn't post the scanned copy of it on your K4YZ
home page as requested along with all your accomplishments.
Gosh, a discharged USMC member who gets a COMMISSION
as a civilian ought to be so proud of that that they shouldn't
hesitate to Tell The World! :-)

How does one get a commission as a member of a state
army unit when they were once medically discharged from
a regular military branch? Is there some Faith Healing we
haven't heard of?

>PLEASE SEND PRIVATE E MAIL COMMENTS TO K4YZ@AOL.COM. RESPSONSES TO THE
>DEJA MAY OR MAY NOT BE RETRIEVED IN A TIMELY FASHION.

Hmmm...apparently the unnamed employer got a bit pissed at
an employee using company Internet facilities? One can only
wonder at that... :-)

didit

2763. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 17:47:33 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010208124733.17535.00002135@nso-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 2913

In article <ljng6.95$05.62647@nntp1.onemain.com>, "Richard McCollum"
<rmccoll@radiks.net> writes:

>If it really disturbs you, you can safely assume that any Technician
>renewal from April thru January is actually a Tech Plus. This crutch is
>about to disappear however.

Now, now, Dick, look at the NEW licensees' numbers. Those
aren't "renewals" from any other class. Want to do that in all
the months before April 15, 2000? :-)

didit

2764. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 17:47:33 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010208124733.17535.00002136@nso-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 2916

In article <95spsvgqf1@nnrp1.deja.com>, Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
writes:

>> the ____ class of license?
>>
>> Dave Heil K8MN
>
>Of course, you assume that all hams, coded and codeless, weigh the same.

Ever since Uncle retired him he is all at sea and wanting to be
"under weigh" or "under way."

Note that Davey put the Technician class in a "blank" form up
there? Looks like a Freudian slip to me...not counting the
non-code-tested as "real hams."

didit

2765. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 17:47:34 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010208124734.17535.00002138@nso-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 2912

In article <95sc4a$3rk$1@nnrp1.deja.com>, Steven J Robeson, K4YZ
<k4yz@my-deja.com> writes:

>In article <3A819251.2B71B488@uci.edu>,
> Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote:
>
>>It's not a smokescreen to point out that what you said contradicted the
>>facts you presented. I can't help it if you didn't say what you meant.
>
> And we're surprised by this...WHY...?!?!

I can't read minds. Even a telepath would have trouble trying
to read four brain cells... :-)

didit

2766. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 17:47:34 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010208124734.17535.00002137@nso-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 2918

In article <95sp3k$g71$1@nnrp1.deja.com>, Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
writes:

>But nothing suprises me anymore. Why just the other day, Dick admitted
>that CW was doomed without the government forced testing. Seems it
>isn't worthwhile enough to learn it on its own merits. After all those
>years of claiming PEEU.

In Dick's case he must have gotten tired of waiting for that
massive Missouri earthquake he read about in a book. Maybe
his "emergency rig" code key oxidized into uselessness
while waiting for it?

Heck, Dick's statement isn't near as bad a tRoll's wanting to
GIVE AWAY amateur radio spectrum to everyone else
because no one will honor and respect his regency. :-)

>I just wish these other guys would come clean and quit the smokescreens
>and diversions.

Oddly enough, a telemarketer called tonight just after supper.
It was a chimney cleaning service soliciting curstomers. I
told them that this newgroup would be good for cleaning and
smoke eliminations. They replied that they weren't big
enough to handle the task... :-)

didit

2767. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 17:47:35 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010208124735.17535.00002140@nso-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 2914

In article <_thg6.109$HH5.794616@news.ntplx.net>, "Ed Hare, W1RFI"
<w1rfi@arrl.net> writes:

>Len Over 21 <lenover21@aol.com> wrote:
>
>> Code-tested licensees are DIMINISHING in number. The
>> trend is there, visible to all except those who wear blinders
>> of old-time CW radio.
>
>> Non-code-tested licensees are INCREASING in number.
>
>Tech+ licensees are being renewed as Tech. They are being counted as
>"non-coded" in the stats you publish.

The SAME trend was happening well before April 15, 2000.

If you wish, I can post stats on NEW licensees for the last
three years. Looks even worse for the code-tested numbers.

didit

2768. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 17:47:35 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010208124735.17535.00002139@nso-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 2917

In article <95sbij$3ad$1@nnrp1.deja.com>, K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org> writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
>
>> Code-tested licensees declined by 9,531 while non-code-tested
>> licensees increased by 13,132
>
>You cannot determine that from the statistics at AH0A.
>
>Some of the "growth" of the Technican class license consists of
>code-tested licensees.
>
>Since the April restructuring of last year, all code-tested
>Tech Plus who renew are being renewed as simply "Technician". Thus
>the "Technician" column now contains roughly 10% (minus attrition
>and upgrades) of licensees from the old "Technician Plus" ranks.

Spin it any way you want, Hans, but OVER THE LAST
THREE YEARS the code-tested licensees are decreasing
in number while the non-code-tested licensees are increasing.

Ed said the same thing as you did so, if you like I can post
NEW licensees' numbers. Still looks bad for code-tested
licensees' numbers...before April 15, 2000, as well as after.

didit

2769. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 17:47:36 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010208124736.17535.00002141@nso-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 2915

In article <3A819251.2B71B488@uci.edu>, Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>
>> Jim Kelley apparently wants to smokescreen the whole thread
>> by concentrating on certain phrases to "prove his point" (which
>> was not really explained except in trying to provoke something
>> about phrase choices. :-)
>
>It's not a smokescreen to point out that what you said contradicted the
>facts you presented. I can't help it if you didn't say what you meant.
>
>jim

Major Kelley, sir, you are just trying to ignite a flame war by
concentration on a trivial phrase of English.

My point was that the non-code-tested US amateur licensees
keep increasing in number while the code-tested US amateur
licensees are decreasing in number.

What is your dispute with that?

didit

2770. Re: Morse Code replacement? Bigtime flame war article!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 17:49:48 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <95um7m$345$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2920

In article <20010207214615.14968.00001276@ng-ff1.aol.com>,
w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:
> >From: n2ey@aol.com
>
> >> I am NOT impressed with the methods being used. To the contrary, I
> >believe
> >> that the anger, the bitterness and the name calling that is being
> >done by some
> >> to "defend" the mode is setting the stage for failure.
>
> >What about the anger, bitterness and name calling on the other side?
>
> I have never seen the other side use anger, bitterness or name
calling to
> defend the mode. :-)

Just to attack it and those who like it and use it.
>
> More seriously, I recall many a conversation with some on the "other"
side
> about their "debating style." Look back a few years to see the
ongoing
> discussions between me and WA6VSE.

You're not the only one who tried to discuss "style" with that one. He
has lots of company.
>
> >> All I see by those who may think they are "defending" Morse code is
> >> posturing and name calling.
>
> >Some of us are trying to combat false information with facts.
>
> I must apologize for not including the words "some of" in front ot
the word
> "those" in my sentence.

No problem.
>
> >> IMHO, taking real steps to get people from 5 wpm
> >> to what you term "journeyman" levels is more valuable than the use
of
> >the term
> >> "bleating cattle" on rrap.
>
> >How about "electronic paintball wars"? ;-)

>
> Yup, I remember giving good ol' Carl a particular hard time about
that one.
> :-)

That was one of the least offensive ones.
>
> >The fun never left. We just need to stop hiding our light under a
> >bushel.
>
> Agreed.

See list below.
>
> >I'll show you my list if you show me yours. ;-)
>
> I readily concede that your list is bigger. Good for you, Jim.

HAH! That's a good one! We gonna compare lobster consumption, too?
You'll win that one, I betcha. (Ayeh!)

But I was only half-joking. I really do want to see any and all lists
on this subject (promoting Morse - the mode, not the test). The ARRL
leadership has done very very little to promote the mode for many
years - now all of a sudden there's this order to do so. Please
understand that these comments come from a longtime member and QST
reader who wants to help, not just take potshots. (I recently filled
some holes in my QST collection - now I'm solid back to October, 1927.
And those are just part of the N2EY radio library).

OK, here are some ideas:

- Bandplans: The ARRL has a "considerate operator's guide", but nowhere
does it say where 5 wpm QSOs may be most easily found. The FISTS
frequencies are not mentioned at all. This is easily fixed.

- QST: The magazine is often a new ham's first contact with the ARRL,
and a resource for all hams. But when was the last time there was a QST
article on any of the following?
+ How to learn the code & how to increase your speed
+ How to adjust a key and send good code
+ Types of keys and advantages/disadvantages of each
+ How to set up a CW station and operate it
+ How to build/buy a good CW setup on a slim budget
+ In-depth product reviews of various Morse training materials and
methods
+ FISTS and other Morse-related organizations and resources

I've seen more QST articles on PSK31 in the past two years than
articles on Morse in the past 20-30 years. Of course the new modes need
to be promoted, but when decades go by with no attention to a popular
mode, there's a problem. Newcomers do not have the ability to easily
dig up articles from 30-40 years ago.

- Other ARRL publications: When I started out, there was an excellent ARRL book called "Understanding Amateur Radio". It cost half the price of a Handbook of the time, (first $2, then $2.50) and it addressed the basics of getting on the air. Some of it was reprints of QST articles that a newcomer would not have seen, but most of it was material intended to teach the basics without a lot of math. There were two versions, then it was dropped. Lots of projects but also lots of plain talk about setting up a station, operating, etc. Such a "junior Handbook" is needed now more than ever. In similar fashion, the fifty cent "Learning The Radiotelegraph Code" booklet needs a new version that doesn't cost too much. Of course the N0HFF book on the MEGS site is excellent, and it's FREE for the downloading. Maybe the ARRL could publish it?

ARRL Website: Some good info, but the list of Morse links is small and many of the best ones are notably absent or buried. Take a look at the Morse links at

http://www.callingcq.org

for some ideas. My favorites are the MEGS site (Morse Enthusiasts Group of Scotland), the AH0A site (for Morse University downloads), Dave Finley's (N1IRZ) explanation of the Koch/Farnsworth method, and of course the FISTS site. Did I find any of them from the ARRL website? Nope.

A link only costs the work to put it on the site, doesn't it?

- Things the BOD can do: It's interesting that the BOD changed the ARRL policy on S25.5 so quickly and so quietly, but that's a done deal. What bothers me is their inaction on further steps. For example, was an ARRL position on RM-10018 even discussed? To me that one is a nobrainer - just DO it! (Widen the "Novice CW bands" to General class size). Another idea is to replace the current mess of "subbands by license class" with "subbands by mode". Say, 35% Morse only, 15% digital, and 50% analog 'phone/image on each of the worldwide amateur only HF/MF ham bands. By law and by treaty, not just by "bandplan". Yes, 40 is a problem, but maybe it can be fixed AND the new subbands put in place at the same time. Why not? This is where the BOD can take the lead.

Learning and using Morse is neither difficult nor time consuming for most people IF the right methods are used. But a new or prospective ham looking at the ARRL website or QST will have a hard time getting info on how to go about it, even though such information is readily available if you know where to look.

And that's just my short list.

73 de Jim, N2EY
--
FISTS #4360
BIT #0001

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2771. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 18:10:45 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <m3o58tos26u9ij5798ihflub6hl8tqc2b9@4ax.com>
Source record: 2921

Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>I'm saying that no one should be allowed on the lower 25kc
>(actually anywhere on the CW segments) unless he has learned to work
>Morse code, and that knowledge tested at licensing.

I'd prefer less Federal regulation not more. Gentleman's agreements have served us well in the past. The lower parts of the bands have always been used mostly for DX and that continues through today. No regulations needed. Ragchewing generally takes place above the 25 KHz line, even the Extras...

>Nocoders mucking around in the CW segments doing what they should
>do with a code practice oscillator and W1AW code practice won't cut it.

The more CW signals heard, even slow speed code practice, the less likely the FCC will see the CW area as unused band space and move the phone line down the band...

> When FCC gets around to repartitioning the bands there should be a
>CW-only segment that requires a CW test to use.

CW use is decreasing as fast as the mortality tables now. Requiring a separate test just to use it would just nail the coffin shut that much faster...

2772. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 18:10:48 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <jun58t0qlmkc9fn8lvjodlug0phbp6f69d@4ax.com>
Source record: 2922

Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>80 meters is probably the most underused band these days.

Agreed. Much less than even 10 years ago...

>go to 40 meters,

It's 10:51am here. There's not one signal to be heard on 40 meters. And I'm in daytime range of Southern California. After the morning skeds, about 10:00am to around 3:00pm daily 40 is usually dead. Not band dead, ham dead. I sometimes set my keyer to repeat CQs and work on other things in the background. Often I go 20 minutes without an answer and finally give up. It wasn't that way even 10 years ago...

>even 30

I seldom used to use this band because it's deader than 40. That's why when I moved I didn't bother to put up an antenna for it...

>or 20

This is where I make most of my daytime contacts. But even 20 is not what it was in the past...

>are much more active.

2773. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 18:12:42 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A82E19A.650DA18D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 2923

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Evolution takes place at its own speed, and pushing and shoving does
> nothing but help to impede it.

We are not discussing Darwin's "Origin of Species". Human knowledge once doubled in a century. It is now doubling every few years. Hams who insist on living in the past will be buried in the sands of time.

> Well OB you can invest your remaining *time* in attempting to make
> *time* stand still so you can hope to garner more *time* for yourself.
> I plan to use mine more constructively.

How, by advocating another Dark Ages?
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2774. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 18:15:44 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A82E250.7A2D2426@IEEE.org>
Source record: 2924

"T. L. Bryant" wrote:
> Who, in their right mind, would even try to work CW if they had no knowlege of
> code whatsoever?

Apparently everyone on Dick's home planet.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2775. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 18:20:39 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A82E377.6D3495E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 2928

Dick Carroll wrote:
> That's what I always called my voice transmitting transducer.

You mean the one that came free with the transceiver VS the
$80 Bencher key? :-)
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2776. Re: Morse Code replacement? Bigtime flame war article!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 18:21:31 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <95uo2u$4v1$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2927

In article <95um7m$345$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
n2ey@aol.com wrote:
>
> And that's just my short list.
>

I like all those ideas, Jim, except the one about publicizing the Fists freqs. I've abandoned any operations anywhere near xx.058, because once a Fists member "collects your number", the contact usually comes to a quick conclusion.

73, Hans, K0HB
Fists # 7419 (I think)

--
"We are fellow travelers on a journey between two eternities, and it's a trip far too brief for me to be concerned about your speed at the Code of Morse."

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2777. Re: ARRL HQ "Attitude" (Was: Re: Pride)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 18:27:13 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010208132713.09475.00001783@nso-fj.aol.com>
Source record: 2925

In article <71zg6.129$HH5.863162@news.ntplx.net>, "Ed Hare, W1RFI"
<w1rfi@arrl.net> writes:

>I believe you, Larry, but I am curious -- how many was it? You made a
>pretty power blanket condemnation of a group of people and I am just
>wondering about your sample size.

...I think he is suffering "sample size envy"... :-)

didit

2778. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 18:27:13 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010208132713.09475.00001784@nso-fj.aol.com>
Source record: 2926

In article <3A82D670.908ECF5B@uci.edu>, Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> writes:

>Brian wrote:
>> I knew what Len meant. What was your excuse again?
>
>My excuse for what? Len was trying to make a mountain out of a mole
>hill - as usual.
>
>ac6xg

You were looking for an excuse...and nit-picked a single phrase
for a "critique" that was not on the subject.

Apparently you don't want to believe that code-tested US radio
amateurs are decreasing in number while non-code-tested
US radio amateurs are increasing in number. That trend has
been going on for years.

The "molehill" is getting bigger, bigger, bigger. The "mountain"
is eroding faster and faster. Closing one's eyes or mind won't
reverse any trend.

didit

2779. Re: Engineers, Technicians, and Appliance Operators

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 18:38:39 UTC
From: "Steven J Robeson", K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <95up3e$5p7$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2929

In article <20010208124732.17535.00002134@nso-fy.aol.com>,
lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:

Most of rehashed "see what a hero I am" tripe trashed. I wrote 2
paragraphs....Lennie wrote a novella.

> How does one get a commission as a member of a state
> army unit when they were once medically discharged from
> a regular military branch? Is there some Faith Healing we
> haven't heard of?

Waivers, Lennie. Waivers. When you have something to offer they
want to use, they are glad to accomodate your needs.

>>PLEASE SEND PRIVATE E MAIL COMMENTS TO K4YZ@AOL.COM. RESPSONSES TO
>>THE DEJA MAY OR MAY NOT BE RETRIEVED IN A TIMELY FASHION.

> Hmmm...apparently the unnamed employer got a bit pissed at
> an employee using company Internet facilities? One can only
> wonder at that...

Why should the "unnamed employer" be concerned over a Deja mail
account, Lennie?

Nice try. Failed again.

Now back to your Geritol.

--
"It Could Be That Your Life's Only Meaning Is To Serve As A Warning To
Others Of How Bad It Could REALLY Be!"

PLEASE SEND PRIVATE E MAIL COMMENTS TO K4YZ@AOL.COM. RESPSONSES TO THE
DEJA MAY OR MAY NOT BE RETRIEVED IN A TIMELY FASHION.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2780. Re: Engineers, Technicians, and Appliance Operators

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 18:43:57 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <95upda$66n$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2930

In article <20010207015601.02997.00001930@nso-mg.aol.com>,
lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:

> He hasn't identified the company
> where is is, or was, purchasing things. :-)

Three minutes of superficial detective work suggests the company
probably is:

Antec Corporation
11450 Technology Circle
Duluth, GA 30097
US

I see their stock is slipping since November when Bob Stanzione
announced a suspension in product shipments to their largest customer,
AT&T Broadband. Now trading around $10, after a high of $61.25 last
spring.

73, de Hans, K0HB

--
"We are fellow travelers on a journey between two
eternities, and it's a trip far too brief for me
to be concerned about your speed at the Code of
Morse."

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2781. Re: Engineers, Technicians, and Appliance Operators

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 19:07:23 UTC
From: "Steven J Robeson", K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <95uqp2$7fn$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2933

In article <20010208124732.17535.00002134@nso-fy.aol.com>,
lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:

> > And by the way, I AM doing both.
>
> "Both what?" Spending company time chatting about personal
> subjects? Spending company Internet time posting over the
> Internet? Naughty, naughty...

Working here AND nursing, Lennie. Not that I needed to tell you.

> Steebie baby, I've done lots of things in my life but you will
> never ever say they are good enough...because all you want
> to do, indeed are obsessed with the subject, is "get back" at
> someone you feel slighted your royal rank, status in the
> USARMCC in a newsgroup.

No one here has "sleighted" me, Lennie, least of all you. You
don't have the credentials nor the means to do so.

Be insulting and demeaning..?!?! THAT you can do. But you do
that to EVERYONE, so I am hardly special or priviledged.

As for the usual "rank/status" comments, well, you go on thinking
that, Lennie.

>>I may never completely master any one of them, but I will do my best
>>to experience as many as I can.
>
> For starters, try to become civil in a newsgroup. I know that is
> very hard, but you can do it with lots of patient hard work.

Since you are unable to accept culpability for your own lack of
civility and your frequently repeated lies, I doubt that you will find
anything I have to offer as it pertains to you as "civil"

Of course, you never acknowledge the "non-controversial" posts in
kind...only the one's where you find the opportunity to reignite the
flamewars.

>>No excuses as to why I didn't do it, other than I didn't do it.
>>No "elitists" holding me back, or failed excuses.
>
> Steebie...the main subject of this newsgroup is the Retention
> or Elimination of the US amateur radio license code test. That
> subject can be argued on its own and NO ONE need be licensed
> in order to discuss that part of Part 97, Title 47 CFR.

No...the main WHINE by a small subset of this newsgroup is about code retention/elimination. You are, as previously cited, it's center stage jester.

> A Brigade is 4 Battalions. A Battalion is 4 Companies. A
> Company is 4 Platoons. A Platoon is 4 Squads of 12 men
> each plus two more. A Brigade would have around 3000+
> personnel. Only a Captain is THE radio officer of a Brigade?

When in cadre status, yes.

> Not in any Table of Organization of regular Army or National
> Guard units I've seen. How is the "E" of TO&E? Still using
> horse-mobile tube transceivers or something?

I am sure you wish. Too bad for you they AREN'T using a technology you MIGHT be competent with. Time moved on...isn't it time YOU did?

--
"It Could Be That Your Life's Only Meaning Is To Serve As A Warning To Others Of How Bad It Could REALLY Be!"

PLEASE SEND PRIVATE E MAIL COMMENTS TO K4YZ@AOL.COM. RESPSONSES TO THE DEJA MAY OR MAY NOT BE RETRIEVED IN A TIMELY FASHION.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2782. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 19:08:48 UTC
From: "Steven J Robeson", K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <95uqrn$7hc$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2932

In article <20010208124735.17535.00002140@nso-fy.aol.com>,
lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:

> If you wish, I can post stats on NEW licensees for the last
> three years. Looks even worse for the code-tested numbers.

If that was ALL you posted, it might. But then again it doesn't
reflect the true CURRENT status of thier licneses, now does it?

--
"It Could Be That Your Life's Only Meaning Is To Serve As A Warning To
Others Of How Bad It Could REALLY Be!"

PLEASE SEND PRIVATE E MAIL COMMENTS TO K4YZ@AOL.COM. RESPSONSES TO THE
DEJA MAY OR MAY NOT BE RETRIEVED IN A TIMELY FASHION.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2783. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 19:10:44 UTC
From: "Steven J Robeson", K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <95uqva$7rn$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2934

In article <20010208124733.17535.00002135@nso-fy.aol.com>,
lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:

> Now, now, Dick, look at the NEW licensees' numbers. Those
> aren't "renewals" from any other class. Want to do that in all
> the months before April 15, 2000? :-)

Lennnie again attempts to narrow the scope of the numbers to ONLY
new licensees, and NOT the CURRENT status of those licensees.

Boohoo for Lennie. He's as transparent as glass.

--
"It Could Be That Your Life's Only Meaning Is To Serve As A Warning To
Others Of How Bad It Could REALLY Be!"

PLEASE SEND PRIVATE E MAIL COMMENTS TO K4YZ@AOL.COM. RESPSONSES TO THE
DEJA MAY OR MAY NOT BE RETRIEVED IN A TIMELY FASHION.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2784. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 19:11:38 UTC
From: "Steven J Robeson", K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <95ur10$7sk$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2931

In article <20010208124735.17535.00002139@nso-fy.aol.com>,
lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:

> Ed said the same thing as you did so, if you like I can post
> NEW licensees' numbers. Still looks bad for code-tested
> licensees' numbers...before April 15, 2000, as well as after.

Still on the same spin...still wrong.

--
"It Could Be That Your Life's Only Meaning Is To Serve As A Warning To
Others Of How Bad It Could REALLY Be!"

PLEASE SEND PRIVATE E MAIL COMMENTS TO K4YZ@AOL.COM. RESPSONSES TO THE
DEJA MAY OR MAY NOT BE RETRIEVED IN A TIMELY FASHION.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2785. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 20:02:37 UTC
From: tlbryant@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <95uu0t01o9l@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 2939

In article <95uik9$v4p$1@nnrp1.deja.com>, K0HB@arrl.org says...
>
>In article <95udod21600@enews2.newsguy.com>,
> tlbryant@my-deja.com (T. L. Bryant) wrote:
>
>> Who, in their right mind, would even try to work CW if they had no
>knowlege of
>> code whatsoever?
>
>I guess we all did, originally. Never heard of anyone born with their
>brain already hardwired with Morse.
>
>73, Hans, K0HB

I never heard of anyone like that either. However, I think it would be more accurate to say that most hams originally learned what each pattern of dits and duhs meant before attempting to communicate with such an encoding scheme.

2786. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 20:07:59 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A82FC9F.1A7319E5@uci.edu>
Source record: 2936

Len Over 21 wrote:
> Apparently you don't want to believe that code-tested US radio
> amateurs are decreasing in number while non-code-tested
> US radio amateurs are increasing in number.

I know you're not stupid, Len, so the only thing I can conclude about why you would say something which is totally inaccurate is because you're so mad at me that you can't think of anything logical to say. I never disputed your figures. You did.

2787. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 20:13:23 UTC
From: tlbryant@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <95uul311o9l@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 2940

In article <95uk1r$l3i$3@208.207.71.142>, dixie@townsqr.com says...

>> Who, in their right mind, would even try to work CW if they had no knowlege
of
>> code whatsoever?
>
>
>Who indeed???? "Just as long as I don't have to pass a hazing-ritual
>test".

Been there, done that.

2788. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 20:13:38 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A82FDF2.B5757C6A@uci.edu>
Source record: 2937

Len Over 21 wrote:
> My point was that the non-code-tested US amateur licensees
> keep increasing in number while the code-tested US amateur
> licensees are decreasing in number.

I have no problem with the data. I was simply correcting your poor
assessment of the data - as have others, albeit for differing reasons.

2789. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 20:28:49 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A830181.A205884@uci.edu>
Source record: 2938

Dick Carroll wrote:
> No. As long as he doesn't get down below .25 and cause everyone down
> there to have to stumble over him.

You just got done saying that his code speed made "no difference at all". Now that turns into "well, whether his code speed matters or not is a function of frequency." Evidently below .25 it's disasterous, and above .25 it's utterly inconsequential. I work above and below .25, and my radio works the same on either side of your demarcation line.

> Did you miss the point earlier? I can't see authorizing nocoders to
> work CW without any training in code whatver, and that's why.

Yes, I did miss that. Did you mention it earlier in our correspondence? Pray tell where?

73 de ac6xg

2790. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 20:54:16 UTC
From: K0HB@qwest.net
Message-ID: <95v11o$3l9$1@news.netmar.com>
Source record: 2935

In article <3A82E377.6D3495E@IEEE.org>, Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
writes:

> VS the $80 Bencher key? :-)

Even the cheapest "fly apart in your hand" Bencher is now $95.00!

At a minimum, get a Kent.

73, Hans, K0HB

----- Posted via NewsOne.Net: Free (anonymous) Usenet News via the Web -----
http://newsone.net/ -- Free reading and anonymous posting to 60,000+ groups
NewsOne.Net prohibits users from posting spam. If this or other posts
made through NewsOne.Net violate posting guidelines, email abuse@newsone.net

2791. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 20:56:59 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A83081B.9F706174@uci.edu>
Source record: 2941

Cecil wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Ah, so now because engineers aren't required to know Morse code is
> > reason enough for hams to not know it either. Pure logic, we see.
>
> Is anybody except hams required to know Morse code in the 21st century?

The guy who programs the Nokia cell phones and the police repeaters
prolly has to know it.

2792. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 21:02:00 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <UQDg6.133$HH5.885202@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 2942

Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

> > > Not the point, nor should it be. The point is the availability of more
> > > communications assets.

> > Would you recommend a rules change that requires that hams are required to
> > have a specific number of communications assets available at their stations,
> > then? If that really is your goal, that would be a much more certain way of
> > accomplishing it. How many communications modes would you propose be
> > required?

> Come on, Ed, surely you know more about the ARS than that. The day when
> regulators can convince themselves that we have no value as a real
> operational communications asset is the day when our allocations are on
> the market for sure.

So your point is stated as being the availability of more communications assets, but you don't think that anything other than retaining proficiency testing for one of many many modes available to amateurs should be done about it?

Do you think that retaining code testing is a good way to convince regulators that Amateur Radio has value as a real communications asset is the best way to do that? Can you cite any statements by any FCC staff that support your conclusion?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2793. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 21:06:02 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <FUDg6.134$HH5.885356@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 2943

Larry Roll K3LT <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote:

> >> Hmmm. Just what *are* the "contributions" of these newly
> >> licensed hams you're talking about? Specifics, please -- include
> >> any relevant documentation -- news articles, media releases,
> >> etc.

> As well you should be. My own standard of what would be a
> significant "contribution" to the ARS would not come close to
> requiring the publication of an article in QST. Or 73, even!

Why did you require that the poster support his contention that some new hams would be making contributions by citing news articles or media releases? If you don't even require a QST article to demonstrate a contribution, don't you think it a bit extreme that you will only accept proof that makes the news.

> As far as I'm concerned, you could have rested on your laurels permanently
> after publishing your first article, but you didn't. I wish we had
> more hams like you, and no more of the kind we're getting with
> the dumbing-down of licensing requirements.

Yes, but I wasn't born this way, Larry; my first 2 decades as a ham (or as an expired ham) contained no contributions whatsoever. And the accomplishement I have done since then were NOT the result of the tests I took. And I gotta' tell ya', Larry; when I was a 14 year old General, I was as dumbed down as they come.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2794. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 21:09:24 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A830B04.B6473FDA@IEEE.org>
Source record: 2944

"Ed Hare, W1RFI" wrote:
> And I gotta' tell ya', Larry; when I was a 14 year old General, I was
> as dumbed down as they come.

And when I was a 14 year old dumbed down General, you were
even dumber than me. :-)
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2795. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 22:10:05 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <95v5fogsj1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2947

In article <20010204002041.18047.00001243@nso-ff.aol.com>,
lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
> Firecracker Material (courtesy of AH0A statistics on US ham licenses)-
>
> In the 9 months following US amateur radio restructuring, the
> total number of US amateur radio licenses increased by
> 3,701 (+0.55% of total). Code-tested licensees declined by
> 9,531 while non-code-tested licensees increased by 13,132.

(Rest snipped for brevity)

The above analysis is not correct.

The period being analyzed is April of 2000 to December of 2000. The relevant numbers are as follows:

April 2000
Total ARS: 678,539 Technicians: 205,857 All others: 472,682

December 2000
Total ARS: 682,240 Technicians: 218,989 All others: 463,251

This works out to the following changes:

Total ARS: +3,701 Technicians: +13,132 All others: -9,431

However, all is not as simple as it appears. As part of the restructuring changes, Technician Plus licenses will be renewed as Technicians. So the above apparent gain of 13,132 is inflated by such renewals, as is the apparent loss of 9,431 in the other classes.

Let's see how big this error really is. Looking at the renewal data on the Speroni site, we see that the number of Tech and Tech Plus renewals over the nine month period was 4,870. Because the FCC will not process renewals until the license is close to expiring, almost all of these 4,870 are Tech Pluses being renewed as Technicians. A fair estimate would be that about 4,700 of them were such renewals.

So the above numbers must be adjusted, because "Technicians" includes both code-tested and non-code-tested licensees. Doing the math, we get:

December 2000
Total ARS: 682,240 "noncodetested": 214,289 "codetested": 467,951

This works out to the following changes:

Total ARS: +3,701 "noncodetested": +8,432 "codetested": -4,731

Quite a difference from the earlier numbers, but it's still clear that the noncodetested numbers are growing while the codetested are shrinking. In round numbeers, the "noncodetested" are gaining at the rate of 937 per month and the "codetested" are shrinking at the rate of 525 per month.

But even THAT's not a complete or correct analysis.

All of the "codetested" licenses are, and have been, experiencing losses due to expirations - but none of the "noncodetested" licenses have expired. This situation will change in a week or so, however.

Suppose that the annual rate of expirations of "noncodetested" licenses is just 5%. Based on 215,000 licensees, that works out to 10,075 expirations per year, or about 840 per month. So the gain of 937 per month shrinks to just 97 per month IF a 5% annual dropout rate is correct.

In other words, the trend is not nearly so dramatic as was originally presented.

More important, however, is the simple fact that it is far too early to even guess at the long-term impact of the restructuring. It is also interesting that the January 2001 figures were not included. And it is to be expected that the easiest-to-get license will have large numbers of licensees.

73 de Jim, N2EY
--
FISTS #4360
BIT #0001

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2796. Re: Nomination for Troll of the month. Re: West Virginia farm boy comes of age

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 22:14:39 UTC
From: offbreed@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <95v5o9$h7v$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2946
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <3A82AC06.E2F9638A@some.net>,
JR <jr@some.net> wrote:
> kc8jbo = cber

Also equals pathetic twit. Good thing for him he avoids alt flame. They
like easy meat like him.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2797. Re: I heard a CB'er on 20 meters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 22:18:56 UTC
From: Kevin Alfred Strom <kevin.strom@innocent.com>
Message-ID: <3A831B50.E4EB68FA@innocent.com>
Source record: 2945
Cross-posted to:
alt.discrimination,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner

"QSL" as a synonym for "yes," or "message received" is very old,
perhaps almost as old as amateur radio itself.

But "contact," meaning "I want to contact you" is quite new, less
than a decade of commonplace use I think. I think it migrated to
amateur radio from the Citizen's Band, though I don't know if it
originated there, and I welcome corrections if I'm wrong. All I know
for certain is that it was almost never heard on the HF amateur
bands from 1968 (when I started listening) until the 1990s.

Personally, I feel that "contact" when used with that meaning is
outside the amateur tradition and also outside good English usage,
so I don't utilize it. The traditional amateur term is "break."

With all good wishes,

Kevin, WB4AIO.
--

Kevin Alfred Strom.

News, links, and pictures: http://www.kevin-strom.com

2798. Re: Nomination for Troll of the month. Re: West Virginia farm boy comes of age

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 22:39:13 UTC
From: KC8JBO <roger_kc8jbo@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <95v76hicb1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2948
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.test

```
In article <3A82AC1A.83CC1A8A@some.net>,
JR <jr@some.net> wrote:
> jr = childmolester
>
> KC8JBO wrote:
>
> > INBRED <offbreed@my-deja.com> whined in message
> > news:95toh5$980$1@nnrp1.deja.com...
> > > In article <95stt0$k8t$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
> > > KC8JBO <roger_kc8jbo@my-deja.com> wrote:
> > > >
> > > > No, but you've seen the head of your daddy's dick before haven't
> > you?
> > >
> > > How did a CB'r ever get a Ham license?
> >
> > How did a half-breed simian-human hybrid such as offbreed/inbred
get a
> > computer?
> >
> > --
> > 73 de Roger, KC8JBO
> > EM99 |ARRL|VE [ARRL & W5YI]|ARES |RACES
> > Yaesu FT-920 |Inverted Vee @ 40 ft.
> > Yaesu FT-90R
> >
> > Sent via Deja.com
> > http://www.deja.com/
>
>

--
73 de Roger, KC8JBO
EM99 |ARRL|VE [ARRL & W5YI]|ARES |RACES
Yaesu FT-920 |Inverted Vee @ 40 ft.
Yaesu FT-90R

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/
```

2799. Re: Nomination for Troll of the month. Re: West Virginia farm boy comes of age

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 22:40:16 UTC
From: KC8JBO <roger_kc8jbo@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <95v78f$ie8$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2949
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

```
In article <3A82AC06.E2F9638A@some.net>,
JR <jr@some.net> wrote:
> jr = cocksucker
>
> offbreed@my-deja.com wrote:
>
> > In article <95stt0$k8t$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
> > KC8JBO <roger_kc8jbo@my-deja.com> wrote:
> > >
> > > No, but you've seen the head of your daddy's dick before haven't
you?
> >
> > How did a CB'r ever get a Ham license?
> >
> > Sent via Deja.com
> > http://www.deja.com/
>
>

--
73 de Roger, KC8JBO
EM99 |ARRL|VE [ARRL & W5YI]|ARES |RACES
Yaesu FT-920 |Inverted Vee @ 40 ft.
Yaesu FT-90R

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/
```

2800. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 23:05:05 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <95v8mtjmt1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 2950

In article <3A82D5F4.54E5D6C8@uci.edu>,
Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote:
> Brian wrote:
> > So now one needs to be an expert in scaleology to be able to state
that
> > the numbers of coded hams are dropping and the number of no-coders
is
> > increasing.
>
> I don't recall you saying that.

That seemed to be your entire point. If it wasn't then your message was
pointless.

> And I don't recall having said you NEEDED to be anything, Brian.

What exactly are you trying to be, Jim?

> Still trying to figure out what, if
> anything, you ARE expert at though.

The greatest hobby in the world - the one everyone talks about!

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2801. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 23:09:33 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <95v8v9jps1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 3051

In article <3A82D670.908ECF5B@uci.edu>,
Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote:
> Brian wrote:
> > I knew what Len meant. What was your excuse again?
>
> My excuse for what? Len was trying to make a mountain out of a mole
> hill - as usual.

If what you say is true, then most everyone would see that and your
comments would be completely unnecessary. But instead, you chose to
define scaleology as if you worked for the dept of weights and measures.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2802. Nomination for FUCKHEAD of the month: Half, er offbreed!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 23:11:06 UTC
From: KC8JBO <roger_kc8jbo@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <95v925jsq1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 3053
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.test

INBREED <offbreed@my-deja.com> cumgargled in message news:95v5o9
$h7v$1@nnrp1.deja.com...
> In article <3A82AC06.E2F9638A@some.net>,
> JR <jr@some.net> wrote:
> > offbreed = goat-cum-swallower
>
> Also equals pathetic twit. Good thing for me I avoids alt
fellate.preteen.boys. I like easy meat like that.

Heh. Indeeeeeeeed.

BTW, maybe I *do* lurk down at
alt.flame.....BWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA!!!!! Or maybe not....
<snicker>

<Space reserved for mewling shitbag half/offbreed/beatoff to
sputter up another LAMEassed response>

--
73 de Roger, KC8JBO
EM99 |ARRL|VE [ARRL & W5YI]|ARES |RACES
Yaesu FT-920 |Inverted Vee @ 40 ft.
Yaesu FT-90R

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2803. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 23:11:23 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <95v92m$jt2$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 3052

In article <20010208124736.17535.00002141@nso-fy.aol.com>,
lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
> In article <3A819251.2B71B488@uci.edu>, Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
writes:
>
> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >
> >> Jim Kelley apparently wants to smokescreen the whole thread
> >> by concentrating on certain phrases to "prove his point" (which
> >> was not really explained except in trying to provoke something
> >> about phrase choices. :-)
> >
> >It's not a smokescreen to point out that what you said contradicted
the
> >facts you presented. I can't help it if you didn't say what you
meant.
> >
> >jim
>
> Major Kelley, sir, you are just trying to ignite a flame war by
> concentration on a trivial phrase of English.
>
> My point was that the non-code-tested US amateur licensees
> keep increasing in number while the code-tested US amateur
> licensees are decreasing in number.
>
> What is your dispute with that?
>
> didit

Since he cannot readily dispute that, he focuses on balance scales.
Anything to be disagreeable.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2804. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 23:17:38 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <95v9ec$k8n$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 3055

In article <20010208124734.17535.00002137@nso-fy.aol.com>,
lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
> In article <95sp3k$g71$1@nnrp1.deja.com>, Brian
<brianburke@my-deja.com>
> writes:
>
> >But nothing suprises me anymore. Why just the other day, Dick
admitted
> >that CW was doomed without the government forced testing. Seems it
> >isn't worthwhile enough to learn it on its own merits. After all
those
> >years of claiming PEEU.
>
> In Dick's case he must have gotten tired of waiting for that
> massive Missouri earthquake he read about in a book. Maybe
> his "emergency rig" code key oxidized into uselessness
> while waiting for it?

While I was in Korea or Guam, I recall hearing on the news that some
egghead predicted the New Madrid fault would jump again.
Meanwhile, Shirley MacClaine held hands with spiritual guides as they
looked to the East and focused on preventing the quake.

Good thing Dick was ready cause I don't have much faith in Shirley.

> Heck, Dick's statement isn't near as bad a tRoll's wanting to
> GIVE AWAY amateur radio spectrum to everyone else
> because no one will honor and respect his regency. :-)

Ditto Bruce/WA8ULX wanting to destroy the ARS because restructuring
didn't go his way.

>
> >I just wish these other guys would come clean and quit the
smokescreens
> >and diversions.
>
> Oddly enough, a telemarketer called tonight just after supper.
> It was a chimney cleaning service soliciting curstomers. I
> told them that this newgroup would be good for cleaning and
> smoke eliminations. They replied that they weren't big
> enough to handle the task... :-)
>
> didit

We've got enough hot air to float the Hindenberg.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2805. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 23:22:12 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <95v9mtkjf1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 3056

In article <20010208124733.17535.00002136@nso-fy.aol.com>,
lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
> In article <95spsvgqf1@nnrp1.deja.com>, Brian
<brianburke@my-deja.com>
> writes:
>
> >> the ____ class of license?
> >>
> >> Dave Heil K8MN
> >
> >Of course, you assume that all hams, coded and codeless, weigh the
same.
>
> Ever since Uncle retired him he is all at sea and wanting to be
> "under weigh" or "under way."
>
> Note that Davey put the Technician class in a "blank" form up
> there? Looks like a Freudian slip to me...not counting the
> non-code-tested as "real hams."
>
> didit

I missed the retirement announcement. Congratulations Dave!

I miss the Air Force. Many of the civilians I've worked around since
leaving the service care about nothing but themselves. Its a wonder
we're even still the USA.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2806. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 23:25:04 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A832AD0.FBDEA93C@uci.edu>
Source record: 3054

W1RFI wrote:

> What percentage of Morse-code communications do you believe is accomplished
> with only a simple RF generator on-off keyed?

100% of the ones that send bweeeeeeeee bweep bweeeeeeee bweep
bweeeeeee bweeeeeeee bweep bweeeeeeee

:-)

ac6xg

2807. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 23:30:14 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010208183014.21807.00000071@ng-cr1.aol.com>
Source record: 3057

>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)

>The "molehill" is getting bigger, bigger, bigger. The "mountain"
>is eroding faster and faster. Closing one's eyes or mind won't
>reverse any trend.

I don't see that the changes in either direction have been anything like "fast." If we factor out the Tech/Tech+ licencees, the number of General, Advanced, Extra and Novices have actually increased slightly since 1997. I don't see any significance to the percentages of increase or decrease of either the code-tested or non-code-tested hams. To date, the changes have been relatively minor.

What will tell, IMHO, is the attrition rate of the no-code Techs that come up for renewal soon. My speculation is that about 60% of them will not renew.

Lobster anyone? :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2808. Re: I heard a CB'er on 20 meters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 23:31:48 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <95va94kse1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 3059

In article <20010207211038.14968.00001267@ng-ff1.aol.com>,
w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:
> >From: Dan/W4NTI w4nti@my-deja.com
>
> >Congratulations you figured it out....to continue.....more
enforcement
> >that then forces the FCC to decide to terminate ham radio because it
is
> >out of control.
>
> Can you offer any examples of other Services for which the FCC took
the action
> you describe?
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
>
No Ed I can't. But that in itself does not make my theory incorrect.
Can you show me any proof that my theory is full of crap? No, you
can't.

I do not trust the US Government one little bit. If you do, good luck.

Dan/W4NTI

--
"Just tellin the truth, and they cain't stand it."

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2809. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 23:36:09 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010208183609.21807.00000072@ng-cr1.aol.com>
Source record: 3058

>From: Aaron Jones nomail@nomail.com

>Unless you intend to leave out the lay people, it is unrealistic to
>believe that average hams can keep up with current technology to the
>extent that they can advance the state of the art, or be of any value
>to the military. And if they can't do those things, what good are they
>to the government (as they once were)...

I don't think the number of hams who advance the state of the art has ever been very high. But the number of hams today who have a fundamental grasp of modern communications technology is smaller than it was in years past, IMHO.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2810. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 23:42:21 UTC
From: Bob Wex w2ilp <w2ilp@juno.com>
Message-ID: <95vassljr1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 3060

In article <95rvsr$n6u$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org> wrote:
> In article <95rv7q$mi7$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
> Bob Wex w2ilp <w2ilp@juno.com> wrote:
>
> > How are we proving that real hams must be "abreast of science" by
> > reducing technical requirements for Extra class.
>
> Which "technical requirements for Extra class" have been reduced?

The technical requirements for the old Advanced Class as well as the
old Extra Class have been folded into the new Extra Class exam, thus
reducing the number of tiotal questions and thus subjects that may be
covered. There are no additional questions that are even at the level
of the old Technician Class with regard to RF radiation hazard
evaluation. No tables that refer to same are given to exam applicants.

Hans, are you a VE? have you had access to the present exams as well
as former exams?
>
> Answer: None.

Answer: You speak out of ignorance and misinformation Hans. Perhaps
you mean well and deserve to be excused but regardless you show your
ignorance.

>
> If you can't debate the issues on facts, I suppose it's OK for
> you to make up arguments to suit your agenda, but of course
> you risk being exposed as an insubstantial pompous windbag.
>
> Blow on, Robert.

I have the facts. I have the software that generates the present and
the old exams. What do you have?

> 73, de Hans, K0HB
> --
> "We are fellow travelers on a journey between two
> eternities, and it's a trip far too brief for me
> to be concerned about your speed at the Code of
> Morse."

I dunno what your Morse speed is, but me thinks that whatever clocks
your brain waves is probably kinda of slow.

Respectful 73,
Hams need MORE license classes.

We do not choose to be guardians of the gate,
but there is no one else.
--Lyndon Baines Johnson (1964)--

Hams are totally responsible for the future of
Ham Radio. Not the ARRL; Not the FCC; But
Hams themselves. Unfortionatly the average
Ham is an old timer, unwilling to accept the
challenges of modern technologies, the cultural
changes of our nation, or the educational needs
of our people...He or she is only able to debate
the relative obsolence of Morse code.
--w2ilp--

Bob Wex w2ilp (Ignoring Licensing Posts?)

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2811. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 23:54:23 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010208185423.21807.00000073@ng-cr1.aol.com>
Source record: 3061

>From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

>> Riley Hollingsworth has been telling hams that we should not let Amateur
>> Radio become obsolete under our watch. What do you think he means by
>> that and why do you think he is saying that to his fellow hams?

> ED just what are you saying?

I asked first. :-) And Hollingsworth said it. What do you think he means?
Why do you think he is telling us that?

>I already know, and have known for a long
>time, how a digitized signal process works, where it samples an analog
>wave, digitizes it and later reconstitutes it as analog once again, sans
>noise.

How is it processed in between the digitizing and the D/A conversion? By what
mechanism would the noise be removed?

>That's not new, nor is understanding the process equivalent to
>rocket science.

Do you think you could pass a multiple-choice test on this technology?

>BUT--- if, like Cecil, you're telling me that Riley and his buddy Dale
>Hatfield insist that I and any serious percentage of ham radio licensees
>must become digital designers just to assure the survival of the ARS,
>you might as well go ahead and pass the word to them that they can begin
>the Big Shutdown anytime now.

I don't recall iether of them saying any such thing. Can you supply a quote?
They are both telling Amateur Radio, each in their own way, that Amateur Radio
needs to modernize. Why do you think they are saying that? My interpretation
is not that all hams need to become design engineers, but that hams should be
making use of modern radio communications techniques within the Service.

I also believe that individual hams should have the same relative grasp of the
communications techniques of today as our counterparts had in the 20s, 30s,
40s, 50s and 60s. In 1964, when I was a General, I was not the brightest ham
in the Service, but if I had taken the covers off of a commercial transmitter
of the day, I would have understood, at a block level, what I was seeing. How
many hams can say that today? When Amateur Radio first came into official
existence, it was virtually synonymous with the commercial radio of the day.
Do you think it would have been permitted back after WW2 if it was not still
relevant to the technology of the 1940s? can see many ways that the relevance
of Amateur Radio to technology has been important to us over the years. I
believe that such relevance is more important to us today than ever, with

Amateur Radio facing spectrum pressures that are greater than ever before.

> I for one am damn tired of being told what we "must" do to insure ham
>radio's survival, all the while the written tests are made dead-easy to
>pass without any effective learning of the material being absorbed by
>the entrant. And that's not just my opinion, rather dead on fact as
>evidenced by so many so clueless who aren't even bashful about admitting
>it publicly.

I have seen one admit it publically on this forum, Dick. I agree that changes need to be made to the tests, but I disagree that they are as useless as you imply. They are certainly, IMHO, just as valuable as that 16-page General study guide I studied in 1964.

> The whole situation looks more and more like a scheme to ease us out of
>our most commercially valuable spectrum segments, and that is something
>that I consider to be inevitable anyway.
You may be right; I am sometimes amazed that Amateur Radio has fared so well over the past years. But I don't believe that the FCC is scheming to take our spectrum away; they would not need to do so -- they have that authority any time they believe that Amateur Radio is not making as good a use of spectrum as others might.

>They WILL be taken from us as commercial demand for them
> reaches critical mass, as has always been
>done, and logically so.

All amateur spectrum is shared, with our sharing partners ranging from the military to radiolocation to unlicensed users. The trick is in finding compatibile sharing partners.

> But with hams having become so dumbed down
>they'll have the perfect rejoinder to our protestations- "We told you
>if you'all didn't become rocket scientists you'd lose frequencies...."

Again, I would love to see that rocket scientist quote by the FCC. Can you provide it?

More seriously, I simply cannot understand how you can lament the "dumbing down" of amateur radio (what with people having to study a 1200 question pool instead of a 16-page study guide) and then turn around and say:

> I for one am damn tired of being told what we "must" do to insure ham
>radio's survival, ...

If you really do believe that the written exams are deficient, and I do, just not to the near-total extent that you do, I cannot imagine why you are not suggesting that it is important that hams continue to learn those things that would raise us to the standards that the FCC would like to see. What I see instead is a lot of very negative "can't do" talk that is having just the opposite effect.

Care to join me in trying to make things a little better?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2812. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-08 23:57:44 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010208185744.21807.00000074@ng-cr1.aol.com>
Source record: 3062

>From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

>Forever things just got to keep moving, forever and ever, without even
>a pause?

Seems that they are doing just that, Dick. Where is the pause in the development of computer technology? Where is the pause in the development of non-amateur wireless technology? I don't see any.

What value would be found in having the Amateur Radio service pause while the rest of the world marches steadily onward? What harm could come of stopping in our tracks?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2813. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 00:00:05 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010208190005.21807.00000076@ng-cr1.aol.com>
Source record: 3063

>From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

>Evolution takes place at its own speed, and pushing and shoving does
>nothing but help to impede it.

Do you believe that this philosophy should be applied to all of ham radio?

>Well OB you can invest your remaining *time* in attempting to make
>*time* stand still so you can hope to garner more *time* for yourself.
> I plan to use mine more constructively.

Great. Can you share with us those constructive things you are planning?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2814. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 00:02:32 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010208190232.21807.00000077@ng-cr1.aol.com>
Source record: 3064

>From: Cecil Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>> How many 5 wpm QSOs have you heard in the lower 25 kHz of the HF ham bands?

>Hey Ed, wanna try one? :-)

How about somewhere near 14.050 MHz? The lower 25 kHz is often used as a DX window and I prefer to honor the gentle agreements.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2815. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 00:04:55 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010208190455.21807.00000078@ng-cr1.aol.com>
Source record: 3065

>From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

>> Did your comments or reply comments to the FCC suggest that a minimum code
>> speed should be allowed in the lower 25 kHz of the band, or is that a new
>> requirement you believe should be put on the plate?

> No I did not. I was confident that there was enough common sense left
>at FCC for them to know better than to do what they did. Silly me, I was
>wrong.

I would not have expected the FCC to make a new rule that all QSOs in the
lower 25 kHz of the band must be at a minimum speed. Why did you think they
would do that as part of their restructuring?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2816. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 00:08:06 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010208190806.21807.00000079@ng-cr1.aol.com>
Source record: 3066

>From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

>> > > How many 5 wpm QSOs have you heard in the lower 25 kHz of the HF ham
>> bands?

>> > What does that matter? You saying that if I haven't heard any then
>> > none are coming?

>> Okay, as long as we all agree that we are discussing what "might" happen.

> Nocoders mucking around in the CW segments doing what they
> should do with a code practice oscillator and W1AW code practice won't cut
it.

Is this another thing that "might" happen?

You can rest assured that it cannot happen until the FCC makes a rules change that permits it. Even then, I think it unlikely that many hams, if any, will get on CW manually unless they know Morse code. No-code Technicians have had the right to use Morse code on VHF since day 1 -- how many have you heard on 2 meters mucking around in the CW segments?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2817. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 00:09:39 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010208190939.21807.00000080@ng-cr1.aol.com>
Source record: 3067

>From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

>Digital should get its own segment, since digital and W do not mix that
>well. And analog voice should get its own.

But I thought CW gets through when no other mode will. Is that true only if
the other mode is not allowed to be used?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2818. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 00:11:56 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010208191156.21807.00000081@ng-cr1.aol.com>
Source record: 3068

>From: Cecil Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>There were wall-to-wall CW QSOs in the 40m Novice band in 1953.

Now, to be fair, Cecil, those wall-to-wall signals were heard on receivers with more than 500 Hz bandwidth.

BUt I agree that CW useage in the Novice/Tech+ segments has declined drastically over the years.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2819. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 00:13:26 UTC
From: Bob Wex w2ilp <w2ilp@juno.com>
Message-ID: <95vcn1$n3d$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 3073

In article <95s9cn02ttj@enews4.newsguy.com>,
tlbryant@my-deja.com (T. L. Bryant) wrote:
> In article <95ruck$lr2$1@nnrp1.deja.com>, w2ilp@juno.com says...
> >
> >In article <95q8blqgl0@208.207.71.146>,
> > Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
> >>
> >>
> >> "T. L. Bryant" wrote:
> >> >
> >> > Ye Olde Fahrtz have been preaching the concept of a "real ham"
for
> >years.
> >If present trends continue the only Hams left may be Olde Fartz.
> >Even if there are one Megafartz of old hams what will that mean if
> >there are no new young hams to replace them in the future???
>
> I suppose the FCC will auction the spectrum off to the highest bidder.
>
I agree!...BUT we Hams are the only ones who can possibly stop that
from happening.

> >> > Despite this narrow-mindedness, the class of license doesn't
prove
> >whether or not the holder of said license is a "real ham".
> >
> >IMHO the narrow-mindered are those who only consider their own
> >interests and could care less about the survival of Ham Radio.
>
> Which, from my experience, is about 90% of all licensed amateurs.

Saddly...You are probably correct.

> >> No, but it beats hell all out of any nocode qualification seen to
> >date.
> >
> >I have recently joined an e-mail group for QCWA members (or old farts
> >as some might say). The QCWA and its chapter clubs are struggling
with
> >the problem of decreased active membership and not enough new members
> >to replace the silent keys...just as most of the ham clubs, who are
> >honest about it, are ready to admit. I would bet that the membership
> >in most ARRL affiliated ham clubs is also decreasing or will soon be
> >decreasing. Some QCWA leaders want to open up membership to all hams
> >who have not yet met the 25 year requirement. This is not unlike the

> >Ham leaders who have been continuing to press for simplified ham
> >license requirements. The trouble is that such changes can only lead
> >to further disinterest and active participation in ham radio by those
> >who have previously qualified. It also leads to a loss of
> >PRIDE...even a loss of prestige for ham radio as a hobby. People who
> >might be considering becoming hams can not be positively influenced
to
> >enter a hobby which can not retain the kind of pride it has had in
the
> >past.
> >
> >The USA and world cultures are changing. In the 1950s people thought
> >that TV would take up so much of peoples' time that they wouldn't be
> >active in clubs and hobbies. It didn't have as much of an effect as
> >was feared on ham radio. BUT...today there are more options for
people
> >who are interested in using technology as a hobby. Unlike TV, but
like
> >Ham Radio, The Internet and cellular phones are interactive..That is,
> >they are two way communication systems which offer the ability to
make
> >new friends and discuss stuff with individuals and with groups
> >worldwide..and to get and give opinions and education about any
matter
> >that might be of interest, technical or not. Today's young techie
> >nerds, hackers and gurus are as interested in computers as we must
have
> >been interested in Ham Radio. They think that Ham Radio is just for
> >old farts. They might join a computer club to learn more about their
> >opertating systems or to swap software...but they won't have any time
> >left for a Ham Club.
>
> What the hell do you expect? Ham radio has stagnated since influx of
the
> computer era. Nothing was done to rise to the challange. The Ancient
Radio
> Relay League insisted on keeping high-speed code testing as a measure
of
> someone worthy to receive a license. Commercial networks upgraded to
2400,
> 9600, 28.8k, and 56k througout the 90s, while packet radio was stuck
at a
> pitiful 1200 baud.

NOW YOU ARE SEEING THINGS MY WAY.

What do I propose to get out of this ancient worshiping rut?
I propose to technically make ham radio compatible with modern computer
science and practice...and for that to happen....

HAMS NEED MORE LICENSE CLASSES.

> >My opinion is if you want ham radio to survive and to eventually
> >interest more people you have to make it more technically
educational;
> >not easier to advance to "Extra" class. Ham Radio is far behind
modern
> >communication technology and must be advanced to the relative point
> >where it was in 1950. To do this we need more higher level technical
> >requirements for the higher level hams...although we still need easy
> >entry requirements to help get youngsters started. This is in
> >opposition to the present ARRL policy. The ARRL leaders can not seem
> >to get it into their heads that to attract new members and to keep
some
> >present hams active...you have to give some PRIDE back to all Hams,
by
> >encouraging those who want to, and can qualify for advanced modern
> >technical ham ability (as real hams, if I may), to take more and
better
> >high level technical exams. Forget high speed CW, but make high
> >technology the mark of a real Ham....If not the goal...If not just
the
> >BASIS anmd PURPOSE of the whole hobby!
> >
> >Hams need more license classes.
> >
> >Bob Wex w2ilp (Insure License Potential)
>
> For someone who wants to pursue a career in communication technology,
ham radio
> might serve as a springboard for that career. Even so, the drive and
ambition
> to achieve technical knowlege will be there without the need for more
license
> classes. Ham radio isn't for everybody.

True ham radio can not be for everyone...BUT we don't want it to evolve
to be for no one.
By definition of Ham Radio, we can only refer to its OFFICIAL basis and
purpose, and thus to the exams which technically advanced hams of the
future may be required to pass.
Therefore I can't agree with your last statement, which denys the need
for more license classes. If you think logically about this matter,
you will find, as I have, that you are disagreeing with your own
previous observations.

Thank you for your comments and for reading my post anyway...BUT please
keep thinking.

73,
Bob Wex w2ilp (Insure License Potential)

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2820. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 00:14:26 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010208191426.21807.00000082@ng-cr1.aol.com>
Source record: 3069

>From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

> I can't see authorizing nocoders to work CW without any training in code
> whatver, and that's why.

No-coders have been authorized to work CW without any testing for code whatver
for about a decade now. What harm have they caused CW operators?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2821. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 00:16:01 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010208191601.21807.00000083@ng-cr1.aol.com>
Source record: 3070

>From: tlbryant@my-deja.com (T. L. Bryant)

>Who, in their right mind, would even try to work CW if they had no knowlege
>of code whatsoever?

That's what I thought. Oh, there could be one or two who want to try out their
CW skills before they are really ready, but I suspect that someone will
"defend" the mode by making them stop.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2822. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 00:17:33 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010208191733.21807.00000084@ng-cr1.aol.com>
Source record: 3071

>From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

>> Who, in their right mind, would even try to work CW if they had no knowlege
>of
>> code whatsoever?

>Who indeed???? "Just as long as I don't have to pass a hazing-ritual
>test".

Are you saying that hordes of people who don't like CW will use it on the lower
25 kHz of the bands and make you stumble?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
>
>
>
>
>

2823. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 00:18:08 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010208191808.21807.00000085@ng-cr1.aol.com>
Source record: 3072

>From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

>80 meters is probably the most underused band these days.
>Try it on weekends, and more to the point, go to 40 meters,even 30 or 20
>are much more active.

Something to do with MUF, I believe.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2824. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 00:22:00 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010208192200.21807.00000086@ng-cr1.aol.com>
Source record: 3074

>From: tlbryant@my-deja.com (T. L. Bryant)

>How many hams dropped out of ham radio altogether because the
>felt the ARRL screwed them?

Depends on who you ask. According to W2NSD, vast hordes. Of course, some folks tend to see everything in sweeping terms. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2825. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 00:24:35 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010208192435.21807.00000087@ng-cr1.aol.com>
Source record: 3076

>From: Aaron Jones nomail@nomail.com

>I remember that lots of hams threatened to quit the ARRL over
>Incentive Licensing, but only someone with membership data would know
>if a large number of hams actually did. Ed?

I wasn't around then; my license expired in 1969 and I wasn't relicensed until about 1973 or so. I do recall reading (here, maybe) that a number of hams did quit the League over the whole deal. I am certain that they didn't all quit ham radio.

I think even then, postal regulations required a regular statement of circulation in QST. Your back issues should give at least a relative indication.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2826. Roger Wiseman's Greyhound Men's Room Band?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 00:25:02 UTC
From: SLee@houston.net
Message-ID: <95vdcu$v1s$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 3075
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.flame

I was surfing the web the other day when I ran across the lyrics of a song by Paul McCartney and Raoul Xemblinosky which was entitled "Roger Wiseman's Greyhound Men's Room Band." You can find the lyrics (which I think should not be published in a delicate family forum such as this one) at http://extra.newsguy.com/~shpxurnq/songs.html#song5.

Is this indeed *our* Roger. And how was it that he came to achieve such fame? That same web site claims that Roger was spanked off of Usenet entirely back in '97, but maybe it was someone else, because we all know that Roger is very much here, even though he's not all there.

Anyone care to enlighten us?

2827. Re: I heard a CB'er on 20 meters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 00:28:00 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010208192800.21807.00000089@ng-cr1.aol.com>
Source record: 3077

>From: Bill Nelson billn@spock.peak.org

>: Wonder how much money 75 meters will bring?

>The whole of the HF band would bring very little. The inconsistant
>propogation characteristics guarantee that.

HF is not useless at all. As I tune outside the ham bands, I hear plenty of signals.

I think the real risk may be found in some of the broadband "wireless" networking that will be networking computers using residential phone wiring and electrical wiring, or providing broadband access over phone lines and even power lines. If Amateur Radio ever lost its primary status over these Part 15 users, it is over.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
>--
>Bill Nelson (billn@peak.org)
>
>
>
>
>
>
>

2828. Re: Morse Code replacement? Bigtime flame war article!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 00:33:05 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010208193305.21807.00000090@ng-cr1.aol.com>
Source record: 3078

>From: n2ey@aol.com

>You're not the only one who tried to discuss "style" with that one. He
>has lots of company.

Yeah, but you know, Carl and I have had many an interesting conversation since and he is now using an entirely different style. I occasionally see some of his infamous "forcefulness," but I think he has chosen a productive route. I count Carl among my friends. Even bought him a lobster once. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2829. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 00:34:22 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010208193422.21807.00000091@ng-cr1.aol.com>
Source record: 3079

>From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

>When one is unqualified at the basics, how can he claim to be fully
>accomplished?

If one is qualified only at the basics, how can he claim to be fully
accomplished?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2830. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 00:34:52 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <95vdvb$o33$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 3081

In article <95u1k2fti1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
Steven J Robeson, K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com> wrote:
> In article <95spcbgbp1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
> Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com> wrote:
>
> > I knew what Len meant.
>
> Birds of a feather.

You knew what Len meant. If you say you didn't, then you're a bigger
fool than even you make yourself on here.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2831. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 00:38:18 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010208193818.21807.00000093@ng-cr1.aol.com>
Source record: 3080

>From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

>That is: The most basic radio communications mode is radiotelegraphy.
> Find one that you can show to be more basic and we'll look again.

The "prisoner tap code" could be OO keyed. It can probably be done at about 5 wpm with a lookup table by someone not experienced in Morse code decoding. That seems more basic to me. If you agree that it is more basic than OOK Morse code, will you now support IT as the mode that all hams should learn to be considered fully versed in radio technology?

As an unspecified digital mode using a permitted modulation method and a publicized encoding, it is probably legal.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2832. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 00:40:51 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010208194051.21807.00000096@ng-cr1.aol.com>
Source record: 3082

>From: Jim Kelley jwkelley@uci.edu

>The guy who programs the Nokia cell phones and the police repeaters
>prolly has to know it.

Not at all. The programmer just needs to know where to look it up. When my programming requires me to know an ascii character, I open my programming book to the correct appendix.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2833. Re: Novice CW

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 00:42:46 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <95vee5ogl1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 3085

In article <95ucit$p3l$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org> wrote:
> In article <95sql6hes1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
> Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com> wrote:
>
> > Gee, you were strangely absent when I was set upon by the virulent
> > pro-coders for saying there was no one on the novice subbands 13
years
> > ago.
>
> You only started cyber-stalking me a couple years ago. I never heard
> of you until about 1998, so I didn't know I was supposed to come
> protect you from "virulent pro-coders" -- poor baby, I bet you were
> really traumatized. Splains a lot.
>
> 73, Hans, K0HB

So if I'm on here and you're on here, it's stalking? Splains a lot
about Hans as well. Hans is all about Hans, with a little delusion
twisted in for fun.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2834. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 00:46:05 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A833DCD.97EFDFE5@uci.edu>
Source record: 3086

Brian wrote:
> If what you say is true, then most everyone would see that and your
> comments would be completely unnecessary. But instead, you chose to
> define scaleology as if you worked for the dept of weights and measures.

I think you're over your head Brian. Best let it drop. The subject -
not your head.

2835. Re: I heard a CB'er on 20 meters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 00:47:27 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010208194727.21870.00000076@ng-cr1.aol.com>
Source record: 3083

>From: Dan/W4NTI w4nti@my-deja.com

>I do not trust the US Government one little bit. If you do, good luck.

Over the past years, I have worked with a few dozen FCC staff, plus a few others from NTIA, OSHA and other agencies. They have been working relationships born of mutual respect and trust. Not once has one single of these individuals acted in a way that I felt was dishonorable.

I have a choice; I can go on that experience, or the fact that I cannot prove that your fanciful, albeit fearful, total distrust of the government. Thanks for the luck, but I will stick with what works for me.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2836. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 00:48:21 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010208194821.21870.00000077@ng-cr1.aol.com>
Source record: 3084

>From: Jim Kelley jwkelley@uci.edu

>> What percentage of Morse-code communications do you believe is accomplished
>> with only a simple RF generator on-off keyed?

>100% of the ones that send bweeeeeeeee bweep bweeeeeeee bweep
>bweeeeeee bweeeeeeee bweep bweeeeeeee

>:-)

Ah, I see you have a Tuna Tin 2. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2837. Re: Morse Code replacement? Bigtime flame war article!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 00:50:59 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010208195059.21870.00000079@ng-cr1.aol.com>
Source record: 3087

>From: n2ey@aol.com

>But I was only half-joking. I really do want to see any and all lists
>on this subject (promoting Morse - the mode, not the test). The ARRL
>leadership has done very very little to promote the mode for many
>years - now all of a sudden there's this order to do so. Please
>understand that these comments come from a longtime member and QST
>reader who wants to help, not just take potshots. (I recently filled
>some holes in my QST collection - now I'm solid back to October, 1927.
>And those are just part of the N2EY radio library).

>OK, here are some ideas:

Thanks for the thought you put into this, Jim. I agree with almost everything
you said and I will carry the list to a few people at HQ.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2838. Re: Morse Code replacement? Bigtime flame war article!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 00:52:43 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <95vf0povn1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 3088

In article <95uo2u$4v1$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org> wrote:
> In article <95um7m$345$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
> n2ey@aol.com wrote:
> >
> > And that's just my short list.
> >
>
> I like all those ideas, Jim, except the one about publicizing the
Fists
> freqs. I've abandoned any operations anywhere near xx.058, because
> once a Fists member "collects your number", the contact usually comes
> to a quick conclusion.
>
> 73, Hans, K0HB

Reminds me of 10-10. I worked a guy in Florida when I was stationed in Nebraska. Then I worked him again from Guam and he told me I was a dupe. When I tried working him from my new duty assignment in Illinois, he kind of got perturbed with me.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2839. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 01:49:12 UTC
From: tlbryant@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <95viao02cr8@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 3100

In article <20010208192200.21807.00000086@ng-cr1.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com says...
>
>>From: tlbryant@my-deja.com (T. L. Bryant)
>
>>How many hams dropped out of ham radio altogether because the
>>felt the ARRL screwed them?
>
>Depends on who you ask. According to W2NSD, vast hordes. Of course, some folks
>tend to see everything in sweeping terms. :-)

Was this before or after he started pushing his bio-electrifier?

2840. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 02:08:06 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A835106.1E1EFC66@uci.edu>
Source record: 3089

W1RFI wrote:
> >From: Jim Kelley jwkelley@uci.edu

> >The guy who programs the Nokia cell phones and the police repeaters
> >prolly has to know it.

> Not at all. The programmer just needs to know where to look it up.

Sounds like an excellent answer to have prepared for your next job interview, Ed. "Well I don't know anything about that, but I can look it up!"

73, ac6xg

2841. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 02:25:02 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A8354FE.449F3F66@uci.edu>
Source record: 3091

Brian wrote:
> In article <3A82D5F4.54E5D6C8@uci.edu>,
> Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote:
> > Brian wrote:
> > > So now one needs to be an expert in scaleology to be able to state
> that
> > > the numbers of coded hams are dropping and the number of no-coders
> is
> > > increasing.
> >
> > I don't recall you saying that.

> That seemed to be your entire point.

I wonder if your head floats. Maybe you should consider only commenting
on things you understand.

> If it wasn't then your message was
> pointless.

I can see how it might seem that way to you.

> > Still trying to figure out what, if
> > anything, you ARE expert at though.

> The greatest hobby in the world - the one everyone talks about!

Excellent choice. Maybe there's a newsgroup you can go pester about
that.

2842. Re: I heard a CB'er on 20 meters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 02:30:57 UTC
From: Jerry Oxendine <joxendi@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <3A835661.223E@bellsouth.net>
Source record: 3090
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner

h wrote:
>
> If he had a license he is a HAM not a CB'er
> Frankly Freebanders are like the Hams of old. If you look at the FCC
> enforcement logs The Hams are out of control and need enforcement while
> Freebanders are mature and working to improver thier knowledge, save lives,
> promote freedom and democracy, and gernerally aid and improve the geneneral
> welfare or thier comunities.
>
> --
Sir,,

You are wrong on the above. Besides breaking the law and interfering with legitimate communications of other domestic radio services, the "skills" of "freebanders" hardly qualifies them for the promotion of the welfare of the community--among other things. If that were true, how come when there's a disaster (flood, tornado, hurricane, etc) they don't call on the "freebanders" to help out instead of ARES, RACES, the host of hams who are not in the above organizations, and Civil Air Patrol? How come they don't ask for "freebanders" to pass traffic on 27.555 instead of hams on 3872 KHZ, or 14.300? In time of disaster, when other comms are down, more traffic is passed by HAMS than any other group.

All this bullcrap about ham radio being "dead" is wishful thinking, bud. And for every "bad" ham that "may" be heard, I can find TEN CBers just as bad or worse. BUT! Does that make CB itself "bad"? NO! For every ten of the "bad" CBers, I can find 20 good ones. For every "one" of the so-called "bad" hams, I can find 100 good operators. The FCC's return to enforcement is welcomed by the rest of the Amateurs and, we hope, that their activity will weed out the bad ops. The rest of us that get smeared by the activities of a few welcome the departure of the jerks. Same with CB: you can't judge the entire service by the antics of a few morons.

Jerry

> >

2843. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 02:43:57 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A83596D.8A24E4DA@uci.edu>
Source record: 3101

W1RFI wrote:
>
> >From: Jim Kelley jwkelley@uci.edu
>
> >> What percentage of Morse-code communications do you believe is accomplished
> >> with only a simple RF generator on-off keyed?
>
> >100% of the ones that send bweeeeeeeee bweep bweeeeeeee bweep
> >bweeeeeee bweeeeeeee bweep bweeeeeeee
>
> >:-)
>
> Ah, I see you have a Tuna Tin 2. :-)

No, actually it's an IC 735. It sounds more like grrrrrr grr grrrrrrr
grr
grrrrrr grrrrrr grr grrrrrrr on 20 - from what I've been told.
Need to replace some more darn trimmer caps I guess. :-(

73, jim ac6xg

2844. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 02:45:40 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010208214540.02997.00002008@nso-mg.aol.com>
Source record: 3093

In article <95uqva$7rn$1@nnrp1.deja.com>, Steven J Robeson, K4YZ
<k4yz@my-deja.com> writes:

>In article <20010208124733.17535.00002135@nso-fy.aol.com>,
> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
>
>> Now, now, Dick, look at the NEW licensees' numbers. Those
>> aren't "renewals" from any other class. Want to do that in all
>> the months before April 15, 2000? :-)
>
> Lennnie again attempts to narrow the scope of the numbers to ONLY
>new licensees, and NOT the CURRENT status of those licensees.

No, just giving code-tested versus non-code-tested license
class totals in the US ARS at the end of December of the
years 2000, 1999, and 1998.

I'll ask again, are you saying that already-code-tested license
class amateurs are switching over to the Technician class? :-)

didit

2845. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 02:45:40 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010208214540.02997.00002007@nso-mg.aol.com>
Source record: 3095

In article <95uqrn$7hc$1@nnrp1.deja.com>, Steven J Robeson, K4YZ
<k4yz@my-deja.com> writes:

>In article <20010208124735.17535.00002140@nso-fy.aol.com>,
> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
>
>> If you wish, I can post stats on NEW licensees for the last
>> three years. Looks even worse for the code-tested numbers.
>
> If that was ALL you posted, it might. But then again it doesn't
>reflect the true CURRENT status of thier licneses, now does it?

FCC databases are updated daily, weekly, and monthly. How
the various tabulators want to do it is their option. The AH0A
site tabulates at the end of the month.

What I did recently was take the AH0A site tabulations at the
end of December for the years 2000, 1999, and 1998. From
that and from previous years' data given over two years ago, the
trend is quite clear...newcomers are more attracted to no code
tests in US amateur radio.

Even more telling is that the code-tested license class totals
are decreasing while the non-code-tested licensees are
increasing.

What are you saying? That code-tested licensees are opting
to change over to Technician class from a code-tested previous
class not a Technician-Plus? :-)

>From: Steven J Robeson, K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com>
>Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
>Subject: Re: Who Is What?
>Date: Thu, 08 Feb 2001 19:08:48 GMT <----------!!!
>Organization: Deja.com
>Lines: 21
>Message-ID: <95uqrn$7hc$1@nnrp1.deja.com>

Ah, still doing e-mail from work, ey? :-)

didit

2846. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 02:45:41 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010208214541.02997.00002009@nso-mg.aol.com>
Source record: 3094

In article <3A82FC9F.1A7319E5@uci.edu>, Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>> Apparently you don't want to believe that code-tested US radio
>> amateurs are decreasing in number while non-code-tested
>> US radio amateurs are increasing in number.
>
>I know you're not stupid, Len, so the only thing I can conclude about
>why you would say something which is totally inaccurate is because
>you're so mad at me that you can't think of anything logical to say. I
>never disputed your figures. You did.

Please state exactly what was "inaccurate." Do you dispute
my arithmetic on two groups of licensees?

Or aren't you just playing word games with the phrase "tipping
scales?"

Shall we all have fun with word games here? Or would you
rather discuss some issues regarding the code-tested state
of US amateur radio license classes?

didit

2847. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 02:45:42 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010208214542.02997.00002010@nso-mg.aol.com>
Source record: 3092

In article <3A82FDF2.B5757C6A@uci.edu>, Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>> My point was that the non-code-tested US amateur licensees
>> keep increasing in number while the code-tested US amateur
>> licensees are decreasing in number.
>
>I have no problem with the data. I was simply correcting your poor
>assessment of the data - as have others, albeit for differing reasons.

I didn't see any "correcting of a poor assessment of data." All I saw
was your attempt at trying to make a new issue out of your
"correction" of the phrase "tipping the scales."

didit

2848. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 02:45:51 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010208214551.02997.00002011@nso-mg.aol.com>
Source record: 3096

In article <95v5fogsj1@nnrp1.deja.com>, n2ey@aol.com writes:

>In article <20010204002041.18047.00001243@nso-ff.aol.com>,
> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
>> Firecracker Material (courtesy of AH0A statistics on US ham licenses)-
>>
>> In the 9 months following US amateur radio restructuring, the
>> total number of US amateur radio licenses increased by
>> 3,701 (+0.55% of total). Code-tested licensees declined by
>> 9,531 while non-code-tested licensees increased by 13,132.
>
>(Rest snipped for brevity)
>
>The above analysis is not correct.

Sorry, Jim, but based on the conditions I stated, it is correct.

Since your arithmetic is the same as mine, my analysis
using the stated conditions is very correct. :-)

<snip>

>However, all is not as simple as it appears. As part of the
>restructuring changes, Technician Plus licenses will be renewed as
>Technicians. So the above apparent gain of 13,132 is inflated by such
>renewals, as is the apparent loss of 9,431 in the other classes.
>
>Let's see how big this error really is. Looking at the renewal data on
>the Speroni site, we see that the number of Tech and Tech Plus renewals
>over the nine month period was 4,870. Because the FCC will not process
>renewals until the license is close to expiring, almost all of these
>4,870 are Tech Pluses being renewed as Technicians. A fair estimate
>would be that about 4,700 of them were such renewals.

That is an ESTIMATE. By using personal estimates based only
on "gut feeling" or something, you are yourself in ERROR.

<snip>

>But even THAT's not a complete or correct analysis.

True, using your estimates is not a correct analysis. :-)

<snip>

>Suppose that the annual rate of expirations of "noncodetested" licenses
>is just 5%. Based on 215,000 licensees, that works out to 10,075
>expirations per year, or about 840 per month. So the gain of 937 per

>month shrinks to just 97 per month IF a 5% annual dropout rate is
>correct.

As far as ESTIMATES, you've failed once more. Note the
tabulation of NEW licensees which increased at 1184 per
month for the 27 months between beginning of January 1998
and end of March 2000 for Technician. The renewals for
those will be in the year 2008 to 2010...but the trend is for
NEW Tech licensees still growing after January 2001.

You've made a wish-fulfillment estimate on the "840 per month
Technician class expirations of 5 percent." That assumes that
percentage will expire and you have NO idea if they will do that.
New Technician class licensees are continually being added
and not just from "Tech-Plus renewals."

>In other words, the trend is not nearly so dramatic as was originally
>presented.

Your statement is "true" only in using incomplete and faulty
estimates. The trend is there whether you want to see it or
not. Your take on "drama" is unknown.

>More important, however, is the simple fact that it is far too early to
>even guess at the long-term impact of the restructuring.

Denial will never see any trend of any kind.

> It is also
>interesting that the January 2001 figures were not included.

Why? Is 9 months after restructuring somehow "faulty" but
10 months after restructuring is somehow "more correct?!?"

What about the two years PRIOR to restructuring? Go do
the figures again and see the trends. Here, I'll do it for you.

First three months of 2000: 163/month code-tested NEW
licensees; 1980/month NEW Technicians. Not affected
by April 15, 2000 restructuring.

All of year 1999: 196/month code-tested NEW licensees;
1165/month non-code-tested NEW Technicians. Not
affected by April 15, 2000 restructuring.

All of year 1998: 265/month code-tested NEW licensees;
1231/month non-code-tested NEW Technicians. Not
affected by April 15, 2000 restructuring.

> And it is
>to be expected that the easiest-to-get license will have large numbers
>of licensees.

The "easiest-to-get license" is a Restricted Radiotelephone
License or Permit from the FCC. No test, lifetime. I have no

idea of the number of those licenses or permits. :-)

didit

2849. Re: Engineers, Technicians, and Appliance Operators

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 02:46:12 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010208214612.02997.00002012@nso-mg.aol.com>
Source record: 3099

In article <95up3e$5p7$1@nnrp1.deja.com>, Steven J Robeson, K4YZ [writing from work at 1:38 PM] <k4yz@my-deja.com> writes:

>In article <20010208124732.17535.00002134@nso-fy.aol.com>,
> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
>
> Most of rehashed "see what a hero I am" tripe trashed. I wrote 2
>paragraphs....Lennie wrote a novella.

A novella is about 10,000 words in the publishing trade. I didn't write that many words. Just some third-party references for my claims for the last 45 years. Where are yours?

Don't try to bluff or play e-poker, here. Show your references about non-amateur experience.

>> How does one get a commission as a member of a state
>> army unit when they were once medically discharged from
>> a regular military branch? Is there some Faith Healing we
>> haven't heard of?
>
> Waivers, Lennie. Waivers. When you have something to offer they
>want to use, they are glad to accomodate your needs.

Digitize-scan those commission papters, block out your private data if you wish, and post them somewhere. Or provide some indisputable proof of this "commission" through a third-party reference. Until then everyone has to assume you are not telling the truth.

>> Hmmm...apparently the unnamed employer got a bit pissed at
>> an employee using company Internet facilities? One can only
>> wonder at that...
>
> Why should the "unnamed employer" be concerned over a Deja mail
>account, Lennie?

You sent this message at 1:38 PM EST according to the footer on this message. That is after normal lunch hours at WORK.

Must be a real cushy job there, Steebie, letting you sit around playing chat in e-mail and newsgroups. :-)

Enjoy it while you can...before you get canned. :-)

didit

>Path:
>lobby!newstf02.news.aol.com!portc03.blue.aol.com!portc01.blue.aol.com!new
sfeed.skycache.com!Cidera!cpk-news-hub1.bbnplanet.com!news.gtei.net!news.m
axwell.syr.edu!nntp2.deja.com!nnrp1.deja.com!not-for-mail
>From: Steven J Robeson, K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com>
>Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
>Subject: Re: Engineers, Technicians, and Appliance Operators
>Date: Thu, 08 Feb 2001 18:38:39 GMT
<------ !!!
>Organization: Deja.com
>Lines: 40
>Message-ID: <95up3e$5p7$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
>References: <95rh4o$99m$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
><20010208124732.17535.00002134@nso-fy.aol.com>
>NNTP-Posting-Host: 63.86.75.170
>X-Article-Creation-Date: Thu Feb 08 18:38:39 2001 GMT
>X-Http-User-Agent: Mozilla/4.0 (compatible; MSIE 5.5; Windows 98)
>X-Http-Proxy: 1.1 x69.deja.com:80 (Squid/1.1.22) for client 63.86.75.170
>X-MyDeja-Info: XMYDJUIDk4yz

2850. Re: Engineers, Technicians, and Appliance Operators

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 02:46:13 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010208214613.02997.00002013@nso-mg.aol.com>
Source record: 3097

In article <95upda$66n$1@nnrp1.deja.com>, K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org> writes:

>In article <20010207015601.02997.00001930@nso-mg.aol.com>,
> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
>
>> He hasn't identified the company
>> where is is, or was, purchasing things. :-)
>
>Three minutes of superficial detective work suggests the company
>probably is:
>
> Antec Corporation
> 11450 Technology Circle
> Duluth, GA 30097
> US
>
>I see their stock is slipping since November when Bob Stanzione
>announced a suspension in product shipments to their largest customer,
>AT&T Broadband. Now trading around $10, after a high of $61.25 last
>spring.
>
>73, de Hans, K0HB

The name "Antec" appeared in message headers some months
ago. No real "detective work" needed then, but it is surprising
that a proud employee wouldn't name his employer. :-)

On the other hand, someone who sits around doing newsgroups
and e-mail on company time might not want it known...

BTW, their company phone number is 678-473-2000 or
800-FIBER-ME. :-) www.antec.com

didit

2851. Re: Engineers, Technicians, and Appliance Operators

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 02:46:15 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010208214615.02997.00002014@nso-mg.aol.com>
Source record: 3098

In article <95uqp2$7fn$1@nnrp1.deja.com>, Steven J Robeson, K4YZ
<k4yz@my-deja.com> writes:

>In article <20010208124732.17535.00002134@nso-fy.aol.com>,
> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
>
>> > And by the way, I AM doing both.

Both? The driving distance from Dunlap, TN, (FCC database
address information) to Duluth, GA, is 3 hours, 17 minutes
by legal speeds. Assuming a one-way driving time of 3 hours,
work time of 8 hours with one hour lunch, the total commute
and work takes 15 hours. That leaves 9 hours to sleep, eat at
least one meal, do personal hygiene...and supposedly work
at a second job.

One of those jobs must not be 8 hours long or both of them are
part-time. [drive 6 hours for a part-time job?!?!?]

Something missing in the above considering there are only
24 hours in a terrestrial day.

>> "Both what?" Spending company time chatting about personal
>> subjects? Spending company Internet time posting over the
>> Internet? Naughty, naughty...
>
> Working here AND nursing, Lennie. Not that I needed to tell you.

Driving 6 hours a day? Doing e-mail and newsgrouping from
one of those jobs? Which one?

> No one here has "sleighted" me, Lennie, least of all you. You
>don't have the credentials nor the means to do so.

...pathological liars cannot, will not admit to telling a lie. QED.

> Of course, you never acknowledge the "non-controversial" posts in
>kind...only the one's where you find the opportunity to reignite the
>flamewars.

If someone posts an uncivil message, they might get a reply
IN KIND. Those are deserving. I've never said otherwise. :-)

> No...the main WHINE by a small subset of this newsgroup is about
>code retention/elimination. You are, as previously cited, it's center
>stage jester.

I'm glad you are amused. Amusement and entertainment are
great stress relievers for those who supposedly have two jobs.

>> A Brigade is 4 Battalions. A Battalion is 4 Companies. A
>> Company is 4 Platoons. A Platoon is 4 Squads of 12 men
>> each plus two more. A Brigade would have around 3000+
>> personnel. Only a Captain is THE radio officer of a Brigade?
>
> When in cadre status, yes.

...only in some non-official militia organization, hotshot.

>PLEASE SEND PRIVATE E MAIL COMMENTS TO K4YZ@AOL.COM. RESPSONSES TO THE
>DEJA MAY OR MAY NOT BE RETRIEVED IN A TIMELY FASHION.

...yes, the employee may wind up fired for doing personal things
on company time. :-)

didit

2852. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 03:04:29 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A835E3D.9AA17A67@uci.edu>
Source record: 3102

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3A82FC9F.1A7319E5@uci.edu>, Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> writes:
>
> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >> Apparently you don't want to believe that code-tested US radio
> >> amateurs are decreasing in number while non-code-tested
> >> US radio amateurs are increasing in number.
> >>
> >I know you're not stupid, Len, so the only thing I can conclude about
> >why you would say something which is totally inaccurate is because
> >you're so mad at me that you can't think of anything logical to say. I
> >never disputed your figures. You did.

> Please state exactly what was "inaccurate."

Here's the statement I was referring to:

"Apparently you don't want to believe that code-tested US radio
amateurs are decreasing in number while non-code-tested
US radio amateurs are increasing in number."

> Shall we all have fun with word games here? Or would you
> rather discuss some issues regarding the code-tested state
> of US amateur radio license classes?

It would go a long way if you would just TRY to make less inflamatory
statements, Len. You seem to feel the need to taunt, or exaggerate, or
belittle, or insult, in every stinkin' one of your posts. That's all
this was about. Geez.

2853. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 03:05:31 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A835E7B.6CB70153@uci.edu>
Source record: 3103

Len Over 21 wrote:

> I didn't see any "correcting of a poor assessment of data." All I saw
> was your attempt at trying to make a new issue out of your
> "correction" of the phrase "tipping the scales."

Some people see only what they wish to see.

2854. Re: I heard a CB'er on 20 meters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 03:15:11 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010208221511.09475.00001811@nso-fj.aol.com>
Source record: 3104

In article <20010208192800.21807.00000089@ng-cr1.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>I think the real risk may be found in some of the broadband "wireless" >networking that will be networking computers using residential phone wiring >and electrical wiring, or providing broadband access over phone lines and >even
>power lines. If Amateur Radio ever lost its primary status over these Part >15 users, it is over.

How's the RFID units at 13.56 MHz nowadays? [asking out of curiosity, not to troll]

didit

2855. Re: Ham Radio Operator caught Jamming Police Frequencies.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 03:27:22 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <B6A8CDC9.DFB%stewartx@sccoast.net>
Source record: 3105

K0HB at K0HB@arrl.org wrote:

> Nope, the alleged perp is a licensed
> ham, licensed for about five years.

Okay, just wondering. The reason is because we had an incident here a few years ago where the person was described in the local newspaper as a ham when in fact he was a just a guy using a marine radio (hey, it wasn't a CB, so that left only ham radio in the mind of the reporter).

> This guy has been at it for over a
> year, faking "officer down" calls,
> cross-linking different police and
> sheriff services, and similar crap.
> Technically smart, and has been able
> to avoid being located by being mobile
> -- he got caught because an officer
> noticed his vehicle antenna at the
> scene of a false-alarm ambulance
> call. He has reportedly admitted
> everything to the cops.

Well, I don't know about the technically smart part, but he was an idiot for broadcasting false calls on the police frequencies. The police have enough to keep them busy, and I would sure hate to realise that a family member was put at risk because the cops were busy elsewhere with a false call.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net

2856. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 03:29:09 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <95vo5t$c4$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 3110

In article <3A8354FE.449F3F66@uci.edu>,
Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote:
> Brian wrote:
> > In article <3A82D5F4.54E5D6C8@uci.edu>,
> > Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote:
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > > So now one needs to be an expert in scaleology to be able to
state
> > that
> > > > the numbers of coded hams are dropping and the number of
no-coders
> > is
> > > > increasing.
> > >
> > > I don't recall you saying that.
>
> > That seemed to be your entire point.
>
> I wonder if your head floats. Maybe you should consider only
commenting
> on things you understand.

Then show where that wasn't your point. Show where I misunderstood.
Show that your head sinks.

> > If it wasn't then your message was
> > pointless.
>
> I can see how it might seem that way to you.

I don't see how.

> > > Still trying to figure out what, if
> > > anything, you ARE expert at though.
>
> > The greatest hobby in the world - the one everyone talks about!
>
> Excellent choice. Maybe there's a newsgroup you can go pester about
> that.

Even hams talk about it, so I'm comfortable where I'm at. Perhaps you
should meet Dick at alt.metamucel.isntworking

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2857. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 03:32:45 UTC
From: tlbryant@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <95voct0git@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 3126

In article <95v8mtjmt1@nnrp1.deja.com>, brianburke@my-deja.com says...

>> Still trying to figure out what, if
>> anything, you ARE expert at though.
>
>The greatest hobby in the world - the one everyone talks about!
>

At the moment, that would be collecting Pokemon cards.

2858. Re: I heard a CB'er on 20 meters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 03:34:16 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <95vofonv1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 3111
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

```
In article <95t3ep$olt$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
t glenn <ab7rs@arrl.net> wrote:
> In article <95snk0$epo$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
> Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com> wrote:
> > In article <95skdi$c1c$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
> > t glenn <ab7rs@arrl.net> wrote:
> > > In article <95q3q8$5pm$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
> > > Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com> wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > I wish there were an organization in America that would work
to
> > > > improve ham
> > > > > radio, licensing, and improve the level of expertise of its
> > > > operators.
> > > >
> > > The organization that you're looking for is the ARRL.
> > > > >
> > >
> > > The ARRL is the problem...not the solution.--
> > > AB7RS,Tracy
> >
> > Tracy, pretend for a moment that I know nothing of the ARRL and the
> ARS.
> > Now explain your position WRT the ARRL, and identify the
organization
> > that you believe to be the solution, and state why.
> >
> > Thanks, Brian
> >
> > Sent via Deja.com
> > http://www.deja.com/
> >
> There is no organization that is "the solution" more hams put thier
> faith in the ARRL than any other organization and the ARRL threw it
all
> away,trampling the traditions of this once great pursuit one by one.TG
> --
> AB7RS,Tracy

Tracy, you keep blurting about the ARRL is "trampling" the ARS. Yet
they still print the Amateur's Code in every Handbook, which most of you
OF's appear to have completely abandoned. You're sending mixed
messages.
```

Now explain yourself rather than just making accusations. Thanks.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2859. Re: ARRL HQ "Attitude" (Was: Re: Pride)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 03:35:35 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A836587.7F71B628@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3113

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> And while I'm naming names, K1ZZ has managed to
> completely annoy me literally ever time we met, starting with the
> '84 Dayton Hamvention and every time since.

Got news for you, Larry. You are the one who *chooses* to be annoyed
unless he literally hit you with a stick.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2860. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 03:36:37 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010208223637.14870.00001887@nso-fr.aol.com>
Source record: 3106

In article <3A835E3D.9AA17A67@uci.edu>, Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> writes:

>> Shall we all have fun with word games here? Or would you
>> rather discuss some issues regarding the code-tested state
>> of US amateur radio license classes?
>
>It would go a long way if you would just TRY to make less inflamatory
>statements, Len. You seem to feel the need to taunt, or exaggerate, or
>belittle, or insult, in every stinkin' one of your posts. That's all
>this was about. Geez.

The "taunt" seems to be 31,971 NEW no-code-test Technicians
who came into the US ARS in the 27 months from the
beginning of January 1998 and end of March 2000...while only
6009 NEW code-tested US ARS licensees came in during the
same time.

Is it an "exaggeration" that the no-code-test Technician class
has been constantly growing since the beginning while every
other US ARS class (code tested) has not grown nearly as fast?

Is it "belittling" that over 200 thousand no-code-test Techs are
now in the US ARS?

Is it "insulting" that such facts are pointed out to those who
have been code-tested?

I suppose you are right. All this talk about stopping code
testing is sure "stinking," isn't it?

I suppose I should "apologize" for pointing out the obvious, but
what are over 200 thousand Technician licensees expected to
do when they are discounted, demeaned, taunted, belittled by
some souls who feel they are "superior" to "stinking" inferiors?

didit

2861. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 03:37:30 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A8365FA.6A21D177@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3114

W1RFI wrote:
> What value would be found in having the Amateur Radio service pause while the
> rest of the world marches steadily onward?

Don't look now, Ed, but it is already happening.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2862. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 03:38:30 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010208223830.29597.00006564@nso-mi.aol.com>
Source record: 3107

In article <3A830B04.B6473FDA@IEEE.org>, Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>"Ed Hare, W1RFI" wrote:
>> And I gotta' tell ya', Larry; when I was a 14 year old General, I was
>> as dumbed down as they come.
>
>And when I was a 14 year old dumbed down General, you were
>even dumber than me. :-)

Ed/Cecil:

I've got you both beat. When I was 14, I was too dumb to even
get a ham ticket. I was too busy whining about having to learn
the Morris Kode, and that's about as dumb as you can get!

73 de Larry, K3LT

2863. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 03:38:30 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010208223830.29597.00006565@nso-mi.aol.com>
Source record: 3108

In article <95rq1201sc@enews1.newsguy.com>, tlbryant@my-deja.com (T. L. Bryant) writes:

>
>Larry doesn't care whether or not hams have reached a certain level of
>technical proficiency. He only cares about how fast they can beep. He calls
>them "welfare hams", but welfare implies that something tangible is taken
>from
>someone who has, and is given to someone who doesn't have. Nothing tangible
>has
>been taken from Larry, but his blurred vision doesn't see things that way.

T. L.:

Wrong again. I could care less if they can beep at all -- as long as they're not whining about learning how to beep in order to attain higher HF privileges. However, its a moot point now. Pretty soon we'll have the beepless ARS you've always dreamed about.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2864. Re: ARRL HQ "Attitude" (Was: Re: Pride)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 03:38:31 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010208223831.29597.00006566@nso-mi.aol.com>
Source record: 3109

In article <71zg6.129$HH5.863162@news.ntplx.net>, "Ed Hare, W1RFI"
<w1rfi@arrl.net> writes:

>
>> More than enough to give me a generally negative impression of
>> the attitude of the ARRL HQ staff toward members -- and that's
>> all that matters.
>
>I believe you, Larry, but I am curious -- how many was it? You made a
>pretty power blanket condemnation of a group of people and I am just
>wondering about your sample size.

Ed:

I stopped counting at four; the count began with the receptionist/
telephone operator in the lobby. It seemed like the only person who
didn't go out of their way to piss me off that day was Chuck Bender
at W1AW. And while I'm naming names, K1ZZ has managed to
completely annoy me literally ever time we met, starting with the
'84 Dayton Hamvention and every time since.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2865. Re: I heard a CB'er on 20 meters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 03:41:05 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <B6A8D100.DFC%stewartx@sccoast.net>
Source record: 3112
Cross-posted to:
alt.discrimination,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner

Kevin Alfred Strom at kevin.strom@innocent.com wrote:

> "QSL" as a synonym for "yes," or
> "message received" is very old,
> perhaps almost as old as amateur
> radio itself.
>
> But "contact," meaning "I want
> to contact you" is quite new, less
> than a decade of commonplace use I
> think. I think it migrated to
> amateur radio from the Citizen's
> Band, [snip]

Heck, for all we know it could be coming from the contact managers everyone has on their computers today. Or it could be coming from the business world. I've noticed a lot of business people saying that today - the word "contact" both as a question and statement (meaning "will you contact..." as a question or "yes, I'll contact..." when answered back). In other words, who knows where this stuff comes from.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net

2866. Re: I heard a CB'er on 20 meters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 03:42:26 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <95vov1ut1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 3115

In article <95t6b9ppc7@208.207.71.156>,
Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>
>
> W1RFI wrote:
> >
> > >From: Dan/W4NTI w4nti@my-deja.com
> >
> > >Congratulations you figured it out....to continue.....more
enforcement
> > >that then forces the FCC to decide to terminate ham radio because
it is
> > >out of control.
> >
> > Can you offer any examples of other Services for which the FCC took
the action
> > you describe?
>
> Well they TRIED on 27 mhz...

They did??? You must have fought them off pretty hard there, CB Dick.
Part 95 priv'liges just keep growing. You crack me up.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2867. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 03:43:22 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A83675A.9304A372@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3117

W1RFI wrote:
>
> >From: Cecil Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>
> >There were wall-to-wall CW QSOs in the 40m Novice band in 1953.
>
> Now, to be fair, Cecil, those wall-to-wall signals were heard on receivers with
> more than 500 Hz bandwidth.

Ain't that the truth. On my Hallicrafters S-53A, I swear I could hear *ALL*
the 40m Novice signals all at once.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2868. Re: Engineers, Technicians, and Appliance Operators

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 03:46:29 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <95vp6j$19g$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 3120

In article <95upda$66n$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org> wrote:
> In article <20010207015601.02997.00001930@nso-mg.aol.com>,
> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
>
> > He hasn't identified the company
> > where is is, or was, purchasing things. :-)
>
> Three minutes of superficial detective work suggests the company
> probably is:
>
> Antec Corporation
> 11450 Technology Circle
> Duluth, GA 30097
> US
>
> I see their stock is slipping since November when Bob Stanzione
> announced a suspension in product shipments to their largest customer,
> AT&T Broadband. Now trading around $10, after a high of $61.25 last
> spring.
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB

No where in their prospectus does it identify Steve as an employee. Not that I care, either. I'm just glad if he says he has a job.

Are you still working for the buro of weights and measures?

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2869. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 03:48:57 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A8368A9.D4A9B2AD@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3118

Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> W1RFI wrote:
>
> > What percentage of Morse-code communications do you believe is accomplished
> > with only a simple RF generator on-off keyed?
>
> 100% of the ones that send bweeeeeeeee bweep bweeeeeeee bweep
> bweeeeeee bweeeeeeee bweep bweeeeeeee

I thought it was deeeeeeoooooo deeoo deeeeeeoooooo deeoo ...
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2870. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 03:53:02 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <95vpiu$mq9$0@208.207.71.143>
Source record: 3116

Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > Jim Kelley wrote:
> > >
> > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > > You couldn't be more wrong, and it is really curious how you managed to
> > > > come to that conclusion. There's littlein ham radio I enjoy more than a
> > > > CW QSO with a young ham, and his code speed is not an issueat all.
> > >
> > > Long as he isn't clogging up the band?
> > >
> > No. As long as he doesn't get down below .25 and cause everyone down
> > there to have to stumble over him.
>
> Please explain to me the exact mechanism by which this "stumbling" can
> occur?
>
> > Did you miss the point earlier? I can't see authorizing nocoders to
> > work CW without any training in code whatver, and that's why. It's
> > strange so many of you seem willing to overlook that.
>
> You seem to have forgotten something along the way here Dick. Follow
> the thread back a ways and re-read what I have written to you. Read
> only what it says. There is no hidden text between any of the lines.
> We have been discussing operating at 5 WPM in the lower 25.
>
> Thanks and 73,
>
> Jim AC6XG

2871. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 03:57:23 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A836AA3.60DA4D4E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3123

Brian wrote:
> Meanwhile, Shirley MacClaine held hands with spiritual guides as they
> looked to the East and focused on preventing the quake.

Shirley MacClaine was asked who was the most influential person in
her life. She answered, "My own higher self."
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2872. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 03:59:24 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <95vpusnbf0@208.207.71.143>
Source record: 3119

Aaron Jones wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
> >I'm saying that no one should be allowed on the lower 25kc
> >(actually anywhere on the CW segments) unless he has learned to work
> >Morse code, and that knowledge tested at licensing.
>
> I'd prefer less Federal regulation not more. Gentleman's agreements
> have served us well in the past. The lower parts of the bands have
> always been used mostly for DX and that continues through today. No
> regulations needed. Ragchewing generally takes place above the 25 KHz
> line, even the Extras...
>
> >Nocoders mucking around in the CW segments doing what they should
> >do with a code practice oscillator and W1AW code practice won't cut it.
>
> The more CW signals heard, even slow speed code practice, the less
> likely the FCC will see the CW area as unused band space and move the
> phone line down the band...
>
> > When FCC gets around to repartitioning the bands there should be a
> >CW-only segment that requires a CW test to use.
>
> CW use is decreasing as fast as the mortality tables now. Requiring a
> separate test just to use it would just nail the coffin shut that much
> faster...

Jones don't you know that logic is lost on the current FCC?

2873. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 04:02:59 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <95vq5j$o45$0@208.207.71.143>
Source record: 3121

Aaron Jones wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
> >80 meters is probably the most underused band these days.
>
> Agreed. Much less than even 10 years ago...
>
> >go to 40 meters,
>
> It's 10:51am here. There's not one signal to be heard on 40 meters.
> And I'm in daytime range of Southern California. After the morning
> skeds, about 10:00am to around 3:00pm daily 40 is usually dead. Not
> band dead, ham dead. I sometimes set my keyer to repeat CQs and work
> on other things in the background. Often I go 20 minutes without an
> answer and finally give up. It wasn't that way even 10 years ago...
>
> >even 30
>
> I seldom used to use this band because it's deader than 40. That's why
> when I moved I didn't bother to put up an antenna for it...
>
> >or 20
>
> This is where I make most of my daytime contacts. But even 20 is not
> what it was in the past...
>

Jones, nothing is what it was in the past, and for sure this media- the internet- has a lot to do with it. But weekend activity sounds as heavy as it ever was, from where I live.

2874. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 04:04:38 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <95vq8m$o45$1@208.207.71.143>
Source record: 3122

Cecil wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Evolution takes place at its own speed, and pushing and shoving does
> > nothing but help to impede it.
>
> We are not discussing Darwin's "Origin of Species". Human knowledge once
> doubled in a century. It is now doubling every few years. Hams who insist
> on living in the past will be buried in the sands of time.
>
> > Well OB you can invest your remaining *time* in attempting to make
> > *time* stand still so you can hope to garner more *time* for yourself.
> > I plan to use mine more constructively.
>
> How.......?

It WON'T be by dancing to your tune.

2875. Re: Code Quick RULEZ!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 04:05:00 UTC
From: Bill Nelson <billn@spock.peak.org>
Message-ID: <95vq9c$sp0$1@bashir.peak.org>
Source record: 3130
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

In rec.radio.amateur.misc Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@ieee.org> wrote:
: jason_hsu@my-deja.com wrote:
:> Actually, many of the Code Quick users reported passing the 13wpm and
:> 20wpm Morse Code exams before last year's restructuring.

: If they can think something like 'Clunky Clunky' when they hear a 'C'
: in a word at 20wpm, they think a lot faster than I. At 20wpm, I would
: consider 'Clunky Clunky' to be extremely distracting and limiting.

Yep. That has been my objection with Code Quick. To me, it would be fine
for learning code - up to about 8-10 wpm. I doubt if the extra level of
translation would work well at higher speeds.

--
Bill Nelson (billn@peak.org)

2876. Re: QCWA TELLS FCC TO END INCENTIVE LICENSING

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 04:10:18 UTC
From: jwill@AstraGate.net
Message-ID: <95vqj6$2b6$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 3125

```
In article <95o28u$bcg$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
Bob Wex w2ilp <w2ilp@juno.com> wrote:
> In article <3A7C0F5B.2158175B@arrl.org>,
> Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote:
> > Bob Wex w2ilp wrote:
> > >
> > > In article <3A797E19.5F1D7E26@arrl.org>,
> > > Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote:
> > > >
> > > > I didn't say they weren't. I only said that according to N9GL,
the
> > > > standards are not derived from the mechanisms but from the known
> > > > effects.
> > >
> > > True...but as engineers, scientists or medical people the
> > > MECHANISM...chemical, biological, electral, mechanical or whatever
> must
> > > be understood if there is to be any corrective measures devised.
> >
> > But we can't apply corrective measures to the design of the human
> body.
> > The only factor we can control is how much RF we expose ourselves
to.
> > For that purpose, it is the effect of the exposure that is
important,
> > not the underlying mechanism.
> >
> > > A hot chicken does not tell you the mechanism by which it got
> hot...but
> > > if you heated it in your microwave oven..You know the mechanism
was
> > > microwave RF not heat conducted from a gas burner or radiated by
> your
> > > fireplace.
> >
> > But if the point is to cook a chicken I don't need to know the
> mechanism
> > by which the cooking takes place, I only need to know that it gets
> > cooked when I apply either heat or RF at sufficient levels.
>
> If you are a chef, then all you may need to know is that the chicken
> got cooked to your liking...BUT if you are a scientist or engineer you
> need to know a lot more; and if you are afraid that the chicken was
not
```

> cooked well enough to kill the bacteria in it, you work with
scientists
> and engineers; You don't care much about what a chef might think
> because he doesn't understand the MECHANISM, nor the cause and effect
> of the groth of bacteria populations in what might be pockets of
> relatively raw chicken. The chef might not even be able to smell or
> taste bad chicken that is dangerously tainted. Worse he might attempt
> to cover up bad chicken with gravies that hide the rotten, stinking
> chicken and make it profitable to do so.
>
> Some of the "experts" who talk about what are considered RF hazard
> levels are no more scientific than old grandmothers who think that
> chicken soup will cure any illness. True, chicken soup might have
some
> healthy benefits for some minor ailments...but the old grannys who
make
> it don't know much about the spread of bacteria that exists within
> humans and certainly aren't aware of the latest reasearch about the
> AIDS virus. Chicken soup might just have a psychological beneficial
> effect on some humans...others might be better off with mock clam
> chowder or mock turtle soup....or some real Johnny Walker.
> >
> > > > Which makes sense. For the purpose of determining safe levels,
> > > > the mechanisms are unimportant
> > >
> > > Huhh? That is like saying Ohm's Law is unimportant as long as
lamp
> > > bulbs light. Only the observation of the light matters for
> determining
> > > what voltage will quickly burn open the filament.
> >
> > It's nothing like that at all. We need to know Ohm's law so we can
> > design electrical devices. We're not designing human bodies.
(Although
> > there are those doctors who've announced plans to clone humans, so
> maybe
> > we will be designing humans soon!)
>
> When you design electrical devices there are certain intrinsic
> conditions that must be delt with. There are physical limitations
that
> involve the actual fabrication of resistors, conductors, insulators,
> etc. (although I admit the human body is much more complex than an
> electrical resistance path)...
> BUT
> WE need to know the mechanism by which hazards can be hazardous before
> we can determine what the safe levels are...just like we need Ohm's
Law
> before we can design for appropriate resistances, voltages and
currents

> that can make a circuit function as we intend it to.
> True, we can not reengineer humans yet...although genetic manipulation
> may not be out of the question in the far future...BUT we need to
> design RF radiating equipments (including cell-phones and Ham HTs) so
> that they are safe for use by humans IF this is possible. On the down
> side, it might not be possible....just like it has not been possible
to
> manufacture a truly safe cigarette that is still a cigarette. We can
> not just think of the human body as a dummy load for RF...nor can we
> just think of the overall thermal effects on the body, without knowing
> the mechanisms that have dangerous propensities. Considering only
> thermal effects will definately prove to be a gross error. If the RF
> can be more consentrated on vulnerable parts of the human body at UHF
> than at VHF then this would not be a consideration if only thermal
> effects on the entire body are all that is being considered. It is a
> known fact that heat is generated when RF causes electrons in certain
> molecules to be agitated. (Heat is actually defined as electron
> agitation) BUT the effects of agitating electrons in the material that
> constitutes human tissue of various functions is poorly understood.

I agree with your opinions, for the most part, but this is not
generally true: Heat as electron agitation only would hold
under certain circumstances, for example in a plasma of some kind.

Electrons almost always are in atoms, and thus they take on
discrete, quantized levels of energy which
are definite and not random.

Heat is usually defined as the degree of randomness of motion
of atoms.

An electric current can cause electrons to move in a medium by
jumping from atom to atom; this causes essentially random
motion in the atoms (say, in a resistor), and thus a rise in
temperature. Removing the electric field leaves the atoms
moving more randomly, but the electrons are not at all random
in the reference frame of the atom with which each one is
associated. If the atoms were not moving randomly, the
electrons would not be, either.

In a conductor, the electrons (in the conduction
band) hardly interact at all with any individual atom;
therefore, with an applied potential, they transfer
little random momentum to the atoms; therefore, they don't
heat it very much.

> What levels, at what frequencies can cause genetic damage? What can
> cause or accelerate cancerous malignancies? What tissues are most
> vulnerable? Can some individuals be more at risk than others? All
> must be considered before setting any safe radiation level standards.
> Although the research continues, we have been permitted to work with
> standards that may be considered conservatively safe by

> some "grannys"...BUT not by W2ILP.
>
> I admit that I dunno at this point in time... nor does N9GL. Let us
> leave it at that.
> >
> > Jon
> >
> Hams need MORE license classes.
> 73,
> Bob Wex w2ilp (Increase License Potential)
>
> Sent via Deja.com
> http://www.deja.com/
>

--
~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~
John

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/
~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~

2877. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 04:17:04 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A836F40.138364AC@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3129

```
Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> Cecil wrote:
> >
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > Well OB you can invest your remaining *time* in attempting to make
> > > *time* stand still so you can hope to garner more *time* for yourself.
> > > I plan to use mine more constructively.
> >
> > How.......?
>
> It WON'T be by dancing to your tune.

Nor by your attempts to turn the ARS into a case of arrested development.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca
```

2878. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 04:17:13 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <95vr09$q0v$0@208.207.71.143>
Source record: 3124

"Ed Hare, W1RFI" wrote:
>
I gotta' tell ya', Larry; when I was a 14 year old General, I was
> as dumbed down as they come.
>

There was a lot of that going on, and FCC with nudging from ARRL introduced incentive licensing in a serious effort to change that. And it clearly worked, until 1985. Now they've turned 180 degrees, and you're right in the same basket with them.

2879. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 04:22:33 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <95vra9$q0v$1@208.207.71.143>
Source record: 3127

W1RFI wrote:
>
t will tell, IMHO, is the attrition rate of the no-code Techs that come
up
> for renewal soon. My speculation is that about 60% of them will not renew.
>
> Lobster anyone? :-)

Shucks, we're together on this one.

2880. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 04:26:00 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <95vrgo$r9j$0@208.207.71.143>
Source record: 3128

W1RFI wrote:
>
> >From: Aaron Jones nomail@nomail.com
>
> >Unless you intend to leave out the lay people, it is unrealistic to
> >believe that average hams can keep up with current technology to the
> >extent that they can advance the state of the art, or be of any value
> >to the military. And if they can't do those things, what good are they
> >to the government (as they once were)...
>
> I don't think the number of hams who advance the state of the art has ever been
> very high. But the number of hams today who have a fundamental grasp of modern
> communications technology is smaller than it was in years past, IMHO.

I don't know why that should be surprising. The technololgy of today is
far more complex than earlier days. To properly do DSP one needs to also
be familiar computer programming techniques. It must be a function of
the fact that you spend most of your time around hams who are also
highly technically trained, but you don't seem to be aware of how small
a percentage of hams are.

2881. Re: I heard a CB'er on 20 meters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 04:50:20 UTC
From: Glen Quarnstrom <glenq@rmci.net>
Message-ID: <lit68tgui5h5fnrmtmuorkanmcnumbgj79@4ax.com>
Source record: 3131
Cross-posted to:
alt.discrimination,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner

Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote:

>Kevin Alfred Strom at kevin.strom@innocent.com wrote:

>> But "contact," meaning "I want
>> to contact you" is quite new, less
>> than a decade of commonplace use I
>> think. I think it migrated to
>> amateur radio from the Citizen's
>> Band, [snip]
>
>
> Heck, for all we know it could be coming from the contact managers
>everyone has on their computers today. Or it could be coming from the
>business world. I've noticed a lot of business people saying that today -
>the word "contact" both as a question and statement (meaning "will you
>contact..." as a question or "yes, I'll contact..." when answered back). In
>other words, who knows where this stuff comes from.

It came from CB sidebanders back in the mid-70s or so. They wanted to
talk like hams, but they didn't want to say "break" because it sounded
too much like AM CBers, so they started that idiotic "contact" crap when
they wanted to break in.

When I want to break in, I just give my call letters. It gets the job
done, and saves time letting people know who's breaking in.
--
glenq@rmci.net
WB7DOW
http://home.rmci.net/glenq/

2882. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 05:33:52 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010209003352.14777.00001684@nso-bd.aol.com>
Source record: 3134

In article <jun58t0qlmkc9fn8lvjodlug0phbp6f69d@4ax.com>, Aaron Jones
<nomail@nomail.com> writes:

>Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>>80 meters is probably the most underused band these days.
>
>Agreed. Much less than even 10 years ago...

There are lots of reasons why. One is the huge antennas ("huge", by the
standards of those used to VHF/UHF and 10 meters) Another is the nightime
nature of the band.
>
>>go to 40 meters,
>
>It's 10:51am here. There's not one signal to be heard on 40 meters.
>And I'm in daytime range of Southern California. After the morning
>skeds, about 10:00am to around 3:00pm daily 40 is usually dead. Not
>band dead, ham dead. I sometimes set my keyer to repeat CQs and work
>on other things in the background. Often I go 20 minutes without an
>answer and finally give up. It wasn't that way even 10 years ago...

Most of us are at work then. When we get home, there are a zillion things to do
before thinking about radio. Gone are the days when Mom took care of the kids
and the meals and the house and Dad could go on the air right after dinner.
Getting on the air requires a block of time when you have some uninterrupted
time and no pressing responsibilities. That's a rare commodity for most of us
with houses and kids and two careers.
>
>>even 30
>
>I seldom used to use this band because it's deader than 40. That's why
>when I moved I didn't bother to put up an antenna for it...

Antennas may be part of the problem.
>
>>or 20
>
>This is where I make most of my daytime contacts. But even 20 is not
>what it was in the past...
>
>>are much more active.
>
The last few nights 40 has been hopping. Just worked YL2SM - 589 both ways.
Sometimes it's hard to find a spot to call CQ between the low end and 7050 -
and that's with a receiver that has cascaded 8 pole 500 Hz filters.

It's the time of day and the MUF. Plus lifestyles.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2883. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 05:33:54 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010209003354.14777.00001686@nso-bd.aol.com>
Source record: 3132

In article <3A832AD0.FBDEA93C@uci.edu>, Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> writes:

>100% of the ones that send bweeeeeeeee bweep bweeeeeeee bweep
>bweeeeeee bweeeeeeee bweep bweeeeeeee

No no no. It's "chowpy chowpit chow chow chichow"

73 de Jim, N2EY

2884. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 05:33:54 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010209003354.14777.00001685@nso-bd.aol.com>
Source record: 3135

In article <20010208192435.21807.00000087@ng-cr1.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>>From: Aaron Jones nomail@nomail.com
>
>>I remember that lots of hams threatened to quit the ARRL over
>>Incentive Licensing, but only someone with membership data would know
>>if a large number of hams actually did. Ed?
>
>I wasn't around then; my license expired in 1969 and I wasn't relicensed
>until
>about 1973 or so. I do recall reading (here, maybe) that a number of hams
>did
>quit the League over the whole deal. I am certain that they didn't all quit
>ham radio.
>
>I think even then, postal regulations required a regular statement of
>circulation in QST. Your back issues should give at least a relative
>indication.
>
I was around back then (Novice in 1967, Advanced in 1968, Extra in 1970). The moaning and whining by some who "lost privileges" was amazing.

But what was more amazing was how few folks knew the real story of how it all came about. The FCC wanted it, but the ARRL got the blame for it because the BOD didn't oppose it. Truth was, the FCC said it was gonna happen one way or another, so the BOD got them to tame the proposal somewhat.

For example, the FCC proposed demoting existing Advanceds to General, then creating a new "Amateur First Class" with a new written and 16 wpm code test (that would have made FOUR code tests!). Plus even more subbands and other gobbledygook. The ARRL talked them into dropping that one and letting the 40,000 or so existing Advanceds have more privileges.

Another deal was that the Extra CW band was going to become the lower 50 khz of 80/40/20/15, not just the lower 25. But the FCC quietly canceled that part in mid 1969, and it never went into effect.

And the whole thing was about hams not having enough technical knowledge, and turning into appliance operators. The code test thingie was the FCC's idea. In fact, the original 1963 ARRL BOD idea was simple: Bring back the pre-1953 system where you needed an Advanced to run phone on the ham bands between 2 and 28 MHz. (In other words, all HF phone except 160 and 10 meters).

Oddly enough, the numbers worked out exactly the opposite of what W2NSD and his ilk supposed.

From 1946 to 1963, the number of US hams more than quadrupled, from 60,000 to about a quarter million. The growth was steady until 1962, then all of a sudden it stopped dead. There were lots of reasons, which I won't go into here, but incentive licensing wasn't one of them. Incentive licensing was more than 5 years in the future at the beginning of 1963.

From 1963 until about 1970, the number of US hams held steady at around 250,000. Then, after incentive licensing was in effect, it started growing again. By 1979, 350,000 had been reached. Half a million US hams was reached just 5 years later. Over 600,000 by 1990 - BEFORE the Tech lost its code test. Go figure.

The hams of the time were split about evenly between supporting and opposing incentive licensing. A few left the ARRL and a few gave up ham radio completely - but only a few, and they were quickly replaced by newcomers. The ARRL BOD still feels the wrath of those times today, even though many of the present directors weren't even hams then. I don't think any of them were ARRL officials then, either.

--

Assuming an annual dropout rate of just 3%, only about 36% of those 1968 hams are still hams today - that's about 90,000. Works out to 13% of the 682,000 US hams licensed now.

I'm one of 'em. Sure doesn't seem like 34 years.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2885. Re: Morse Code replacement? Bigtime flame war article!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 05:33:55 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010209003355.14777.00001687@nso-bd.aol.com>
Source record: 3133

In article <95uo2u$4v1$1@nnrp1.deja.com>, K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org> writes:

>In article <95um7m$345$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
> n2ey@aol.com wrote:
>>
>> And that's just my short list.
>>
>
>I like all those ideas, Jim, except the one about publicizing the Fists
>freqs. I've abandoned any operations anywhere near xx.058, because
>once a Fists member "collects your number", the contact usually comes
>to a quick conclusion.

I must be doing something wrong, then. I work lotsa FISTS members, but the QSOs all turn into nice ragchews. Maybe we trade numbers, maybe we don't - they're all on the website anyway.

7058 is full of foreign 'phones nowadays, anyhow.

40 has been hopping recently - worked a Hungarian last night, and when I signed with him a KT4 that I last worked on Xmas Day called me to catch up. Nice chat - then when he and I signed, a UA3 called me. Pretty decent for a homebrew 100 watt CW transceiver and an inverted V at 35 feet, huh?

Now I'm gonna see what's going on tonight before bedtime.
>
>73, Hans, K0HB
>Fists # 7419 (I think)
>
Yup -you're 7419. I'm 4360. See ya around 7040.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2886. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 05:35:31 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <95vvj3$8dl$0@208.207.71.143>
Source record: 3136

W1RFI wrote:
>
> >From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
>
> >Forever things just got to keep moving, forever and ever, without even
> >a pause?
>
> Seems that they are doing just that, Dick. Where is the pause in the
> development of computer technology? Where is the pause in the development of
> non-amateur wireless technology? I don't see any.
>
> What value would be found in having the Amateur Radio service pause while the
> rest of the world marches steadily onward? What harm could come of stopping in
> our tracks?
>

This isn't rocket science either, Ed. Where's the logic in expecting
any substantial percentage of non-technical people, which is what the
majority of hams are, to stay current on the intricacies of the latest
digital communications techniques? Does it seem in any way likely to
happen, when the vast majorithy of the newly licensed come from a
one-day study-the-test session where all fee payers come away with a
license? You really think any serious percentage of hams would have a
clue about "block diagrams" when looking under the hood of an IC756?
Most of the components these days are SMt and impossible to even
identify visually even if you know what you're looking at, unless and
until one has been to the "factory service school" on the particular
piece of gear, and that as a professional technician!
Even old fellers like me, who spent the working career AND 44 year ham
radio experience mostly in the technical side of radio find it beyond
reasonable that it be demanded of us that we abandon what we know and
like in favor of some dippy digital engineer's ideal of what radio
communications should be today, just because he has found that he is
capable of scrambling the numbers and inventing some new mode each week.
In a word, much of it is BORING.
As I noted earlier, history is littered with "better idea"s that didn't
make the cut. The good stuff, the things that attract people, has a way
of staying around long past the tenure of many successive
"improvements". Commercial communications has its objectives. They have
diverged rather seriously from that of ham radio in the past decade or
two. There is no valid reason why hams should be mandated to follow the
same path when there is simply no need.
If the ham bands were clogged and overcrowded such that spectral
efficiency (especially at HF) was an issue there would at least be some

reason for it. That is simply NOT the case and as noted earlier. Especially at HF. Activity most of the time is reduced, no doubt by massive amounts of time previously devoted to on the air ham activities now spent on the Internet, as we are doing now. It's a case of "technology for its own sake". Not good enough. Many hams will simply abandon ship first. If I must give up what I find attractive in ham radio for all-digital radio communications, I'll just go internet full time. I know hams who have done exactly that.
In fact, this ongoing argument has reduced my interest in digital modes. I was an early packeteer, following even earlier RTTY activity, from an old MOdel 15 that stripped a fiber gear and was replaced a Commodore Vic 20 with a Microlog Air One module when that was the latest, long before IBM PCs came on the scene. All this constant haranguing about how we "MUST" has about got my disgust level up and my digital radio interest down.

2887. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 05:40:52 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <95vvt4$8dl$1@208.207.71.143>
Source record: 3137

W1RFI wrote:
>
> >From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
>
> >Digital should get its own segment, since digital and W do not mix that
> >well. And analog voice should get its own.
>
> But I thought CW gets through when no other mode will.

Would you please to attempt to quote accurately? It's "gets through
when other commonly available modes cannot".

> Is that true only if
> the other mode is not allowed to be used?

Well, I was in a weak-signal QSO when a PSK31 station came on the
frequency exactly zero beat. You figure it out.

2888. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 05:48:35 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9600bj$8dl$2@208.207.71.143>
Source record: 3138

W1RFI wrote:
>
> >From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
>
> >When one is unqualified at the basics, how can he claim to be fully
> >accomplished?
>
> If one is qualified only at the basics, how can he claim to be fully
> accomplished?

So who ever advocated stopping there???

2889. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 05:50:23 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9600ev$8dl$3@208.207.71.143>
Source record: 3139

W1RFI wrote:
>
> >From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
>
> >That is: The most basic radio communications mode is radiotelegraphy.
> > Find one that you can show to be more basic and we'll look again.
>
> The "prisoner tap code" could be OO keyed. It can probably be done at about 5
> wpm with a lookup table by someone not experienced in Morse code decoding. That
> seems more basic to me. If you agree that it is more basic than OOK Morse
> code, will you now support IT as the mode that all hams should learn to be
> considered fully versed in radio technology?
>

The prisoner tap code was never a radiocommunications mode, and was not
designed to be. Military men who needed to communicate over radio knew
enough to use Morse.

2890. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 06:01:45 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <960149cbg0@208.207.71.143>
Source record: 3140

Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> Len Over 21 wrote:
> >
> > In article <3A82FC9F.1A7319E5@uci.edu>, Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> writes:
> >
> > >Len Over 21 wrote:
> > >> Apparently you don't want to believe that code-tested US radio
> > >> amateurs are decreasing in number while non-code-tested
> > >> US radio amateurs are increasing in number.
> > >
> > >I know you're not stupid, Len, so the only thing I can conclude about
> > >why you would say something which is totally inaccurate is because
> > >you're so mad at me that you can't think of anything logical to say. I
> > >never disputed your figures. You did.
>
> > Please state exactly what was "inaccurate."
>
> Here's the statement I was referring to:
>
> "Apparently you don't want to believe that code-tested US radio
> amateurs are decreasing in number while non-code-tested
> US radio amateurs are increasing in number."
>
> > Shall we all have fun with word games here? Or would you
> > rather discuss some issues regarding the code-tested state
> > of US amateur radio license classes?
>
> It would go a long way if you would just TRY to make less inflamatory
> statements, Len. You seem to feel the need to taunt, or exaggerate, or
> belittle, or insult, in every stinkin' one of your posts. That's all
> this was about. Geez.

It's all he has ever done and is the reason most here just ignore him.
He had pretty well dried up for lact of attention when someone engaged
him in a drawnout flamefest, and he was rejuvenated.He is not interested
in ham radio in the least, other than to slam and criticize it and all
who are in it. He lives only to disturb and disrupt and like all such
idiots, when he gets no attention he goes away.

2891. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 07:10:15 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <60678tgm3t0mpt9pss6ce7iep1tqi07u9m@4ax.com>
Source record: 3141

w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:
>the number of hams today who have a fundamental grasp of modern
>communications technology is smaller than it was in years past, IMHO.

I would agree. And the reason is mainly because of today's advanced
technology, not because of any less intelligence in today's hams...

2892. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 07:10:18 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <9r578tsjd4ga0sbemnhlitpnq7gq8igep8@4ax.com>
Source record: 3142

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>There are lots of reasons why [there is no activity on 80].
>One is the huge antennas ("huge", by the standards of those
>used to VHF/UHF and 10 meters) Another is the nightime
>nature of the band.

I don't think that either of those reasons would explain the reduced activity on 80 as compared to 10 years ago. My guess: One reason is the Internet. I have considerably reduced my on the air time because I play on this computer. I doubt that I am alone in this. Another possible reason might be that most of the 80 year olds I worked 10 years ago are no longer with us, and there are few 20 year olds to take their place.

>Most of us are at work then [9am - 3pm]...

And lots of us don't work then. Even before retirement I did lots of shift work so I was often on 40 during those afternoon hours. But for comparing now to then, likely as many hams worked then as now during those hours...

>Antennas may be part of the problem [why 30 is dead].

Sometime I wondered about that. But when I did find a QSO the signals were good each way, and we had the band completely to ourselves...

2893. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 07:10:20 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <qo578t45lkqjh1ggiqp312u0nvlumqsrqr@4ax.com>
Source record: 3143

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>The moaning and whining by some who "lost privileges" was amazing.

Entirely predictable. People who feel they have been unfairly treated
tend to remember it a long time...

>And the whole thing was about hams not having enough technical knowledge, and
>turning into appliance operators.

And of course most hams today lack technical knowledge and are
appliance operators...

>The growth was steady until 1962, then all of a sudden
>it stopped dead. There were lots of reasons, which I won't go into here,

What were the reasons?

>Then, after incentive licensing was in effect, it started growing again.

Did Bash have anything to do with it... :-)

2894. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 08:02:29 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <96086l$t3g$0@208.207.71.164>
Source record: 3144

Aaron Jones wrote:
>

> >Then, after incentive licensing was in effect, it started growing again.
>
> Did Bash have anything to do with it... :-)

Not till nearly ten years later. He did his thing in the late 70's, and
it led directly to the adoption of the question pools and VE testing
system.

2895. The Raoul Xemblinosky mystery deepens

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 09:57:16 UTC
From: SLee@houston.net
Message-ID: <960ets$h6s$0@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 3145
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.flame,alt.fan.karl-malden.nose

On Thu, 08 Feb 2001 21:06:04 -0500, KC8JBO <kc8jbo-no-spam@cotse.com> wrote:

: Poor, poor "Stagger".. it must be hard on him when he realized he is OWNED.
: "Stagger" is scraping the bottom of the barrel with these latest lies. A quick
: check of "Roger Wiseman" in switchboard yields quite a few Roger Wisemans
: around....HAHAHAHAHAHA!!!

What an amazing coincidence it is then! The several songs about "Roger
Wiseman" on http://extra.newsguy.com/~shpxurnq/songs.html mention
Marshall County, West Virginia (see "Hit the Road, Bucktoothed Choad").

Imagine that: Two Roger Wisemans in Marshall County, both of whom use
the same colorful language. Apparently, one of them was booted off
both alt.fan.karl-malden.nose and alt.flame some years ago.

Fancied himself to be a flamer, but got laughed at.

It seems that Raoul Xemblinosky wrote his songs in the same language Roger used
to commemorate that auspicious occasion.

But, hey: You deny that songs like "Imagine #2" were written about you,
and who are we to question that?

2896. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 11:34:02 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010209063402.16888.00000158@ng-mj1.aol.com>
Source record: 3146

>From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

>> >That is: The most basic radio communications mode is radiotelegraphy.
>> > Find one that you can show to be more basic and we'll look again.

>> The "prisoner tap code" could be OO keyed. It can probably be done at
>> about 5 wpm with a lookup table by someone not experienced in
>> Morse code decoding. That seems more basic to me. If you agree
>> that it is more basic than OOK Morse
code, will you now support IT
>> as the mode that all hams should learn to be
>> considered fully versed in radio technology?

>The prisoner tap code was never a radiocommunications mode, and was not
>designed to be.

Morse code was originally designed to be a wire communications mode, deciphered
by machine. It was adapted to radio use.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2897. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 11:35:35 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010209063535.16888.00000159@ng-mj1.aol.com>
Source record: 3147

>From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)

>The FCC wanted it, but the ARRL got the blame for it because the
>BOD didn't oppose it.

Is this much like a few who now believe that the ARRL asked the FCC to create 3 classes of license and a 5 wpm code test?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2898. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 11:40:05 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010209064005.02997.00002027@nso-mg.aol.com>
Source record: 3148

In article <qo578t45lkqjh1ggiqp312u0nvlumqsrqr@4ax.com>, Aaron Jones
<nomail@nomail.com> writes:

>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>>The moaning and whining by some who "lost privileges" was amazing.
>
>Entirely predictable. People who feel they have been unfairly treated
>tend to remember it a long time...

Exactly! And they weren't quiet about it, either.
>
>>And the whole thing was about hams not having enough technical knowledge,
>and
>>turning into appliance operators.
>
>And of course most hams today lack technical knowledge and are
>appliance operators...

Yup. The FCC did not understand what was really going on at the time at all.
They still don't. I also think that the FCC was reacting to "Sputnik fever"
(the whole incentive licensing thing started very quietly in 1958, right after
the launch of Sputnik)
>
>>The growth was steady until 1962, then all of a sudden
>>it stopped dead. There were lots of reasons, which I won't go into here,
>
>What were the reasons?

Well, you asked, so here goes. Please keep in mind that there was no single
dominant reason - there were a lot of little ones that all added up to the
growth suddenly stopping.

- SSB: A few hams had been using SSB since 1933. Lots more started using it
after 1948, when the phasing and low-cost filter methods were developed by
folks like Mike Villard, W6QYT. By 1962, the introduction of easy-to-use gear
primarily designed for SSB (S-line, KWM-2, TR-3, etc.) turned the tide and made
SSB the most common voice mode on the HF ham bands. But this meant that SWLs
could no longer easily listen in on ham QSOs, as they did in the AM days. Short
wave listening was a major soiurce of new hams back then that was seriously
reduced by the predominance of SSB. The cost and complexity of an SSB setup
also had a negative effect on prospective hams by making it more expensive to
get started on 'phone.

- FCC rules changes: In those days you had to live a certain distance from a
quarterly FCC exam point in order to have the option of taking the Conditional
test by mail instead of doing the General in front of an FCC examiner. In 1963

the distance requirement was increased from 75 miles to 175 miles, and the number of FCC exam points increased as well. Huge areas of the country that used to be "Conditional country" suddenly became General territory. This change meant that the investment of time and money to upgrade greatly increased because you couldn't go to old Joe across town for an exam at a convenient time - you had to make a trip of up to 175 miles "air line" to an FCC exam point that might only have exam sessions four times a year. Since a Novice back then was only good for a year and could not be renewed or retaken, this change greatly increased the dropout rate. To add insult to injury, the FCC started charging fees of $4 to take the exam (pass or fail). $4 was a bit of money back then to many people - about $20-25 in today's money.

- CB: 27 MHz CB had been introduced a few years earlier, but by 1963 the number of CBers was greater than the number of hams, and growing fast. The equipment was inexpensive, the antennas small and simple, and there was no test at all. Although licenses were required and there were strict regulations about the new service, many CBers simply ignored the rules and did as they pleased. Soon it was discovered that the FCC could not enforce the rules with any great degree of effectiveness. Many people who might have become hams went to CB instead.

- Cultural changes: Ham radio has always been a sort of "square" thing, to use a term of the day. Very few hams of '60s looked like John Lennon or even Austin Powers. Famous amateurs of the time were folks like Barry Goldwater, Curtis LeMay, Arthur Godfrey - hardly "flower children"! The emergence of the '60s "counterculture" drew lots of young people away from things like ham radio. Vietnam didn't help, either.

- TV and other media: TV watching increased all through the '50s and '60s. More stations were on the air more hours in more places, resulting in less time for ham radio. I remember seeing test patterns on TV as a young child, and there being only 3 TV stations in a major market like Philadelphia. I also recall many people in outlying areas like the New Jersey shore foregoing TV because it required a huge antenna to get a snowy picture. That all changed over time, mostly in the '60s. The internet and PCs have had a similar effect in the past 5-10 years.

- Economic conditions: For some reason, ham radio tends to grow more during periods of bad economic conditions than during good ones, with the single exception of the 1950s. The roaring 20s showed slow growth, while the Depression era produced a near-tripling of the number of US hams in less than 5 years. WW2 shut down ham radio for much of the '40s. The affluence of the '60s produced no growth while the stagflation and oil crises of the '70s and early '80s more than doubled the number of hams. When did the growth of the early '80s stop? About the time the stock market really took off. (When Clinton took office in 1992, the Dow was 3620)

And that's just the short list!
>
>>Then, after incentive licensing was in effect, it started growing again.
>
>Did Bash have anything to do with it... :-)

Probably a small effect. Many of the above causes reached "saturation" by 1970. For example, the FCC eventually dropped the fees and began giving license tests at hamfests and club meetings using traveling examiners. SSB became so entrenched that decent used first-generation gear became cheap. SWLs were replaced by scanner enthusiasts, who encountered ham radio by way of FM repeaters. CB lost its newness and got overcrowded. TV became commonplace and the quality of the shows sagged. The draft and Vietnam ended. Economic conditions got bad.

Waddya think?

73 de Jim, N2EY

2899. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 11:40:42 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <960kvpmab1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 3151

In article <95voct0git@enews3.newsguy.com>,
tlbryant@my-deja.com (T. L. Bryant) wrote:
> In article <95v8mtjmt1@nnrp1.deja.com>, brianburke@my-deja.com
says...
>
> >> Still trying to figure out what, if
> >> anything, you ARE expert at though.
> >
> >The greatest hobby in the world - the one everyone talks about!
> >
>
> At the moment, that would be collecting Pokemon cards.

Not the moment most people live in. Guess again.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2900. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 11:45:28 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010209064528.16888.00000161@ng-mj1.aol.com>
Source record: 3149

>From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

>> I don't think the number of hams who advance the state of the art has ever
>>been very high. But the number of hams today who have a fundamental
>>grasp of modern communications technology is smaller than it was in
>>years past, IMHO.

>I don't know why that should be surprising. The technololgy of today is
>far more complex than earlier days.

It is not more difficult to understand the fundamentals of how it works than it is to understand the fundamentals of AM, FM, SSB.

> To properly do DSP one needs to also be familiar computer programming
> techniques.

In 1963, I could not "do" an analog filter. One does not need to be a programmer to understand how DSP functions.

> It must be a function of the fact that you spend most of your time around
> hams who are also highly technically trained, but you don't seem to be
> aware of how small a percentage of hams are.

I am quite aware of the present technical status of hams, Dick; I spend about 2 or 3 hours a day on the phone, answering their questions. Most of them don't share your "can't do" viewpoint.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2901. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 11:48:29 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010209064829.16888.00000163@ng-mj1.aol.com>
Source record: 3150

>From: Aaron Jones nomail@nomail.com

>>the number of hams today who have a fundamental grasp of modern
>>communications technology is smaller than it was in years past, IMHO.

>I would agree. And the reason is mainly because of today's advanced
>technology, not because of any less intelligence in today's hams...

I agree that it is not intelligence; today's hams are probably, on the whole, a bit smarter than we were.

I don't agree that the technology is so advanced that today's intelligent hams cannot learn the fundamentals of how it works. I believe that it is a chicken-and-egg sort of thing, with such techniques not in use in Amateur Radio, so hams don't learn about them, making it less likely that they will be in use in Amateur Radio. The net effect, unfortunately, is that the rest of the radio world is passing us by.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2902. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 11:52:34 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <960lm1mom1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 3154

In article <3A833DCD.97EFDFE5@uci.edu>,
Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote:
>
>
> Brian wrote:
> > If what you say is true, then most everyone would see that and your
> > comments would be completely unnecessary. But instead, you chose to
> > define scaleology as if you worked for the dept of weights and
measures.
>
> I think you're over your head Brian. Best let it drop. The subject -
> not your head.

Yeh, you keep saying that. So let us review.

Len brings up the fact that the numbers of coded hams are decreasing and the numbers of non-coded hams are increasing (the "point" of the discussion). He uses a balance scale term. You cannot comment on the facts of the ham population, so instead dissect balance scale engineering, and thus you claim Len's statements false. Ergo coded ham populations are increasing. Nice fantasy.

Am I still in over my head?

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2903. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 11:53:06 UTC
From: tlbryant@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <960ln202tpc@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 3165

In article <960149cbg0@208.207.71.143>, dixie@townsqr.com says...

>> > Shall we all have fun with word games here? Or would you
>> > rather discuss some issues regarding the code-tested state
>> > of US amateur radio license classes?
>>
>> It would go a long way if you would just TRY to make less inflamatory
>> statements, Len. You seem to feel the need to taunt, or exaggerate, or
>> belittle, or insult, in every stinkin' one of your posts. That's all
>> this was about. Geez.
>
> It's all he has ever done and is the reason most here just ignore him.
>He had pretty well dried up for lact of attention when someone engaged
>him in a drawnout flamefest, and he was rejuvenated.He is not interested
>in ham radio in the least, other than to slam and criticize it and all
>who are in it. He lives only to disturb and disrupt and like all such
>idiots, when he gets no attention he goes away.

I think that if Len wanted to be inflamatory, he would have done a lot more
than complain about playing word games.

2904. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 11:53:48 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010209065348.16888.00000164@ng-mj1.aol.com>
Source record: 3152

>From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

>> >Digital should get its own segment, since digital and W do not mix that
>> >well. And analog voice should get its own.

>> But I thought CW gets through when no other mode will.

> Would you please to attempt to quote accurately? It's "gets through
>when other commonly available modes cannot".

Sure. But the digital and analog voice modes are commonly available.

>> Is that true only if the other mode is not allowed to be used?

> Well, I was in a weak-signal QSO when a PSK31 station came on the
>frequency exactly zero beat. You figure it out.

I can indeed figure it out. If that PSK-31 signal was more than about 30 Hz
away from "zero beat," it went on just fine and the CW ops experienced QRM. Of
those two commonly available modes, which one got through while the other did
not?

CW has a necessary bandwidth of about 50 Hz. Go ahead, start calling CQ 51 Hz
away from a CW QSO in progress and tell me the result.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
>
>
>
>
>
>

2905. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 11:54:30 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <960lpjmpb1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 3153

In article <3A836AA3.60DA4D4E@IEEE.org>,
Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> Brian wrote:
> > Meanwhile, Shirley MacClaine held hands with spiritual guides as
they
> > looked to the East and focused on preventing the quake.
>
> Shirley MacClaine was asked who was the most influential person in
> her life. She answered, "My own higher self."

She's her own God. Kind of like on here. ;)

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2906. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 11:55:35 UTC
From: tlbryant@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <960lrn12tpc@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 3166

In article <3A8365FA.6A21D177@IEEE.org>, Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org says...
>
>W1RFI wrote:
>> What value would be found in having the Amateur Radio service pause while
the
>> rest of the world marches steadily onward?
>
>Don't look now, Ed, but it is already happening.

True. The elimination of high-speed code testing certainly didn't make the
cover of Time magazine.

2907. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 12:00:43 UTC
From: tlbryant@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <960m5b22tpc@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 3167

In article <96086l$t3g$0@208.207.71.164>, dixie@townsqr.com says...

>Aaron Jones wrote:
>>
>
>> >Then, after incentive licensing was in effect, it started growing again.
>>
>> Did Bash have anything to do with it... :-)
>
>Not till nearly ten years later. He did his thing in the late 70's, and
>it led directly to the adoption of the question pools and VE testing
>system.

That. and the fact that having to administer amateur license exams was a very
big boil on the FCC's behind.

2908. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 12:12:22 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010209071222.16867.00000158@ng-mj1.aol.com>
Source record: 3155

>From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

In an earlier post, Dicc Carroll writes:

> So who ever advocated stopping there???

and in this post, he answers his own question:

>Even old fellers like me, who spent the working career AND 44 year ham
>radio experience mostly in the technical side of radio find it beyond
>reasonable that it be demanded of us that we abandon what we know and
>like in favor of some dippy digital engineer's ideal of what radio
>communications should be today, just because he has found that he is
>capable of scrambling the numbers and inventing some new mode each week.
>In a word, much of it is BORING.

> As I noted earlier, history is littered with "better idea"s that didn't
>make the cut.

Modern radio techniques have very much made the cut, Dick; they are being used everywhere outside of Amateur Radio (and even a little bit within it).

Why do you resist learning new things?

> Commercial communications has its objectives. They have
>diverged rather seriously from that of ham radio in the past decade or
>two.

Yes, they have progressed while we have paused, to use your word from a previous post.

> There is no valid reason why hams should be mandated to follow the
>same path when there is simply no need.

If Amateur Radio were not in touch with the technology of the 40s, we would not be here after being shut down after WW2.

>If the ham bands were clogged and overcrowded such that spectral
>efficiency (especially at HF) was an issue there would at least be some
>reason for it.

It is not necessarily an issue of overcrowding, Dick; it is an issue of amateur radio being seen outside of our circles as being more than an anachronism. Ane the overcrowding issue can be part of it, too. In most urban areas, a ham who wants to put up a new repeater is told that "no pairs are available." Yet, tune the band, and most of the repeaters sit idle most of the time. This is not an efficient use of spectrum.

> If I must give up what I find attractive in ham
>radio for all-digital radio communications, I'll just go internet full
>time.

You must have me mixed up with someone else, Dick; I have never proposed ahtat you have to give up doing what you enjoy in ham radio. I am proposing that more hams learn the most fundamental components of modern radio technology. Unlike your view of your favorite mode, I am not proposing that you have to take a pass/fail test in these fundamentals to be licensed, although a few more questions about them would be nice.

I believe in the ability of hams to learn and grow. If more information is made available in amateur circles, they will come and they will learn and when such techniques come to be used in Amateur Radio, they will have an understanding of their advantages and disadvantages. Some hams will continue to thirst for radio knowledge, others will "pause," but as long as the Service as a whole continues to grow, we will have met the technical components of our regulatory objectives.

> In fact, this ongoing argument has reduced my interest in digital
>modes. ... All this constant haranguing about how we "MUST" has about
> got my disgust level up and my digital radio interest down.

Let me be perfectly clear, Dick; I do not believe that you "must." You are quite free to rest on your laurels and let others carry on, if that is your wish.

But imagine how some of the talk about "must" affects other hams, whose budding interest is being shot down just like yours -- with all this talk about "must" with respect to Morse code. I believe that if some folks were not telling them how Morse code is a big hill to climb to prove their character, more of them would sooner or later want to give the mode a whirl.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
>
>
>
>
>

2909. Re: Morse Code replacement? Bigtime flame war article!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 12:14:20 UTC
From: kelly@dvol
Message-ID: <3a83de57.41990447@news2.dvol.com>
Source record: 3156

On 09 Feb 2001 00:33:05 GMT, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:

>Yeah, but you know, Carl and I have had many an interesting conversation since
>and he is now using an entirely different style. I occasionally see some of his
>infamous "forcefulness," but I think he has chosen a productive route. I count
>Carl among my friends. Even bought him a lobster once. :-)
>
Don't bring that sumbitch to Bookbinders for the RV/EY lobsterfest,
he'll never make it back to Allentown.
>
>73,
>Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
w3rv

2910. Re: ARRL HQ "Attitude" (Was: Re: Pride)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 12:15:55 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010209071555.16867.00000159@ng-mj1.aol.com>
Source record: 3157

>From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

>I stopped counting at four;

Can you estimate how many more?

>the count began with the receptionist/telephone operator in the lobby.

If it was Penny, she is one of the dearest people I know.

> It seemed like the only person who didn't go out of their way to piss me
> off that day was Chuck Bender at W1AW.

What day were you at HQ, Larry? I don't recall any memos that said "Larry is here; everybody go out of your way to honk him off."

Tell you what. Come back to HQ and I will personally give you a tour and introduce you to all of my friends at HQ.

Perhaps others here who have visited HQ can share their experiences, to confirm or contrast the bad one that you appear to have had.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2911. Re: I heard a CB'er on 20 meters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 12:19:32 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010209071932.16867.00000160@ng-mj1.aol.com>
Source record: 3158

>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)

>How's the RFID units at 13.56 MHz nowadays? [asking out of curiosity,
>not to troll]

Don't know, Len; unfortunately, I have enough to worry about inside the ham bands. VSDL, HomePhoneNetworking and HomePlug are just starting to take hold.

The upper part of 2.4 GHz is about to fill up with Part 15 devices, it would appear. It may be a lick-em or join-em issue, and we don't have a prayer of licking them. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2912. Re: Engineers, Technicians, and Appliance Operators

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 12:22:05 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010209072205.16867.00000161@ng-mj1.aol.com>
Source record: 3159

>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)

>No real "detective work" needed then, but it is surprising
>that a proud employee wouldn't name his employer. :-)

Now, Len, look what some (you included) have done to me when they learned who I work for. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2913. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 12:25:18 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010209072518.16867.00000162@ng-mj1.aol.com>
Source record: 3160

>From: Jim Kelley jwkelley@uci.edu

>Sounds like an excellent answer to have prepared for your next job
>interview, Ed. "Well I don't know anything about that, but I can look
>it up!"

If they ask me to cite from memory what the ascii code is for a semicolon, I will do just that. I will also wonder why they asked me the question.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2914. Re: I heard a CB'er on 20 meters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 12:34:20 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010209073420.16867.00000163@ng-mj1.aol.com>
Source record: 3161

>From: Glen Quarnstrom glenq@rmci.net

> They wanted to talk like hams, but they didn't want to say "break"
> because it sounded too much like AM CBers, so they started that idiotic
> "contact" crap when they wanted to break in.

In some contexts, it is more useful to break into a net in such a way that the reason for the break is announced at the time of breaking. On the SSB county hunters net, "last county contact" is often used to break NCS between running mobiles so that an individual mobile or portable station can ask for a minute to move a contact for a last county in a state off the net. Break is generally used to indicate a mobile who needs to run his/her county off frequency rather than wait on a long list to be run on the main frequency. I could imagine "contact" being a way of breaking an existing repeater, indicating that the breaker wanted to make a call to establish contact with another station not involved in the ongoing conversation.

>When I want to break in, I just give my call letters. It gets the job
>done, and saves time letting people know who's breaking in.

Contact gets the job done, and saves time letting people know the purpose of the break. Either is legal under FCC rules.

Will the method of breaking into a repeater now join the importance of using "name," "handle" or "personal" in the annals of what is important to modern amateur radio?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2915. Re: The Raoul Xemblinosky mystery deepens

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 12:36:00 UTC
From: KC8JBO <roger_kc8jbo@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <960o7goih1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 3162
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.flame,alt.fan.karl-malden.nose

In article <960ets$h6s$0@dosa.alt.net>,
FAGGOT WEE WEE abuse@127.0.0.1 "wrote:"
>
> On Thu, 08 Feb 2001 21:06:04 -0500, KC8JBO <kc8jbo-no-spam@cotse.com>
wrote:
>
> : Poor, poor "Stagger".. it must be hard on him when he realized he
is OWNED.
> : "Stagger" is scraping the bottom of the barrel with these latest
lies. A quick
> : check of "Roger Wiseman" in switchboard yields quite a few Roger
Wisemans
> : around....HAHAHAHAHAHA!!!
>
> What <SLAP!!!!!!>

I KNEW YOU'D ANSWER MY POST BIIIIIIIIIITCCCCCHHHHHHH!!!!!!!!!

Hey, You should be going to trial soon because you your arrest in that
big Harrison County drug sting....LOL!!!!!!
--
73 de Roger, KC8JBO
EM99 |ARRL|VE [ARRL & W5YI]|ARES |RACES
Yaesu FT-920 |Inverted Vee @ 40 ft.
Yaesu FT-90R

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2916. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 12:39:20 UTC
From: "Steven J Robeson", K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <960odo$or8$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 3163

In article <20010208214540.02997.00002007@nso-mg.aol.com>,
lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:

> What are you saying? That code-tested licensees are opting
> to change over to Technician class from a code-tested previous
> class not a Technician-Plus?

No...simply YOU try to discount the "Techs" who upgrade. Yes,
most "new" licensees are Techs. But a LARGE number don't stay there.

You ignore that.

> >Date: Thu, 08 Feb 2001 19:08:48 GMT <----------!!!

> Ah, still doing e-mail from work, ey?

From wherever I do it, it doesn't take much to make a fool out of
you, Lennie.

--
"It Could Be That Your Life's Only Meaning Is To Serve As A Warning To
Others Of How Bad It Could REALLY Be!"

PLEASE SEND PRIVATE E MAIL COMMENTS TO K4YZ@AOL.COM. RESPSONSES TO THE
DEJA MAY OR MAY NOT BE RETRIEVED IN A TIMELY FASHION.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2917. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 12:41:09 UTC
From: "Steven J Robeson", K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <960oh4otb1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 3164

In article <20010208214540.02997.00002008@nso-mg.aol.com>,
lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:

> I'll ask again, are you saying that already-code-tested license
> class amateurs are switching over to the Technician class?

Accorning to the way the FCC is "realigning" the licenses on
paper, so it would seem, but even an idiot like you knows better.

--
"It Could Be That Your Life's Only Meaning Is To Serve As A Warning To
Others Of How Bad It Could REALLY Be!"

PLEASE SEND PRIVATE E MAIL COMMENTS TO K4YZ@AOL.COM. RESPSONSES TO THE
DEJA MAY OR MAY NOT BE RETRIEVED IN A TIMELY FASHION.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2918. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 12:48:39 UTC
From: "Steven J Robeson", K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <960ov5$p9a$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 3168

In article <20010208223637.14870.00001887@nso-fr.aol.com>,
lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:

> The "taunt" seems to be 31,971 NEW no-code-test Technicians
> who came into the US ARS in the 27 months from the
> beginning of January 1998 and end of March 2000...while only
> 6009 NEW code-tested US ARS licensees came in during the
> same time.

And again you try to make it appear that ONLY the "new" Technician
licenses are making an impact. You fail to account for those who
transition. You only refer to "new" code tested licensees. NOT those
who are ALREADY licensed and upgrade.

> Is it "belittling" that over 200 thousand no-code-test Techs are
> now in the US ARS?

Only to you. Must chap your chops knowing there's all those teen
and pre-teen ops out there able to do what you CAN'T do after your
years aas a technician

> Is it "insulting" that such facts are pointed out to those who
> have been code-tested?

Only when YOU presume us to be ignorant enough to accept your poor
math as "fact".

> I suppose I should "apologize" for pointing out the obvious, but
> what are over 200 thousand Technician licensees expected to
> do when they are discounted, demeaned, taunted, belittled by
> some souls who feel they are "superior" to "stinking" inferiors?

They are only those things in YOUR mind, Lennie. It's all you
have left to believe that you are on some noble crusade.

--
"It Could Be That Your Life's Only Meaning Is To Serve As A Warning To
Others Of How Bad It Could REALLY Be!"

PLEASE SEND PRIVATE E MAIL COMMENTS TO K4YZ@AOL.COM. RESPSONSES TO THE
DEJA MAY OR MAY NOT BE RETRIEVED IN A TIMELY FASHION.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2919. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 12:54:23 UTC
From: "Steven J Robeson", K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <960p9spdi1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 3169

In article <20010208214542.02997.00002010@nso-mg.aol.com>,
lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:

> I didn't see any "correcting of a poor assessment of data."

Of course you didn't....Someone pointed out that you were (again)
wrong, and you immediately went into flame mode.

> All I saw was your attempt at trying to make a new issue out of your
> "correction" of the phrase "tipping the scales."

That was about 2-3 posts later...after you had stuck your poisoned
pen in the well a couple times.

--
"It Could Be That Your Life's Only Meaning Is To Serve As A Warning To
Others Of How Bad It Could REALLY Be!"

PLEASE SEND PRIVATE E MAIL COMMENTS TO K4YZ@AOL.COM. RESPSONSES TO THE
DEJA MAY OR MAY NOT BE RETRIEVED IN A TIMELY FASHION.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2920. Re: Engineers, Technicians, and Appliance Operators

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 13:05:50 UTC
From: "Steven J Robeson", K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <960pvapud1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 3171

In article <20010208214612.02997.00002012@nso-mg.aol.com>,
lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:

> A novella is about 10,000 words in the publishing trade. I didn't
> write that many words. Just some third-party references for my
> claims for the last 45 years. Where are yours?

Same place they were when offered to you in the first place...but
rebuffed by AOL's "postmaster" as "this recipient is not accepting mail
from your account".

So much for showing you anything. You ask for "proof" then close
your eyes.

> Don't try to bluff or play e-poker, here. Show your references
> about non-amateur experience.

Did. You refused it. Oh well.

> Digitize-scan those commission papters, block out your
> private data if you wish, and post them somewhere. Or
> provide some indisputable proof of this "commission" through
> a third-party reference. Until then everyone has to assume
> you are not telling the truth.

How's the State Adjutant General of the State of Tennessee. It's
a matter of public record. Call them and ask.

> You sent this message at 1:38 PM EST according to the footer
> on this message. That is after normal lunch hours at WORK.

The operative word being "normal". And yes, it's a cushy job. I
get paid an obscene wage for the easiest job I have ever had.

> Enjoy it while you can...before you get canned.

I am sure that would make you happy...AND give you more
opportunity to spread your decitful and lecherous tripe completely
unchecked.

--
"It Could Be That Your Life's Only Meaning Is To Serve As A Warning To
Others Of How Bad It Could REALLY Be!"

PLEASE SEND PRIVATE E MAIL COMMENTS TO K4YZ@AOL.COM. RESPSONSES TO THE
DEJA MAY OR MAY NOT BE RETRIEVED IN A TIMELY FASHION.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2921. Re: Roger Wiseman's Greyhound Men's Room Band?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 13:10:05 UTC
From: whogives@fat.rats.ass
Message-ID: <960puvslj7@pizzaboy.databasix.com>
Source record: 3170
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.flame

SLee@houston.net (Stagger Lee) is dead. His/her/its will states:

>
>I was surfing the web the other day when I ran across the lyrics of a
>song by Paul McCartney and Raoul Xemblinosky which was entitled "Roger
>Wiseman's Greyhound Men's Room Band." You can find the lyrics (which I
>think should not be published in a delicate family forum such as this
>one) at http://extra.newsguy.com/~shpxurnq/songs.html#song5.
>
>Is this indeed *our* Roger.

Yep.

>And how was it that he came to achieve such fame?

He was a racist anti-Semitic fucknut.

>That same web site claims that Roger was spanked off of Usenet
>entirely back in '97,

And that website would be correct. For 1997. If he's here now, he's welcome to
come on back if he ever wanna try ageein, 'cause I done told you once you son
of a bitch I'm the best that evva -- wait, I was supposed to *hate* country
music. Ahem. Anyway.

>Anyone care to enlighten us?

I got a QSL for ya, right heeeere.

--
mhm21x20 the2belo@wavenet.or.jp

"Yo! What's all this talk about my short attention sp

2922. Re: Engineers, Technicians, and Appliance Operators

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 13:17:34 UTC
From: "Steven J Robeson", K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <960ql9qlm1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 3172

In article <20010208214615.02997.00002014@nso-mg.aol.com>,
lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:

> Something missing in the above considering there are only
> 24 hours in a terrestrial day.

I guess the concept of two residences is beyond you.

> Driving 6 hours a day? Doing e-mail and newsgrouping from
> one of those jobs? Which one?

Actually, it's three hours on Monday and three on Friday. The
nursing's in the middle when I choose to take an Agency shift.

> ...pathological liars cannot, will not admit to telling a lie.

You should know, Lennie.

> If someone posts an uncivil message, they might get a reply
> IN KIND. Those are deserving. I've never said otherwise.

Then you have absolutely NOTHING to complain about. You are
reaping your own reward.

> > When in cadre status, yes.
>
> ...only in some non-official militia organization, hotshot.

Again...you are free to call the Adjutant General of the State of
Tennessee. Want me to get the numbr for you too? I offered you my 800
number hre, but you haven't moved on THAT either.

> ...yes, the employee may wind up fired for doing personal things
> on company time

If the company's business wasn't getting done, you MIGHT be
correct. You are, as usual, not.

--
"It Could Be That Your Life's Only Meaning Is To Serve As A Warning To
Others Of How Bad It Could REALLY Be!"

PLEASE SEND PRIVATE E MAIL COMMENTS TO K4YZ@AOL.COM. RESPSONSES TO THE
DEJA MAY OR MAY NOT BE RETRIEVED IN A TIMELY FASHION.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2923. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 13:25:36 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net>
Message-ID: <3A83EFD0.A19CAD0F@ovis.net>
Source record: 3173

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <95spsvgqf1@nnrp1.deja.com>, Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
> writes:
>
> >> the ____ class of license?
> >>
> >> Dave Heil K8MN
> >
> >Of course, you assume that all hams, coded and codeless, weigh the same.
>
> Ever since Uncle retired him he is all at sea and wanting to be
> "under weigh" or "under way."

Troll number one?

> Note that Davey put the Technician class in a "blank" form up
> there? Looks like a Freudian slip to me...not counting the
> non-code-tested as "real hams."
>
> didit

Troll number two?

It doesn't matter which license class is inserted in the blank, Len.
You still can't make me believe that the balance scales are tipping
until any group of non-code tested hams exceeds the number of code
tested hams. No scales have begun tipping so your original claim is,
like several others you have made, false.

Dave K8MN

2924. Re: Engineers, Technicians, and Appliance Operators

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 13:26:18 UTC
From: "Steven J Robeson", K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <960r5k$qu6$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 3175

In article <20010208214613.02997.00002013@nso-mg.aol.com>,
lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:

> The name "Antec" appeared in message headers some months
> ago. No real "detective work" needed then, but it is surprising
> that a proud employee wouldn't name his employer.

Very good, Lennie! All those days of retired bliss sitting in
front of the 'puter paid off! It's only half right, but then you
usually are.

> On the other hand, someone who sits around doing newsgroups
> and e-mail on company time might not want it known...

I am sure you will tell them!

> BTW, their company phone number is 678-473-2000

> 800-FIBER-ME.

I have no doubt taht a bit of fiber in your diet would go a long
way towards changing your attitudes on life.

You can change that to "8515" if you have the intestinal fortitude
to engage in a personal conversation. Knowing you for the coward you
are, I'll just go on about my day.

Past events would indicate that you don't have that fortitude.
Not even to say "I am busy right now". However you then have great fun
creating fictional events SUBSEQUENT to that. You always do.

And by the way, we are a subsidiary of Antec, "Electronic System
Products". Bob's stock problems are his own, thankfully.

--
"It Could Be That Your Life's Only Meaning Is To Serve As A Warning To
Others Of How Bad It Could REALLY Be!"

PLEASE SEND PRIVATE E MAIL COMMENTS TO K4YZ@AOL.COM. RESPSONSES TO THE
DEJA MAY OR MAY NOT BE RETRIEVED IN A TIMELY FASHION.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2925. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 13:33:51 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net>
Message-ID: <3A83F1BF.564DE8C0@ovis.net>
Source record: 3174

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3A819251.2B71B488@uci.edu>, Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> writes:
>
> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >
> >> Jim Kelley apparently wants to smokescreen the whole thread
> >> by concentrating on certain phrases to "prove his point" (which
> >> was not really explained except in trying to provoke something
> >> about phrase choices. :-)
> >
> >It's not a smokescreen to point out that what you said contradicted the
> >facts you presented. I can't help it if you didn't say what you meant.
> >
> >jim
>
> Major Kelley, sir, you are just trying to ignite a flame war by
> concentration on a trivial phrase of English.
>
> My point was that the non-code-tested US amateur licensees
> keep increasing in number while the code-tested US amateur
> licensees are decreasing in number.
>
> What is your dispute with that?
>
> didit

I don't think anyone will dispute that statement. That is not the statement you originally made, Windy--the one with scales tipping. It is obvious that with an easy test available, most folks will opt for that one initially.

So?

We could even come up with a new and radical assumption from all of this: maybe some code tested hams are turning in their tickets and obtaining non-code tested licenses. That could certainly account for the increase on one hand and the decrease on the other.

Do you have anything interesting for the group or can we expect more number crunching ala Len?

Dave K8MN

2926. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 13:38:08 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A83F2C0.3170D943@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3177

W1RFI wrote:
> I can indeed figure it out. If that PSK-31 signal was more than about 30 Hz
> away from "zero beat," it went on just fine and the CW ops experienced QRM. Of
> those two commonly available modes, which one got through while the other did
> not?

:-)
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2927. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 13:41:20 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net>
Message-ID: <3A83F380.E8041619@ovis.net>
Source record: 3176

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3A82D670.908ECF5B@uci.edu>, Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> writes:
>
> >Brian wrote:
> >> I knew what Len meant. What was your excuse again?
> > >
> > >My excuse for what? Len was trying to make a mountain out of a mole
> > >hill - as usual.
> > >
> > >ac6xg
>
> You were looking for an excuse...and nit-picked a single phrase
> for a "critique" that was not on the subject.
>
> Apparently you don't want to believe that code-tested US radio
> amateurs are decreasing in number while non-code-tested
> US radio amateurs are increasing in number. That trend has
> been going on for years.
>
> The "molehill" is getting bigger, bigger, bigger. The "mountain"
> is eroding faster and faster. Closing one's eyes or mind won't
> reverse any trend.
>
> didit

You, of course assume that non-code tested licensees will never upgrade.
What is this rate of change supposed to mean to us, Len? Why all this
"mountain eroding" and "scales tipping" guff? It would appear to be
something which is natural given the current licensing structure and it
certainly doesn't worry me. Why should it worry you, a non-licensee?
I don't think those scales will tip in your lifetime. Would you like
one of us to give you a report in the afterlife? Please provide a
forwarding address.

Dave K8MN

2928. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 13:47:57 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A83F50D.BBD4D793@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3178

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> W1RFI wrote:
> > If one is qualified only at the basics, how can he claim to be fully
> > accomplished?
>
> So who ever advocated stopping there???

If you're stopping short of DSP, you're stopping there, Dick.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2929. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 13:56:01 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net>
Message-ID: <3A83F6F1.FFE2535@ovis.net>
Source record: 3179

Brian wrote:
>
> In article <3A833DCD.97EFDFE5@uci.edu>,
> Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote:
> >
> >
> > Brian wrote:
> > > If what you say is true, then most everyone would see that and your
> > > comments would be completely unnecessary. But instead, you chose to
> > > define scaleology as if you worked for the dept of weights and
> measures.
> >
> > I think you're over your head Brian. Best let it drop. The subject -
> > not your head.
>
> Yeh, you keep saying that. So let us review.
>
> Len brings up the fact that the numbers of coded hams are decreasing and
> the numbers of non-coded hams are increasing (the "point" of the
> discussion). He uses a balance scale term. You cannot comment on the
> facts of the ham population, so instead dissect balance scale
> engineering, and thus you claim Len's statements false. Ergo coded ham
> populations are increasing. Nice fantasy.
>
> Am I still in over my head?
>
> Sent via Deja.com
> http://www.deja.com/

His statement, taken as a whole, was false because of his incorrect analogy. When Len can carry on a dialog without inserting all of the silly phrases such as the obviously wrong one which he used, maybe someone will take him seriously. Just maybe.

When viewed as an obvious troll meant to stir things up rather than to really discuss anything, Len's post has little meaning. Len isn't a ham so he isn't contributing to eroding mountains or tipping scales one way or the other. He knows a few hams though.

Your own role here is an interesting one. For several years I've had the opportunity to observe you playing defender for the likes of Len, Cecil and Carl Stevenson. If you'd like to continue with analogies, I'd describe your perception of amateur radio reality with a term from ionospheric propagation: skewed path.

Dave K8MN

2930. Re: Engineers, Technicians, and Appliance Operators

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 13:56:01 UTC
From: "Steven J Robeson", K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <960stdsdl1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 3181

In article <960r5k$qu6$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
Steven J Robeson, K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com> wrote:
> In article <20010208214613.02997.00002013@nso-mg.aol.com>,
> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
>
> > The name "Antec" appeared in message headers some months
> > ago. No real "detective work" needed then, but it is surprising
> > that a proud employee wouldn't name his employer.

By the way, Lennie and others, it has been on my "bio" page of QRZ
for some time, along with the call sign of the club call sign for the
company.

C'est le vie.

--
"It Could Be That Your Life's Only Meaning Is To Serve As A Warning To
Others Of How Bad It Could REALLY Be!"

PLEASE SEND PRIVATE E MAIL COMMENTS TO K4YZ@AOL.COM. RESPSONSES TO THE
DEJA MAY OR MAY NOT BE RETRIEVED IN A TIMELY FASHION.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2931. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 13:58:13 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net>
Message-ID: <3A83F775.90B8585B@ovis.net>
Source record: 3180

Brian wrote:
>
> In article <3A836AA3.60DA4D4E@IEEE.org>,
> Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> > Brian wrote:
> > > Meanwhile, Shirley MacClaine held hands with spiritual guides as
> they
> > > looked to the East and focused on preventing the quake.
> >
> > Shirley MacClaine was asked who was the most influential person in
> > her life. She answered, "My own higher self."
>
> She's her own God. Kind of like on here. ;)
>
> Sent via Deja.com
> http://www.deja.com/

...sort of like Cecil and a group of Baptists down his way praying to
Cecil's inner self as desribed here a couple of years back. Maybe Cecil
has been praying to Shirley MacLaine all of these years.

Dave K8MN

2932. Re: Roger Wiseman's Greyhound Men's Room Band?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 14:43:57 UTC
From: mysterian2001@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <960vnbuvi1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 3182
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.flame

In article <960puvslj7@pizzaboy.databasix.com>,
the2belo@wave-netDELETETHIS.or.jp wrote:
> SLee@houston.net (Stagger Lee) is dead. His/her/its will states:
>
> >
> >I was surfing the web the other day when I ran across the lyrics of a
> >song by Paul McCartney and Raoul Xemblinosky which was
entitled "Roger
> >Wiseman's Greyhound Men's Room Band." You can find the lyrics
(which I
> >think should not be published in a delicate family forum such as this
> >one) at http://extra.newsguy.com/~shpxurnq/songs.html#song5.
> >
> >Is this indeed *our* Roger.
>
> Yep.
>
> >And how was it that he came to achieve such fame?
>
> He was a racist anti-Semitic fucknut.

The key term here being *was*, if he ever was at all!
According to the deja archives he has you bouncing for quite a while.

> >That same web site claims that Roger was spanked off of Usenet
> >entirely back in '97,
>
> And that website would be correct. For 1997. If he's here now, he's
welcome to
> come on back if he ever wanna try ageein, 'cause I done told you once
you son
> of a bitch I'm the best that evva -- wait, I was supposed to *hate*
country
> music. Ahem. Anyway.
>
> >Anyone care to enlighten us?
>
> I got a QSL for ya, right heeeere.
>
> --
> mhm21x20 the2belo@wavenet.or.jp
>
> "Yo! What's all this talk about my short attention sp

I wouldn't give what 2-Belo says any credence, from the "Alt.flame
Who's Who":

"This idiot came out of nowhere in late 1996 posting from
Japan, following up every cascade in existence, until he was deemed
irritating enough to reply to. Quickly jumped on the Meow bandwagon,
hiding in alt.fan.karl-malden.nose." --flamefaq@feedME.

"Sad little dog (er...cat) who begs to be led around by a leash. Has
had
about the same amount of free thought this decade as Ronald Reagan.
Needs
someone to lead him and tell him what to do (also not unlike Ronald
Reagan)."
--The Cypher

"The 2-Belo always has something to say; to anyone, about anything.
Very
rarely will it make sense. Almost never will it be worth reading. On
the odd
occasion, when the planets align, it may provide the odd chuckle.
Otherwise,
I wish the 2-Belo did get fired. Would finally shut-up. Would at last
leave
a cascade without molesting it. Would, well, be gone." -- Strawberry.
"A balding, vicious little bastard pissed off at the world due to his
enslavement in the land of the Rising Sun. Has made it his mission to
punish
a dot f because he has to pay $75.00 US for a single fucking grape in
Japan.
His one saving grace is his sense of humour. He _knows_ he's a short,
balding fuckhead. But the dwarf can flame." -- Scott Campbell.

"Skittish and awkward like a colt on coke, this autistic child
prostitute
hides behind the sympathy generated by the gastrointestinal disease
that
bears his name. Boyd's Disease, characterized by the projectile
expulsion
of a curdlike, smelly discharge, forces him to leave the keyboard every
ten
minutes for an enema. This explains his sporadic and halfhearted proof-
reading." -- Blub.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2933. Re: The Raoul Xemblinosky mystery deepens

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 14:46:27 UTC
From: mysterian2001@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <960vs2$v39$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 3183
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.flame,alt.fan.karl-malden.nose

In article <960o7goih1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
KC8JBO <roger_kc8jbo@my-deja.com> wrote:
> In article <960ets$h6s$0@dosa.alt.net>,
> FAGGOT WEE WEE abuse@127.0.0.1 "wrote:"
> >
> > On Thu, 08 Feb 2001 21:06:04 -0500, KC8JBO <kc8jbo-no-
spam@cotse.com>
> wrote:
> >
> > : Poor, poor "Stagger".. it must be hard on him when he realized he
> is OWNED.
> > : "Stagger" is scraping the bottom of the barrel with these latest
> lies. A quick
> > : check of "Roger Wiseman" in switchboard yields quite a few Roger
> Wisemans
> > : around....HAHAHAHAHAHA!!!
> >
> > What <SLAP!!!!!!>
>
> I KNEW YOU'D ANSWER MY POST BIIIIIIIIIITCCCCCHHHHHHH!!!!!!!!!
>
> Hey, You should be going to trial soon because you your arrest in that
> big Harrison County drug sting....LOL!!!!!!
> --
> 73 de Roger, KC8JBO
> EM99 |ARRL|VE [ARRL & W5YI]|ARES |RACES
> Yaesu FT-920 |Inverted Vee @ 40 ft.
> Yaesu FT-90R

Who cares? Take it someplace else! Idiot.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2934. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 15:30:15 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9612e7$7a6$0@208.206.142.113>
Source record: 3184

W1RFI wrote:
>

> Morse code was originally designed to be a wire communications mode, deciphered
> by machine. It was adapted to radio use.
>

Yep. And when the first radio experimenters began to develop the
fledgling RF communications system they very quickly realized that Morse
was a natural for use with a system where the most basic requirements
were simply to key a carrier on and off with information encoded in
those bits of RF....
It WAS a natural. Still is.

2935. Re: The Raoul Xemblinosky mystery deepens

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 16:20:01 UTC
From: Roger Wiseman <crow@west.vagina.ham>
Message-ID: <3A8418B1.296A@west.vagina.ham>
Source record: 3185
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.angst,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.flame,alt.fan.karl-malden.nose,alt.usenet.kooks

mysterian2001@my-deja.com wrote:
>
> In article <960o7goih1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
> KC8JBO <roger_kc8jbo@my-deja.com> wrote:
> > In article <960ets$h6s$0@dosa.alt.net>,
> > FAGGOT WEE WEE abuse@127.0.0.1 "wrote:"
> > >
> > > On Thu, 08 Feb 2001 21:06:04 -0500, KC8JBO <kc8jbo-no-
> spam@cotse.com>
> > wrote:
> > >
> > > : Poor, poor "Stagger".. it must be hard on him when he realized he
> > is OWNED.
> > > : "Stagger" is scraping the bottom of the barrel with these latest
> > lies. A quick
> > > : check of "Roger Wiseman" in switchboard yields quite a few Roger
> > Wisemans
> > > : around....HAHAHAHAHAHA!!!
> > >
> > > What <SLAP!!!!!!>
> >
> > I KNEW YOU'D ANSWER MY POST BIIIIIIIIIITCCCCCHHHHHHH!!!!!!!!!
> >
> > Hey, You should be going to trial soon because you your arrest in that
> > big Harrison County drug sting....LOL!!!!!!
> > --
> > 73 de Roger, KC8JBO
> > EM99 |ARRL|VE [ARRL & W5YI]|ARES |RACES
> > Yaesu FT-920 |Inverted Vee @ 40 ft.
> > Yaesu FT-90R
>
> Who cares? Take it someplace else! Idiot.

Following up to yourself is bad trolling.-BucktoothedChoaD

2936. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 16:22:21 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <9TUg6.143$HH5.946268@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 3186

Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

> > Morse code was originally designed to be a wire communications mode, deciphered
> > by machine. It was adapted to radio use.

> Yep. And when the first radio experimenters began to develop the
> fledgling RF communications system they very quickly realized that Morse
> was a natural for use with a system where the most basic requirements
> were simply to key a carrier on and off with information encoded in
> those bits of RF....

> It WAS a natural. Still is.

Sure is; I use it for almost all of my hamming, and it certainly is the most enjoyable. It is very useful to Amateur Radio. The difference in our opinions is that I believe that its usefulness is enough that hams will use it whether they are required to learn it to get their licenses. I also believe that hams will not get on the air and use it unless they know the code (unless they use a TNC or other computer encoding/decoding scheme).

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2937. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 16:29:18 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <HZUg6.144$HH5.946717@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 3187

Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

> There was a lot of that going on, and FCC with nudging from ARRL
> introduced incentive licensing in a serious effort to change that. And
> it clearly worked, until 1985. Now they've turned 180 degrees, and
> you're right in the same basket with them.

The Extra Class license is still required to obtain all amateur priveleges. The number of steps required to get there have been reduced, with each step being more difficult than it was before. The Technician with HF endorsement is now the entry-level HF license -- how much harder is is than the Novice used to be? Is this your idea of a 180-degree phase shift?

I have said often that I believe that amateurs need to learn more about modern radio technology; you have disagreed with me. Just what basket are you saying I am in?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2938. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 16:34:25 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <t2Vg6.145$HH5.947011@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 3188

Larry Roll K3LT <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote:

> Wrong again. I could care less if they can beep at all -- as long as
> they're not whining about learning how to beep in order to attain higher
> HF privileges.

How do you feel about those that have learned how to send and receive Morse code, but believe that changes need to be made in the way Morse code is tested?

> However, its a moot point now. Pretty soon we'll have the beepless ARS
you've always dreamed about.

I do not believe that Morse code use will end any time soon, Larry. Do you feel that the mode has so little value to ham radio that no one will learn it and use it unless it is tested? I disagree; all of the other modes have avid proponents without such testing. I do not agree with you that those modes that use code are the bottom of the pile.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2939. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 16:59:09 UTC
From: "R.L. Tannehill, P.E." <rickw7rt@firstinter.net>
Message-ID: <3A8421DD.FCC9918C@firstinter.net>
Source record: 3189

W1RFI wrote:
>
> >From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>
> >The "molehill" is getting bigger, bigger, bigger. The "mountain"
> >is eroding faster and faster. Closing one's eyes or mind won't
> >reverse any trend.
>
> I don't see that the changes in either direction have been anything like
> "fast." If we factor out the Tech/Tech+ licencees, the number of General,
> Advanced, Extra and Novices have actually increased slightly since 1997. I
> don't see any significance to the percentages of increase or decrease of either
> the code-tested or non-code-tested hams. To date, the changes have been
> relatively minor.
>
> What will tell, IMHO, is the attrition rate of the no-code Techs that come up
> for renewal soon. My speculation is that about 60% of them will not renew.
>
> Lobster anyone? :-)
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI
ED,
What's the percentage differential that qualifies for a wager? :)

Rick T.
W7RT

2940. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 17:19:25 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9618qi$896$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 3193

In article <20010209063535.16888.00000159@ng-mj1.aol.com>,
w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:
> >From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>
> >The FCC wanted it, but the ARRL got the blame for it because the
> >BOD didn't oppose it.
>
> Is this much like a few who now believe that the ARRL asked the FCC
to create 3
> classes of license and a 5 wpm code test?

Exactly. All sorts of rumors and hearsay flew around back then. Most of
it was false or distorted.

73 de Jim, N2EY
--
FISTS #4360
BIT #0001

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2941. Re: The Raoul Xemblinosky mystery deepens

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 17:19:41 UTC
From: KC8JBO <roger_kc8jbo@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <9618r1$89d$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 3194
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.angst,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.flame

In article <3A8418B1.296A@west.vagina.ham>,
Roger Wiseman <crow@west.vagina.ham> wrote:
> molesterian2001@my-deja.com wrote:
> >
> > In article <960o7goih1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
> > KC8JBO <roger_kc8jbo@my-deja.com> wrote:
> > > In article <960ets$h6s$0@dosa.alt.net>,
> > > FAGGOT WEE WEE abuse@127.0.0.1 "wrote:"
> > > >
> > > > On Thu, 08 Feb 2001 21:06:04 -0500, KC8JBO <kc8jbo-no-
> > spam@cotse.com>
> > > > wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > : Poor, poor "Stagger".. it must be hard on him when he
realized he
> > > is OWNED.
> > > > : "Stagger" is scraping the bottom of the barrel with these
latest
> > > lies. A quick
> > > > : check of "Roger Wiseman" in switchboard yields quite a few
Roger
> > > Wisemans
> > > > : around....HAHAHAHAHAHA!!!
> > > >
> > > > What <SLAP!!!!!!>
> > >
> > > I KNEW YOU'D ANSWER MY POST BIIIIIIIIIITCCCCCHHHHHHH!!!!!!!!!
> > >
> > > Hey, You should be going to trial soon because you your arrest in
that
> > > big Harrison County drug sting....LOL!!!!!!
> > > --
> > > 73 de Roger, KC8JBO
> > > EM99 |ARRL|VE [ARRL & W5YI]|ARES |RACES
> > > Yaesu FT-920 |Inverted Vee @ 40 ft.
> > > Yaesu FT-90R
> >
> > Who cares? Take it someplace else! Idiot.

FOAD, Molesterian.

> Following up to yourself is bad trolling.-BucktoothedChoaD

You sound like an EXPERT, cockroach.

--
73 de Roger, KC8JBO
EM99 |ARRL|VE [ARRL & W5YI]|ARES |RACES
Yaesu FT-920 |Inverted Vee @ 40 ft.
Yaesu FT-90R

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2942. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 17:21:16 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <tKVg6.146$HH5.948770@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 3191

R.L. Tannehill, P.E. <rickw7rt@firstinter.net> wrote:

> > What will tell, IMHO, is the attrition rate of the no-code Techs that come up
> > for renewal soon. My speculation is that about 60% of them will not renew.

> > Lobster anyone? :-)

> What's the percentage differential that qualifies for a wager? :)

I don't know if I dare to make another lobster bet with you! :-) At least a 60% chance I will be at Ft Tuthill, though.

But I do deserve a chance to break even, so here's the deal: In the first 3 full months of the time period where no-code Tech license, I think that more than 60% of those Technician licencees eligibile to renew will not do so. If the percentage that renews is >40%, you will win. In very unlikely event it is precisely 60.000%, we each buy a lottery ticket and go dutch treat on the lobster. :-)

What say?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2943. Re: ARRL HQ "Attitude" (Was: Re: Pride)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 17:21:34 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <3A84271E.EDBD6080@arrl.org>
Source record: 3190

W1RFI wrote:
>
> > It seemed like the only person who didn't go out of their way to piss me
> > off that day was Chuck Bender at W1AW.
>
> What day were you at HQ, Larry? I don't recall any memos that said "Larry is
> here; everybody go out of your way to honk him off."

I guess Chuck didn't get the memo either!

Jon

2944. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 17:26:44 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <3A842854.12D806EE@arrl.org>
Source record: 3192

"R.L. Tannehill, P.E." wrote:
>
> W1RFI wrote:
> >
> > What will tell, IMHO, is the attrition rate of the no-code Techs that come up
> > for renewal soon. My speculation is that about 60% of them will not renew.
> >
> > Lobster anyone? :-)
> >
> > 73,
> > Ed Hare, W1RFI
> ED,
> What's the percentage differential that qualifies for a wager? :)

Maybe it should be based on the size of the lobster. 5% = 1 lb, 10% = 2
lb...

Jon

2945. Re: Morse Code replacement? Bigtime flame war article!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 17:29:25 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9619d7$8ta$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 3195

In article <20010208195059.21870.00000079@ng-cr1.aol.com>,
w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:
> >From: n2ey@aol.com
>
> >But I was only half-joking. I really do want to see any and all lists
> >on this subject (promoting Morse - the mode, not the test). The ARRL
> >leadership has done very very little to promote the mode for many
> >years - now all of a sudden there's this order to do so. Please
> >understand that these comments come from a longtime member and QST
> >reader who wants to help, not just take potshots. (I recently filled
> >some holes in my QST collection - now I'm solid back to October,
1927.
> >And those are just part of the N2EY radio library).
>
> >OK, here are some ideas:
>
> Thanks for the thought you put into this, Jim.

You're welcome. I volunteer to do reviews of semiautomatic keys ;-)

> I agree with almost everything
> you said

It would be interesting to see where you disagree.

>and I will carry the list to a few people at HQ.

TNX! It will be interesting to see what happens to it.

73 de Jim, N2EY
--
FISTS #4360
BIT #0001

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2946. Re: The Raoul Xemblinosky mystery deepens

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 17:40:14 UTC
From: KC8JBO <roger_kc8jbo@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <961a1s$9ie$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 3196
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.angst,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.flame

From: Raoulger Wiseman <crow@west.vagina.ham>
Subject: Re: The Raoul Xemblinosky mystery deepens
Date: 09 Feb 2001 00:00:00 GMT
Message-ID: <3A8418B1.296A@west.vagina.ham>
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
References: news:95vdcu$v1s$0@pita.alt.net
<981684364.3a83508c25b05@webmail.cotse.com> <960ets$h6s$0@dosa.alt.net>
<960o7goih1@nnrp1.deja.com> <960vs2$v39$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Organization: Bucktoothed Choad Fellator
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Mime-Version: 1.0
Newsgroups:
rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.angst,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.flame,alt.
fan.karl-malden.nose,alt.usenet.kooks

In article <3A8418B1.296A@west.vagina.ham>,
Roger Williams/wymess/Matt brucey <crow@west.vagina.ham> wrote:
> mysterian2001@my-deja.com wrote:
> >
> > In article <960o7goih1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
> > KC8JBO <roger_kc8jbo@my-deja.com> wrote:
> > > In article <960ets$h6s$0@dosa.alt.net>,
> > > FAGGOT WEE WEE abuse@127.0.0.1 "wrote:"
> > > >
> > > > On Thu, 08 Feb 2001 21:06:04 -0500, KC8JBO <kc8jbo-no-
spam@cotse.com>
> > > wrote:
> > > >
> > > > : Poor, poor "Stagger".. it must be hard on him when he
realized he
> > > is OWNED.
> > > > : "Stagger" is scraping the bottom of the barrel with these
latest
> > > lies. A quick
> > > > : check of "Roger Wiseman" in switchboard yields quite a few
Roger
> > > Wisemans
> > > > : around....HAHAHAHAHAHA!!!
> > > >
> > > > What <SLAP!!!!!!>
> > >
> > > I KNEW YOU'D ANSWER MY POST BIIIIIIIIIITCCCCCHHHHHHH!!!!!!!!!
> > >

> > > Hey, You should be going to trial soon because you your arrest in
that
> > > big Harrison County drug sting....LOL!!!!!!

> >
> > Who cares? Take it someplace else! Idiot.
>
> Following up to yourself is bad trolling.-BucktoothedChoaD

Matt Bruce
12 Medina Dr.
Wareham, MA 02571-2720

(508) 295-6820
--
73 de Roger, KC8JBO
EM99 |ARRL|VE [ARRL & W5YI]|ARES |RACES
Yaesu FT-920 |Inverted Vee @ 40 ft.
Yaesu FT-90R

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2947. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 18:00:22 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <961b7mruf0@208.206.142.113>
Source record: 3197

W1RFI wrote:
>
> >From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
>
> In an earlier post, Dicc Carroll writes:
>
> > So who ever advocated stopping there???
>
> and in this post, he answers his own question:
>
> >Even old fellers like me, who spent the working career AND 44 year ham
> >radio experience mostly in the technical side of radio find it beyond
> >reasonable that it be demanded of us that we abandon what we know and
> >like in favor of some dippy digital engineer's ideal of what radio
> >communications should be today, just because he has found that he is
> >capable of scrambling the numbers and inventing some new mode each week.
> >In a word, much of it is BORING.
>
> > As I noted earlier, history is littered with "better idea"s that didn't
> >make the cut.
>
> Modern radio techniques have very much made the cut, Dick; they are being used
> everywhere outside of Amateur Radio (and even a little bit within it).
>
> Why do you resist learning new things?
>

Why do you insist on dodging my point? Would it destroy your most
effective weapon, your assertion that I actually DO resist learning new
things?

What I said is that I have tried almost every new mode that came along
and for the most part they are BORING! And yes, I "learned" new things
about them, contrary to your assertion. Sure modern techniques have made
the cut.
I use them every time I turn on a rug. But I gotta tell ya, I prefer the
old crystal filter to anything DSP has offered to date. I'm on my fourth
DSP and so far I see nothing but disappointment from any of them. I also
have a little audio autonotch filter that has had much more use against
the carriers of the many RF spammer/jammers that all this infusion of
'new blood' has brought.

> > Commercial communications has its objectives. They have
> >diverged rather seriously from that of ham radio in the past decade or
> >two.

>
> Yes, they have progressed while we have paused, to use your word from a
> previous post.

Really? Maybe you have paused, but I don't think that Icom and Kenwood
ant others would be cranking this stuff out by the shipload if hams
weren't buying, do you? If I still used the old homebrew 6ag7/807 rig
and BC454 receiver you might have a point. But the continued assertion
by all the folk who have such vested interest in "progress" for its own
sake is getting to be just as boring as the constant glowing raves over
DSP.

>
> > There is no valid reason why hams should be mandated to follow the
> >same path when there is simply no need.
>
> If Amateur Radio were not in touch with the technology of the 40s, we would not
> be here after being shut down after WW2.

Dodging the issue? Why so all you "we all just gotta change everything"
mavens ignore the fact that we hams do this not because we want to just
communicate- we have cell phones for that- but for much deeper and more
complex reasons.
>
> >If the ham bands were clogged and overcrowded such that spectral
> >efficiency (especially at HF) was an issue there would at least be some
> >reason for it.
>
> It is not necessarily an issue of overcrowding, Dick; it is an issue of amateur
> radio being seen outside of our circles as being more than an anachronism.

Evidently FCC and most of the others who seem to be monitoring our
every teansmission to see what old mode we insist on keeping can't see
the forest for all the trees.

Ane
> the overcrowding issue can be part of it, too.

I clearly remember the days when that was indeed a factor, when 75 meter
voice band was one big series of heterodynes. Sure, the move to SSB was
definitely justified to relieve that. There is today no such problem,
nor anything even remotely approaching the congestion of the 50's and
60's.

In most urban areas, a ham who
> wants to put up a new repeater is told that "no pairs are available." Yet,
> tune the band, and most of the repeaters sit idle most of the time. This is not
> an efficient use of spectrum.

It sure isn't, but that is not a technical problem, rather one of
administration that could very easily be resolved. The fact that all
paris are "assigned" is the problem. You just have to offend those who
need to be offended since they are too selfcentered to do the right

thing themselves. No one should have the inherent right to tie up a frequency pair just because he asked first. It should be a use it or lose it situation. Repeaters should only rarely be approved for individuals where they can preclude many other potential users from use of spectrum, the rule should be 'show your real data or be denied'. It's a failure if administration that the repeater fiasco is allowed to continue as it has.

>
> > If I must give up what I find attractive in ham
> >radio for all-digital radio communications, I'll just go internet full
> >time.
>
> You must have me mixed up with someone else, Dick; I have never proposed ahtat
> you have to give up doing what you enjoy in ham radio. I am proposing that more
> hams learn the most fundamental components of modern radio technology.

Unlike
> your view of your favorite mode,

You don't even understand that CW is NOT my favorite mode, although it is one of my favorites. From long experience I know how effective it can be. If operators equip themselves to use it. You don't seem to yet understand- or do you just prefer to ignore- that my outlook is that it is just as irresponsible of ham radio operators to refuse to learn to use CW, the basic radiocommunications mode as you believe it to be for them to ignore DSP techniquues. It is also irresponsible for ARRL and FCC to ignore the most basic radiocommunications mode. Do they all think that there will never again be any need for anything basic?

> I am not proposing that you have to take a
> pass/fail test in these fundamentals to be licensed,

Well that's appropriate since you don't have to learn enough to pass a test on them to be able to use them. With the only code test at 5wpm there is no valid rationale whatever for avoiding learning Morse code. Even if you don't intend to use it. Many hams -even most- learned it who never intended to again touch a key and along the way discovered that it was very different than expected, and many became advocates of the mode. I was one.

> although a few more
> questions about them would be nice.

Ah, yes, gotta fill up those question pools, whether or not anyone learns from their afternoon cram class before the test.

Check this posting .....I changed a few names and callsigns to keep the guilty from protesting.

The -xx- County Repeater Association and -xx- County ARES (Amateur Radio Emergency Service)are again pleased to announce a free Technician License Class.

Participants attending the free one-day class will be prepared to take
the 35 question test required to obtain the entry level Technician Class
license.
The class consists of video, Power Point, lecture and live
demonstrations of
SSB, CW and many digital modes. We have a success rate of about 70% of
our
students getting licenced. No book or other material is required for the
class except pencil and paper. There will NOT be a testing session after
the class.
Saturday March xx, 2001 8:30 to 5:00 -xx- County Government Annex At
the
Corner of ---------xx-------, xx xx214 Upstairs in Room xxx For
information on the class: e-mail xx5xxx@arrl.net Talk-in on 145.xxx -
1xx Hz PL

There it is... So you might as well send them a full course in the
latest digital modes, I'm sure they will absorb it just as
well.

>
> I believe in the ability of hams to learn and grow. If more information is
> made available in amateur circles, they will come and they will learn and when
> such techniques come to be used in Amateur Radio, they will have an
> understanding of their advantages and disadvantages. Some hams will continue
> to thirst for radio knowledge, others will "pause," but as long as the Service
> as a whole continues to grow, we will have met the technical components of our
> regulatory objectives.

Taking lessons from Cecil? Your use of "pause" to indicate refusal to
learn is way out of context and you know it or should. Knowledge, is not
the issue, rather the contined assertion that "we all gotta move on to
the latest digi gadgetry or we'll stagnate" BS is the issue. We HAVE
moved on, and not all of it has been beneficial other than to the bottom
lines of manufacturers and retailers. And maybe the ARRL.

I truly believe, indeed KNOW that this continued incessant demamding
has caused many hams to abandon ham radio, just quit. I know some who
have done it. They heard all of the nonsense they wanted to hear, and
moved on to pursuits where less trivial drivel is involved. If you want
hams new or old to learn new you need to show some actual benefit of
that learning. Basics of new techniques, to the extent that they can be
learned by non-technical persons are certainly appropriate. Strangely
they are absent from the question pools for the most part. And for sure
no one is about to learn anything serious by just associating an answser
to a question, nor by attending a one-day "guaranteed" tech license cram
cursse. But you're welcome to keep on talking about it, as you wish.

>
> > In fact, this ongoing argument has reduced my interest in digital
> >modes. ... All this constant haranguing about how we "MUST" has about

> > got my disgust level up and my digital radio interest down.
>
> Let me be perfectly clear, Dick; I do not believe that you "must." You are
> quite free to rest on your laurels and let others carry on, if that is your
> wish.

You ARE taking your cues from Cecil. I rest on my laurals as a ham
simply in that there are no more ham radio tests for me to take, the
last one was over thirty years ago. If you believe that I haven't learnd
anything since that time I'll just lump you in with Cecil, and surely
you don't want to be there.

>
> But imagine how some of the talk about "must" affects other hams, whose budding
> interest is being shot down just like yours -- with all this talk about "must"
> with respect to Morse code.

If a few of you CW lovers whose real beliefs were not trumped by
Politically Correct demands foisted on you by a few geeks with an Agenda
would instead just simply state the facts--- that any ham who overlooks
learning Morse code is missing the very most basic radiocommunications
mode yet devised, and instead urge all hams to learn it as a matter of
course, none of this would be necessary. Instead you cower like so many
sheep.

> I believe that if some folks were not telling them
> how Morse code is a big hill to climb

You've got it backwards, again. It is not nearly as hard as they first
think it is, when they decide they just don't want to, and that has been
the point. Why do you contradict it?

>to prove their character, more of > them would sooner or later want to give >the mode a
whirl.

Based on knowledge of how things have worked in the past that is most
unlikely. No one excapt a few of us posting here has a single good word
to say about it. Extremely few newcomers are informed and with the
current attitude at HQ and by all the ridicule and criticism it and its
supporters get here there's not much chance of improvement. The Big Dumb
Down will just continue until the Big Shutdown.

2948. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 18:06:09 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <961bi9atk1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 3198

In article <960ln202tpc@enews4.newsguy.com>,
tlbryant@my-deja.com (T. L. Bryant) wrote:
> In article <960149cbg0@208.207.71.143>, dixie@townsqr.com says...

> > It's all he has ever done and is the reason most here just ignore
him.
> >He had pretty well dried up for lact of attention when someone
engaged
> >him in a drawnout flamefest, and he was rejuvenated.He is not
interested
> >in ham radio in the least, other than to slam and criticize it and
all
> >who are in it. He lives only to disturb and disrupt and like all such
> >idiots, when he gets no attention he goes away.
>
> I think that if Len wanted to be inflamatory, he would have done a lot
more
> than complain about playing word games.

I'd say they got off pretty easy.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2949. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 18:16:50 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <961c67bhc1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 3201

In article <3A83F6F1.FFE2535@ovis.net>,
Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net> wrote:

I'd
> describe your perception of amateur radio reality with a term from
> ionospheric propagation: skewed path.
>
> Dave K8MN

Likewise, you seem to hang with what I consider some of the wrong
elements in amateur radio. You follow the ground wave.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2950. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 18:22:20 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <961cgs$1mf$0@208.206.142.113>
Source record: 3199

Cecil wrote:
>
> W1RFI wrote:
> > I can indeed figure it out. If that PSK-31 signal was more than about 30 Hz
> > away from "zero beat," it went on just fine and the CW ops experienced QRM. Of
> > those two commonly available modes, which one got through while the other did
> > not?
>
> :-)

So smirk, smirk. the PSk31 station requies many thousands of active
devices plus all the cabling, setup and crossed fingers required to get
it running.

CW? well, you already know.......

2951. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 18:24:42 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <961cla$1mf$1@208.206.142.113>
Source record: 3200

Cecil wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > W1RFI wrote:
> > > If one is qualified only at the basics, how can he claim to be fully
> > > accomplished?
> >
> > So who ever advocated stopping there???
>
> If you're stopping short of DSP, you're stopping there, Dick.

So any ham who seosn't learn how to do his own DSP can never be a fully
accomplished ham.

Hey, Cecil--BULLSHIT!!!!

2952. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 18:33:25 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <961d5lcii1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 3204

In article <20010208214551.02997.00002011@nso-mg.aol.com>,
lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
> In article <95v5fogsj1@nnrp1.deja.com>, n2ey@aol.com writes:
>
> >In article <20010204002041.18047.00001243@nso-ff.aol.com>,
> > lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
> >> Firecracker Material (courtesy of AH0A statistics on US ham
licenses)-
> >>
> >> In the 9 months following US amateur radio restructuring, the
> >> total number of US amateur radio licenses increased by
> >> 3,701 (+0.55% of total). Code-tested licensees declined by
> >> 9,531 while non-code-tested licensees increased by 13,132.
> > >
> > >(Rest snipped for brevity)
> > >
> > >The above analysis is not correct.
> >
> > Sorry, Jim, but based on the conditions I stated, it is correct.

No, Len, it is not correct. Let's look at what you wrote:

"In the 9 months following US amateur radio restructuring, the total
number of US amateur radio licenses increased by 3,701 (+0.55% of
total)."

That part is correct. Subtract the total number of licenses in December
2000 from the total in April 2000 and you get a difference of 3701.

"Code-tested licensees declined by 9,531 while non-code-tested
licensees increased by 13,132."

That part is NOT correct. First off, there's a minor arithmetic error
(9431 not 9531). But the big mistake is that you equate "non-code-
tested licensees" with "Technicians". The two are not the same. Some
holders of Technician licenses are code-tested, and have some HF
privileges.

You wrote "licensees" not "licenses", too. So you were referring to the
people, not their licenses.
>
> Since your arithmetic is the same as mine, my analysis
> using the stated conditions is very correct. :-)

Your arithmetic contains a small error. And your analysis is flawed and
in error, as I have shown.

>
> <snip>
>
> >However, all is not as simple as it appears. As part of the
> >restructuring changes, Technician Plus licenses will be renewed as
> >Technicians. So the above apparent gain of 13,132 is inflated by such
> >renewals, as is the apparent loss of 9,431 in the other classes.
> >
> >Let's see how big this error really is. Looking at the renewal data
on
> >the Speroni site, we see that the number of Tech and Tech Plus
renewals
> >over the nine month period was 4,870. Because the FCC will not
process
> >renewals until the license is close to expiring, almost all of these
> >4,870 are Tech Pluses being renewed as Technicians. A fair estimate
> >would be that about 4,700 of them were such renewals.
>
> That is an ESTIMATE.

Yes, it is. It's also true - the FCC renewed 4,870 Technician and Technician Plus licenses in that time period, and reclassified the Tech Pluses as Technicians. The holders of the licenses - the licensees - are responsible for maintaining proof that they have been code tested if they want to retain their HF privileges.

This stuff is all explained on the Speroni site. Your failure to include it in your analysis is a serious error that reduces your credibility.

> By using personal estimates based only
> on "gut feeling" or something, you are yourself in ERROR.

My estimate is not based on "gut feeling". It is based on a thorough knowledge of the information, the applicable regulations and basic math as applied to statistics. It's a fair estimate.

Your analysis did not include the fact that the FCC is renewing Tech Plus licenses as Technicians, and that by doing so, one cannot equate "Technician license" with "non-code-tested licensee". By improperly putting code-tested Technicians in the non-code-tested category, you overstate their number and understate the number of code tested licensees.

The error is not a small one. 4,700 of 13,000+ is more than a third.

If there is any error in my analysis, it is that the number 4,700 is too small. Also left out are all Technicians who have passed the 5 wpm code test but not upgraded to General or Extra yet. They are "code-tested licensees".

End result is that your numbers are way off.
>

> <snip>
>
> >But even THAT's not a complete or correct analysis.
>
> True, using your estimates is not a correct analysis. :-)

It is far more correct than your analysis.
>
> <snip>
>
> >Suppose that the annual rate of expirations of "noncodetested"
licenses
> >is just 5%. Based on 215,000 licensees, that works out to 10,075
> >expirations per year, or about 840 per month. So the gain of 937 per
> >month shrinks to just 97 per month IF a 5% annual dropout rate is
> >correct.
>
> As far as ESTIMATES, you've failed once more.

How do you know? What is faulty in my estimate? I clearly
said "SUPPOSE" - that makes it hypothetical.

> Note the
> tabulation of NEW licensees which increased at 1184 per
> month for the 27 months between beginning of January 1998
> and end of March 2000 for Technician.

The actual numbers jump all over the place from month to month. And the
tabulation is of new licenses, not new licensees.

The number of new Technician licenses proves one thing: Most people
starting out in ham radio do so by getting a Technician license. The
data does not tell how many of those new licensees later upgrade,
because upgrades are lumped into "modifications".

> The renewals for
> those will be in the year 2008 to 2010...

Which has no bearing on the analysis. What really matters is how many
will come up for renewal, and be renewed, in the near future. My hope
is that the renewal rate will be very high. 99% would be great. 100%
would be even better, but is probably not realistic.

> but the trend is for
> NEW Tech licensees still growing after January 2001.

That's an ESTIMATE on your part. Nobody knows what the renewal rate
will be like until they actually start to expire.
>
> You've made a wish-fulfillment estimate on the "840 per month
> Technician class expirations of 5 percent."

That's simply not correct. I don't "wish" for a 5% dropout rate -
I "wish" it would be 0%. The 5% is just a highly-educated guess, and
identified as such.

By ignoring the fact that no Technician licenses have expired yet, your
analysis is even more faulty. My estimate is closer to the facts than
yours because it includes relevant corrections. My method is simply
more accurate.

> That assumes that
> percentage will expire and you have NO idea if they will do that.

It was identified as a "suppose". You ignored the whole expiration
thing completely. My analysis is more correct because the relevant
factors are included, and estimates identified as such.

You have no idea how many will expire and how many will renew, either.

> New Technician class licensees are continually being added
> and not just from "Tech-Plus renewals."

Of course! No one denies that, least of all me. But as I have shown, at
least a third of the ones you have credited as "new non-code-tested
licensees" are actually code-tested Tech Pluses renewed as Techs. The
real number is probably close to 40%. That's a BIG error, Len. And it's
an avoidable error.
>
> >In other words, the trend is not nearly so dramatic as was originally
> >presented.
>
> Your statement is "true" only in using incomplete and faulty
> estimates.

My estimates are accurate within the limits stated. My analysis is more
accurate than yours. Much more accurate.

> The trend is there whether you want to see it or
> not.

The trend is that most new hams start out with Technician licenses.
That's been the trend for over a decade. Some upgrade, some don't.
Describing all Technicians as "non-code-tested licensees" is simply not
correct or accurate.

> >More important, however, is the simple fact that it is far too early
to
> >even guess at the long-term impact of the restructuring.
>
> Denial will never see any trend of any kind.

I'm not denying any trends. I'm just stating the facts and pointing out
your errors. Which of my facts is not true?
>
> > It is also
> >interesting that the January 2001 figures were not included.

>
> Why? Is 9 months after restructuring somehow "faulty" but
> 10 months after restructuring is somehow "more correct?!?"

10 months of data are available, so why not include them? The longer the baseline, the more accurate the extrapolation or interpolation.

Basing conclusions on the 10 months of data following the restructuring is, by definition, more accurate and correct than basing them on the 9 months of data following the restructuring.
>
> What about the two years PRIOR to restructuring?

Different ballgame. Different license structure, different test requirements, different dynamics. And the FCC was renewing Tech Pluses as Tech Pluses back then.

> Go do
> the figures again and see the trends.

I have. The trends changed markedly after April 2000.

>Here, I'll do it for you.

Will this be as accurate as your earlier analysis? ;-)
>
> First three months of 2000: 163/month code-tested NEW
> licensees; 1980/month NEW Technicians. Not affected
> by April 15, 2000 restructuring.
>
> All of year 1999: 196/month code-tested NEW licensees;
> 1165/month non-code-tested NEW Technicians. Not
> affected by April 15, 2000 restructuring.
>
> All of year 1998: 265/month code-tested NEW licensees;
> 1231/month non-code-tested NEW Technicians. Not
> affected by April 15, 2000 restructuring.

Which tells us that most new hams start out with the Technician license - as I have written many times. Upgrades are not shown as new licenses in the Speroni data. Upgrades are not shown separately in the Speroni data, either.

And the restructuring DID have an effect. Once the NPRM was announced, hams and prospective hams who kept up with the news knew that changes were probably coming. Some of them would act accordingly, perhaps delaying upgrading until the new license structure was known. After the late December 1999 R&O, those thinking about getting licenses or upgrading knew what was on the way and acted accordingly. The exact effects can only be guessed at, but there WERE effects.

What do you think the above data says in terms of trends, beyond the fact that most new hams today start out as Technicians?

>
> > And it is
> >to be expected that the easiest-to-get license will have large
numbers
> >of licensees.
>
> The "easiest-to-get license" is a Restricted Radiotelephone
> License or Permit from the FCC.

Sorry, I made a mistake there. It should read:

"And it is to be expected that the easiest-to-get US amateur radio
license will have large numbers of licensees."

That's better. I apologize for being vague in that statement the first
time.

N2EY
--
FISTS #4360
BIT #0001

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2953. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 18:34:37 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A84383D.64A943F2@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3206

Dick Carroll wrote:
> If a few of you CW lovers whose real beliefs were not trumped by
> Politically Correct demands foisted on you by a few geeks with an Agenda
> would instead just simply state the facts--- that any ham who overlooks
> learning Morse code is missing the very most basic radiocommunications
> mode yet devised, and instead urge all hams to learn it as a matter of
> course, none of this would be necessary.

Your lack of reading comprehension is showing, Dick. Both Ed and I
encourage all hams to learn Morse code and use the CW mode which is
useful and fun for some. We will continue to encourage all hams to do
so even after the Morse code testing requirement is dropped entirely.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2954. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 18:35:11 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <961d8v$3k3$0@208.206.142.113>
Source record: 3202

W1RFI wrote:
>
> >From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
>
> >> >Digital should get its own segment, since digital and W do not mix that
> >> >well. And analog voice should get its own.
>
> >> But I thought CW gets through when no other mode will.
>
> > Would you please to attempt to quote accurately? It's "gets through
> >when other commonly available modes cannot".
>
> Sure. But the digital and analog voice modes are commonly available.
>
> >> Is that true only if the other mode is not allowed to be used?
>
> > Well, I was in a weak-signal QSO when a PSK31 station came on the
> >frequency exactly zero beat. You figure it out.
>
> I can indeed figure it out. If that PSK-31 signal was more than about 30 Hz
> away from "zero beat," it went on just fine and the CW ops experienced QRM. Of
> those two commonly available modes, which one got through while the other did
> not?
>
> CW has a necessary bandwidth of about 50 Hz. Go ahead, start calling CQ 51 Hz
> away from a CW QSO in progress and tell me the result.

Naw, you didn't figure it out at all. I was in QSO when the PSker
landed on top of us and flailed away, clueless.

More to the point, he was doubtless running at minimum a pentium with a
million or so active devices, AND some sort of an elaboirate SSB
transciever. I on the other hand was (or easily could have been) running
my Tuna Tin Deuce and a single stage regen. So now who has the
efficiency edge?

2955. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 18:40:22 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <961dim$499$0@208.206.142.113>
Source record: 3205

W1RFI wrote:
>
> >From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
>
> >> I don't think the number of hams who advance the state of the art has ever
> >>been very high. But the number of hams today who have a fundamental
> >>grasp of modern communications technology is smaller than it was in
> >>years past, IMHO.
>
> >I don't know why that should be surprising. The technololgy of today is
> >far more complex than earlier days.
>
> It is not more difficult to understand the fundamentals of how it works than it
> is to understand the fundamentals of AM, FM, SSB.
>

Understanding the fundamentals is far from "We all gotta adopt the
latest yada yada yada" crap that is the Cecilian hue and cry, and to
which you clearly subscribe.

> > It must be a function of the fact that you spend most of your time around
> > hams who are also highly technically trained, but you don't seem to be
> > aware of how small a percentage of hams are.
>
> I am quite aware of the present technical status of hams, Dick; I spend about 2
> or 3 hours a day on the phone, answering their questions. Most of them don't
> share your "can't do" viewpoint.

Really? So what're they doing on the phone asking you simple questions?
Kindly refrain from misrepresenting my viewpoint if you please. *I* DID.
"They" seem to resist any such activity, preferring to have "Ed do it"
for them.

2956. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 18:41:16 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A8439CC.39E38230@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3207

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> Cecil wrote:
> >
> > W1RFI wrote:
> > > I can indeed figure it out. If that PSK-31 signal was more than about 30 Hz
> > > away from "zero beat," it went on just fine and the CW ops experienced QRM. Of
> > > those two commonly available modes, which one got through while the other did
> > > not?
> >
> > :-)
>
> So smirk, smirk. the PSk31 station requies many thousands of active
> devices plus all the cabling, setup and crossed fingers required to get
> it running.
>
> CW? well, you already know.......

Yep, CW requires many billions of active devices called brain cells
plus many hours of specialized training. Thousands VS billions plus
a short learning curve sounds like a fair trade to me, Dick. If you
don't believe in labor savings devices, why don't you ride a horse?
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2957. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 18:43:56 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A843A6C.E203CA20@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3208

```
Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> Cecil wrote:
> >
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > >
> > > W1RFI wrote:
> > > > If one is qualified only at the basics, how can he claim to be fully
> > > > accomplished?
> > >
> > > So who ever advocated stopping there???
> >
> > If you're stopping short of DSP, you're stopping there, Dick.
>
> So any ham who seosn't learn how to do his own DSP can never be a fully
> accomplished ham.

DSP is to ham radio now as SSB was to ham radio in the early 50s.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca
```

2958. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 18:55:40 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <961efc$6f3$0@208.206.142.113>
Source record: 3209

W1RFI wrote:
>
> >I already know, and have known for a long
> >time, how a digitized signal process works, where it samples an analog
> >wave, digitizes it and later reconstitutes it as analog once again, sans
> >noise.
>
> How is it processed in between the digitizing and the D/A conversion? By what mechanism would the noise be removed?

Undersampling, what else? It us reconstructed from samples with most of
the original and the noise absent.

> >That's not new, nor is understanding the process equivalent to
> >rocket science.
>
> Do you think you could pass a multiple-choice test on this technology?

Of course- all I'd have to do is download the Question Pool and read it
awhile!

> >BUT--- if, like Cecil, you're telling me that Riley and his buddy Dale
> >Hatfield insist that I and any serious percentage of ham radio licensees
> >must become digital designers just to assure the survival of the ARS,
> >you might as well go ahead and pass the word to them that they can begin
> >the Big Shutdown anytime now.
>
> I don't recall iether of them saying any such thing. Can you supply a quote?

Sure, they both said "Hey you dumbass hams better get your rears in
gear and get off that old mundane stuff, you're not doing our engineers
nor the rest of the economy any good by sticking with that old reliable
gear. You gotta do what the Maritime services did, get rid of that old
stuff and take up the new, hoswever flawed and no matter what complex
gear you have to get, so we can progress....."

Well? What were we supposed to get out of paragraphs of nonspecific
chatter that said essentially that in paraphrase?

> They are both telling Amateur Radio, each in their own way, that Amateur Radio
> needs to modernize.

When no such thing is needed in any way!!

Why do you think they are saying that? My interpretation
> is not that all hams need to become design engineers, but that hams should be
> making use of modern radio communications techniques within the Service.

And many DO! That is what shows that they will not be satisfied with anything that hams do. The Carl Stevensons and Cecil Moores out there are the root of it. Barely ever a ham at all, -hams have fun- they now can do little but bitch about what everyone but they are doing. For reasons known only to themselves FCC et all find themselves unable to effectively shrug off that sort of crap and instead we get nothing but criticism that we don't do all that they do! Looks like a terminal case of envy! We actually have fun with what we do. It's a shame they can't.

2959. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 19:01:31 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A843E8B.3F22D6C4@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3210

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> W1RFI wrote:
> > How is it processed in between the digitizing and the D/A conversion? By what mechanism would the noise be removed?
>
> Undersampling, what else? It us reconstructed from samples with most of
> the original and the noise absent.

Actually, one generally has the option of removing uncorrelated noise or correlated noise. Removing uncorrelated noise works well for digital signals. Removing correlated noise works well for SSB. Noise is removed using adaptive digital filtering.

> > They are both telling Amateur Radio, each in their own way, that Amateur Radio
> > needs to modernize.
>
> When no such thing is needed in any way!!

The great majority of hams are stuck in the 60s, Dick. We are already stagnating 40 years behind the state of the art in RF communications.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2960. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 19:03:51 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A843F17.38524316@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3211

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> W1RFI wrote:
> > It is not more difficult to understand the fundamentals of how it works than it
> > is to understand the fundamentals of AM, FM, SSB.
>
> Understanding the fundamentals is far from "We all gotta adopt the
> latest yada yada yada" crap that is the Cecilian hue and cry, and to
> which you clearly subscribe.

There you go crawfishing again, Dick.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2961. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 19:06:20 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A843FAC.7122CB95@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3212

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> W1RFI wrote:
> > CW has a necessary bandwidth of about 50 Hz. Go ahead, start calling CQ 51 Hz
> > away from a CW QSO in progress and tell me the result.
>
> Naw, you didn't figure it out at all. I was in QSO when the PSker
> landed on top of us and flailed away, clueless.

And you probably didn't even appear on his waterfall display. That's
what you get for using such a broad band mode, Dick. :-)
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2962. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 19:22:01 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A844359.8562401B@uci.edu>
Source record: 3214

Len Over 21 wrote:
> The "taunt" seems to be 31,971 NEW no-code-test Technicians
> who came into the US ARS in the 27 months from the
> beginning of January 1998 and end of March 2000...while only
> 6009 NEW code-tested US ARS licensees came in during the
> same time.

What's to taunt about?

> Is it an "exaggeration" that the no-code-test Technician class
> has been constantly growing since the beginning while every
> other US ARS class (code tested) has not grown nearly as fast?

Nope. That's not it.

> Is it "belittling" that over 200 thousand no-code-test Techs are
> now in the US ARS?

Nope. Not what I was referring to at all.

> Is it "insulting" that such facts are pointed out to those who
> have been code-tested?

You are all of the above, Leonard. It's amazing you can't see it.

> I suppose you are right. All this talk about stopping code
> testing is sure "stinking," isn't it?

I don't think so. You're like a bad comedian, Len. The jokes would be
funny if somebody else told them.

> didit

no you didn't

2963. Re: The Raoul Xemblinosky mystery deepens

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 19:26:07 UTC
From: "The Kinder", Gentler Menace <the__phantom_menace@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <961g82fjf1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 3215
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,alt.angst,rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.flame

```
There Be No Karma Here for KC8JBO:
> In article <3A8418B1.296A@west.vagina.ham>,
> Roger Wiseman <crow@west.vagina.ham> wrote:
> > molesterian2001@my-deja.com wrote:
> > >
> > > In article <960o7g$oih$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
> > > KC8JBO <roger_kc8jbo@my-deja.com> wrote:
> > > > In article <960ets$h6s$0@dosa.alt.net>,
> > > > FAGGOT WEE WEE abuse@127.0.0.1 "wrote:"
> > > > >
> > > > > On Thu, 08 Feb 2001 21:06:04 -0500, KC8JBO <kc8jbo-no-
> > > spam@cotse.com>
> > > > wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > : Poor, poor "Stagger".. it must be hard on him when he
> realized he
> > > > is OWNED.
> > > > > : "Stagger" is scraping the bottom of the barrel with these
> latest
> > > > lies. A quick
> > > > > : check of "Roger Wiseman" in switchboard yields quite a few
> Roger
> > > > Wisemans
> > > > > : around....HAHAHAHAHAHA!!!
> > > > >
> > > > > What <SLAP!!!!!!>
> > > >
> > > > I KNEW YOU'D ANSWER MY POST BIIIIIIIIIITCCCCCHHHHHHH!!!!!!!!!
> > > >
> > > Hey, You should be going to trial soon because you your arrest
in
> that
> > > > big Harrison County drug sting....LOL!!!!!!
> > > > --
> > > > 73 de Roger, KC8JBO
> > > > EM99 |ARRL|VE [ARRL & W5YI]|ARES |RACES
> > > > Yaesu FT-920 |Inverted Vee @ 40 ft.
> > > > Yaesu FT-90R
> > >
> > Who cares? Take it someplace else! Idiot.
>
> FOAD, Molesterian.
```

Haha, the infamous FUCKHEAD CHILD MOLESTER Molesterian has nothing better to do than beet off to jpgs of handsome dashing rock vocalist ERIC SAEGER, wishing he was a boy like the last boy he BEAT AND MOLESTED with a two-headed dildo.
Molesterian lives in a big Maytag box in the Bronx, and he sprouted from the bucktoothed choad of his HALF-MONKEY MOM and a thousand mental patients.

e-vince

--
"SarumanTheChef tells us that in the novelization, Darth Maul had another line that wasn't in the movie, and it was a great line too. While the Jedi and Maul are stuck in between the security barriers in the final duel, Maul tests his saber on the shield like in the movie, but after he looks at Qui-gon, he looks at Obi-wan and smiles, saying 'Oh, don't worry, I'm coming for you too.'"
- TheForce.net

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2964. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 19:26:42 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A844472.F298A51E@uci.edu>
Source record: 3213

Brian wrote:
> Len brings up the fact that the numbers of coded hams are decreasing and
> the numbers of non-coded hams are increasing (the "point" of the
> discussion). He uses a balance scale term.

He use a balance scale analogy to indicate the opposite of the facts he
cites.

> You cannot comment on the
> facts of the ham population, so instead dissect balance scale
> engineering, and thus you claim Len's statements false.

I DID not comment on that because no comment was necessary. I have
nothing to say on the issue other than, great! More new hams.

> Ergo coded ham
> populations are increasing. Nice fantasy.

Yours, not mine.

> Am I still in over my head?
>
> Sent via Deja.com
> http://www.deja.com/

2965. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 19:47:38 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A84495A.B7954D2@uci.edu>
Source record: 3216

> >W1RFI wrote:
> >>What percentage of Morse-code communications do you believe is accomplished
> >>with only a simple RF generator on-off keyed?

Then I wrote:
> >100% of the ones that send bweeeeeeeee bweep bweeeeeeee bweep
> >bweeeeeee bweeeeeeee bweep bweeeeeeee

N2EY came back with:
> No no no. It's "chowpy chowpit chow chow chichow"

And Cecil added:
> I thought it was deeeeeeooooooo deeoo deeeeeeooooooo deeoo ...

I stand corrected. Thanks for the chuckles, guys. Fun stuff. :-)

73, Jim AC6XG

2966. Re: Engineers, Technicians, and Appliance Operators

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 20:04:43 UTC
From: K0HB@qwest.net
Message-ID: <961igr$5o5$1@news.netmar.com>
Source record: 3203

In article <960stdsdl1@nnrp1.deja.com>, Steven J Robeson, K4YZ
<k4yz@my-deja.com> writes:

> By the way, Lennie and others, it has been on my "bio" page of QRZ
>for some time, along with the call sign of the club call sign for the
>company.

On your web page you make a big hairy deal about not using eQSL, yet when I
check my eQSL list, here is one from K4YZ.

Somebody must be bootlegging your card on eQSL.

dit dit

73, de Hans, K0HB

----- Posted via NewsOne.Net: Free (anonymous) Usenet News via the Web -----
http://newsone.net/ -- Free reading and anonymous posting to 60,000+ groups
NewsOne.Net prohibits users from posting spam. If this or other posts
made through NewsOne.Net violate posting guidelines, email abuse@newsone.net

2967. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 20:33:49 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <vzYg6.150$HH5.959195@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 3218

Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote:

> Len Over 21 wrote:
> > The "taunt" seems to be 31,971 NEW no-code-test Technicians
> > who came into the US ARS in the 27 months from the
> > beginning of January 1998 and end of March 2000...while only
> > 6009 NEW code-tested US ARS licensees came in during the
> > same time.

> What's to taunt about?

Nothing. I am pleased that there are 37,980 new hams.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2968. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 20:38:05 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <vDYg6.151$HH5.959875@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 3220

Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

> So smirk, smirk. the PSk31 station requies many thousands of active
> devices plus all the cabling, setup and crossed fingers required to get
> it running.

> CW? well, you already know.......

Yes, I do; CW can be done with a single active device on transmit.

How many active devices are inside the transmitter you use for CW? Let's assume 10,000 per IC and count from there. The microprocessors and RAM etc probably have quite a few more, but that will be offset by some of the IC amplifiers. Don't forget to count your keyer, if you use one.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2969. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 20:38:39 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A84554F.D0CEF1C5@uci.edu>
Source record: 3219

W1RFI wrote:
>
> >From: Jim Kelley jwkelley@uci.edu
>
> >Sounds like an excellent answer to have prepared for your next job
> >interview, Ed. "Well I don't know anything about that, but I can look
> >it up!"

> If they ask me to cite from memory what the ascii code is for a semicolon, I
> will do just that. I will also wonder why they asked me the question.

True. But you could also tell them that you can look up how to do polar
conversions, and path loss calculations, and amplifier stage gains.

Maybe it's just a matter of opinion which things we need to know, and
which things we don't. Heck, isn't it true that everything on the ham
exams can be looked up?
I think one could point to almost anything on the exams and make an
argument that it didn't need to be there for the same reason you cite in
the instance of code. One would counter that argument by saying that
there is a reason for having that particular question on the exam. Are
you going to claim that there are absolutely zero reasons that can be
given for having the Morse code as part of amateur radio exams?

73, Jim AC6XG

2970. Re: QCWA TELLS FCC TO END INCENTIVE LICENSING

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 20:42:54 UTC
From: Bob Wex w2ilp <w2ilp@juno.com>
Message-ID: <961kocjvv1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 3221

In article <95vqj6$2b6$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
jwill@AstraGate.net wrote:
> In article <95o28ubcg1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
> Bob Wex w2ilp <w2ilp@juno.com> wrote:
> > In article <3A7C0F5B.2158175B@arrl.org>,
> > Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote:
> > > Bob Wex w2ilp wrote:
> > > >
> > > > In article <3A797E19.5F1D7E26@arrl.org>,
> > > > Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > I didn't say they weren't. I only said that according to N9GL,
> the
> > > > > standards are not derived from the mechanisms but from the
known
> > > > > effects.
> > > >
> > > > True...but as engineers, scientists or medical people the
> > > > MECHANISM...chemical, biological, electral, mechanical or
whatever
> > must
> > > > be understood if there is to be any corrective measures devised.
> > >
> > > But we can't apply corrective measures to the design of the human
> > body.
> > > The only factor we can control is how much RF we expose ourselves
> to.
> > > For that purpose, it is the effect of the exposure that is
> important,
> > > not the underlying mechanism.
> > >
> > > > A hot chicken does not tell you the mechanism by which it got
> > hot...but
> > > > if you heated it in your microwave oven..You know the mechanism
> was
> > > > microwave RF not heat conducted from a gas burner or radiated by
> > your
> > > > fireplace.
> > >
> > > But if the point is to cook a chicken I don't need to know the
> > mechanism
> > > by which the cooking takes place, I only need to know that it gets
> > > cooked when I apply either heat or RF at sufficient levels.
> >

> > If you are a chef, then all you may need to know is that the chicken
> > got cooked to your liking...BUT if you are a scientist or engineer
you
> > need to know a lot more; and if you are afraid that the chicken was
> not
> > cooked well enough to kill the bacteria in it, you work with
> scientists
> > and engineers; You don't care much about what a chef might think
> > because he doesn't understand the MECHANISM, nor the cause and
effect
> > of the groth of bacteria populations in what might be pockets of
> > relatively raw chicken. The chef might not even be able to smell or
> > taste bad chicken that is dangerously tainted. Worse he might
attempt
> > to cover up bad chicken with gravies that hide the rotten, stinking
> > chicken and make it profitable to do so.
> >
> > Some of the "experts" who talk about what are considered RF hazard
> > levels are no more scientific than old grandmothers who think that
> > chicken soup will cure any illness. True, chicken soup might have
> some
> > healthy benefits for some minor ailments...but the old grannys who
> make
> > it don't know much about the spread of bacteria that exists within
> > humans and certainly aren't aware of the latest reasearch about the
> > AIDS virus. Chicken soup might just have a psychological beneficial
> > effect on some humans...others might be better off with mock clam
> > chowder or mock turtle soup....or some real Johnny Walker.
> > >
> > > > > Which makes sense. For the purpose of determining safe levels,
> > > > > the mechanisms are unimportant
> > > >
> > > > Huhh? That is like saying Ohm's Law is unimportant as long as
> lamp
> > > > bulbs light. Only the observation of the light matters for
> > determining
> > > > what voltage will quickly burn open the filament.
> > >
> > > It's nothing like that at all. We need to know Ohm's law so we can
> > > design electrical devices. We're not designing human bodies.
> (Although
> > > there are those doctors who've announced plans to clone humans, so
> > maybe
> > > we will be designing humans soon!)
> >
> > When you design electrical devices there are certain intrinsic
> > conditions that must be delt with. There are physical limitations
> that
> > involve the actual fabrication of resistors, conductors, insulators,
> > etc. (although I admit the human body is much more complex than an

> > electrical resistance path)...
> > BUT
> > WE need to know the mechanism by which hazards can be hazardous
before
> > we can determine what the safe levels are...just like we need Ohm's
> Law
> > before we can design for appropriate resistances, voltages and
> currents
> > that can make a circuit function as we intend it to.
> > True, we can not reengineer humans yet...although genetic
manipulation
> > may not be out of the question in the far future...BUT we need to
> > design RF radiating equipments (including cell-phones and Ham HTs)
so
> > that they are safe for use by humans IF this is possible. On the
down
> > side, it might not be possible....just like it has not been possible
> to
> > manufacture a truly safe cigarette that is still a cigarette. We
can
> > not just think of the human body as a dummy load for RF...nor can we
> > just think of the overall thermal effects on the body, without
knowing
> > the mechanisms that have dangerous propensities. Considering only
> > thermal effects will definately prove to be a gross error. If the
RF
> > can be more consentrated on vulnerable parts of the human body at
UHF
> > than at VHF then this would not be a consideration if only thermal
> > effects on the entire body are all that is being considered. It is
a
> > known fact that heat is generated when RF causes electrons in
certain
> > molecules to be agitated. (Heat is actually defined as electron
> > agitation) BUT the effects of agitating electrons in the material
that
> > constitutes human tissue of various functions is poorly understood.
>
> I agree with your opinions, for the most part, but this is not
> generally true: Heat as electron agitation only would hold
> under certain circumstances, for example in a plasma of some kind.

I don't agree with your statement for the most part.
>
> Electrons almost always are in atoms, and thus they take on
> discrete, quantized levels of energy which
> are definite and not random.

True.

> Heat is usually defined as the degree of randomness of motion
> of atoms.

Not exactly. You need to study cryogenics and what happens at super cold temperatures approaching absolute kelvanic zero where electron motion approaches a stand still. Is it any motion that is responsible for heat or is it heat that is responsible for any motion?...or is it both? is there truly any random motion?
> An electric current can cause electrons to move in a medium by
> jumping from atom to atom;

Wrong. You said yourself that electrons hardly ever leave the atoms that they are a part of.
Electro-chemical action such as electrolysis is perhaps the only example of an electric current moving atoms...not just electrons. The normal situation is not that electrons move from one atom to another but that they polarize the atoms in a dominio effect. The current does not "flow" either from positive to negative or from negative to positive, as is taught in most tech and high schools, but the atoms of conducting material become polarized and this polarization travels through the conductor at a speed approaching the speed of light.

> this causes essentially random
> motion in the atoms (say, in a resistor), and thus a rise in
> temperature.

The random motion is always there at ambient temperature. The random motion does contribute to noise if the conduction is part of the front end circuitry of a sensitive radio receiver, for example. In a MASAR the front end gets cooled by liquid nitrogen and this sharply reduces the random noise. The random motion does not cause the material to heat up to any temperature that is beyond the ambient temperature which caused it in the first place. The ambient temperature can however be considered as a reason for the electron agitation within atoms to exist.

> Removing the electric field leaves the atoms
> moving more randomly, but the electrons are not at all random
> in the reference frame of the atom with which each one is
> associated. If the atoms were not moving randomly, the
> electrons would not be, either.

The atoms do not move in most cases but the electrons in their outer orbits do become agitated.

> In a conductor, the
electrons (in the conduction
> band) hardly interact at all with any individual atom;
> therefore, with an applied potential, they transfer
> little random momentum to the atoms; therefore, they don't
> heat it very much.

You start the above by disagreeing with what you wrote at the beginning, but here again your conclusion is wrong because you are not agreeing with Ohm's Law. Every conductor has a finite amount of

electrical resistance (even if it is 0.000001 Ohms). If an IR drop occurs in the conductor it must disipate some energy...Most of this energy is disapated in the form of heat, although some energy is in the form of an electro-magnetic field, since any conductor which has any dimention will have some field developed about itself. Thus if accurate measurements are made any conductor will show some rise in temperature when it is conducting any electrical current. The motion we are speaking of is not random...It is determined by the nature of the voltage which causes the current and will be very constantly direct or related to the frequency of such current, if it is AC or RF.

> > What levels, at what frequencies can cause genetic damage? What can
> > cause or accelerate cancerous malignancies? What tissues are most
> > vulnerable? Can some individuals be more at risk than others? All
> > must be considered before setting any safe radiation level
standards.
> > Although the research continues, we have been permitted to work with
> > standards that may be considered conservatively safe by
> > some "grannys"...BUT not by W2ILP.
> >
> > I admit that I dunno at this point in time... nor does N9GL. Let us
> > leave it at that.
> > >

All of the basic physics and chemistry that we may be discussing here has little to do with RF hazards. The human hazard problems that may or may not exist at radio frequencies (HF, VHF, UHF) may not be complertly explained by a knowledge of how electrons act at DC. That is particularily why I believe that the thermal considerations are but the tip of an iceberg. Let me get back to the human eye, for example. We know that we can not safely look directly at the sun or other high level sources of light. This is not just to avoid the heat that the sun radiates. Intense light is harmful to our eyes...and our eye lids normally automatically protect us from prolonged exposure to direct intense light. We can wear sunglasses to avoid light glare when driving our cars. The glasses filter out some of the light. The better sunglasses are polaroid types which can filter out light of one polarity and pass light of a polarity that is 90 degrees different. We can not see RF...BUT Perhaps we may need to wear specially designed filter goggles when we use HTs. Goggles can probably be made, which can filter out the RF which can cause eye cancer. This would be better protection than a device which is currently marketed. The device absorbs some of the radiated RF and causes most cell phones to increase RF output to compensate for the device's attenuation in order to maintain communication. In my technical opinion such a device can only shorten the cell-phone battery life and has little or no effect on reducing any possible hazard.

Thanks for your comments...Although maybe neither of us are sheding much light (or RF) on the subject.

Hams need more license classes and maybe more physics classes as well.

73,
Bob Wex w2ilp (I Learned Physics)

A man, visiting a crazy house, saw a man
who was trying to hammer a nail into
a wall head first. Another nut laughed
and said "If you want to do that, you
had better turn the hammer around".
Still another crazy inmate said,
"I know better! I was an engineer before
I wound up in this place. It is obvious
that that nail was designed only for use
in the opposite wall".
We all can understand that the nail
should be turned around...but if we
couldn't see the nail...such a project
(to show which way to hammer in nails)
could at least lead to a government grant.
--w2ilp--

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2971. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 21:08:22 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <961m7u$la5$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 3222

In article <3A84495A.B7954D2@uci.edu>,
Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote:
> > >W1RFI wrote:
> > >>What percentage of Morse-code communications do you believe is
accomplished
> > >>with only a simple RF generator on-off keyed?
>
> Then I wrote:
> > >100% of the ones that send bweeeeeeeee bweep bweeeeeeee bweep
> > >bweeeeeee bweeeeeeee bweep bweeeeeeee
>
> N2EY came back with:
> > No no no. It's "chowpy chowpit chow chow chichow"
>
> And Cecil added:
> > I thought it was deeeeeeooooooo deeoo deeeeeeooooooo deeoo ...
>
> I stand corrected. Thanks for the chuckles, guys. Fun stuff. :-)
>
> 73, Jim AC6XG

Mine is the most accurate. It was in QST.

73 de Jim, N2EY
--
FISTS #4360
BIT #0001

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2972. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 21:12:00 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A845D20.ABE9C7BA@uci.edu>
Source record: 3223

Brian wrote:
> Show where I misunderstood.

You apparently understand nothing. You're an impudent boorish punk with nothing intellectual to bring to a discussion. I expect you find pestering people on the newsgroup to be as entertaining as jamming your local repeater and playing telephone pranks.

Blither on, N0IMD.

2973. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 21:16:05 UTC
From: K0HB@qwest.net
Message-ID: <961mml$7vn$1@news.netmar.com>
Source record: 3217

Dick Carroll writes:
>> They are both telling Amateur Radio, each in their own way,
>> that Amateur Radio needs to modernize.
>
>
>When no such thing is needed in any way!!
>
>

Damned straight! My grandads team of horses and wagon got him into town just fine; wouldn't need these fancy cement roads, and there wouldn't be no damn Arabs taking all our money for some kinda refined decayed dinasoar muck. Never had to cross your fingers hopin' old Prince and Nelly would start on a cold morning.

Who needs this modern crap anyhow -- all this modern digital modem internet crapola is too complicated by far. At 15-cents a word Western Union got by just fine with some telegraph lines strung up along the railroad tracks and a kid on a bike delivering it right to your door -- why we gotta have all this satelite crap anyhow.

73, Hans, K0HB

----- Posted via NewsOne.Net: Free (anonymous) Usenet News via the Web -----
http://newsone.net/ -- Free reading and anonymous posting to 60,000+ groups
NewsOne.Net prohibits users from posting spam. If this or other posts
made through NewsOne.Net violate posting guidelines, email abuse@newsone.net

2974. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 21:28:03 UTC
From: "Steven J Robeson", K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <961ncnmdn1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 3225

In article <961d5lcii1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
n2ey@aol.com wrote:

> Your analysis did not include the fact that the FCC is renewing Tech
> Plus licenses as Technicians, and that by doing so, one cannot
> equate "Technician license" with "non-code-tested licensee". By
> improperly putting code-tested Technicians in the non-code-tested
> category, you overstate their number and understate the number of code
> tested licensees.

You would expect this creep to admit an error?

> The error is not a small one. 4,700 of 13,000+ is more than a third.

Of course if WE made this error, we KNOW what would be coming out
of Soutern Californication, don't you?

--
"It Could Be That Your Life's Only Meaning Is To Serve As A Warning To
Others Of How Bad It Could REALLY Be!"

"Just Remember...An Amateur Built The Ark, Engineers Built The Titanic"

PLEASE SEND PRIVATE E MAIL COMMENTS TO K4YZ@AOL.COM. RESPSONSES TO THE
DEJA MAY OR MAY NOT BE RETRIEVED IN A TIMELY FASHION.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2975. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 21:28:20 UTC
From: K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <961nd8$me0$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 3224

> N2EY came back with:
> > No no no. It's "chowpy chowpit chow chow chichow"

That's it exactly! Sounds like the TCS-8 mounted just above the coffee pot in Radio Central on a 2250-ton Gearing/Sumner class destroyer.

The TCS-8 back in Aux Radio went "pwaukty pwauktit pwauk pwauk pwipwauk".

Above 25WPM they both went "braaawwwwwwwkkkkkkkkkkkkkkkkkkkkkkkkkkk".

73, Hans, K0HB
ex-NBFP, NIDO, NHXW, NFUF, NAM, NPN, etc.

--
"Consistency is the last refuge of the unimaginative."

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2976. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 21:30:35 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A84617B.AC97BBD5@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3227

n2ey@aol.com wrote:
> Mine is the most accurate. It was in QST.

Anybody who thinks it starts with a "ch" and not a "d" needs
to clean out his ears. :-)
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2977. Re: Engineers, Technicians, and Appliance Operators

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 21:31:14 UTC
From: "Steven J Robeson", K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <961nj3$mo7$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 3226

In article <961igr$5o5$1@news.netmar.com>,
K0HB@qwest.net wrote:

> On your web page you make a big hairy deal about not using eQSL, yet
> when I check my eQSL list, here is one from K4YZ.

No, Hans, you were one of two or three I replied to just to "test
the waters". In as much as I "know" you, I thought I owed you the
courtesy of a reply. You were kind enough to send me one of those
beautiful real cards, I thought it only proper.

73

Steve, K4YZ
--
"It Could Be That Your Life's Only Meaning Is To Serve As A Warning To
Others Of How Bad It Could REALLY Be!"

"Just Remember...An Amateur Built The Ark, Engineers Built The Titanic"

PLEASE SEND PRIVATE E MAIL COMMENTS TO K4YZ@AOL.COM. RESPSONSES TO THE
DEJA MAY OR MAY NOT BE RETRIEVED IN A TIMELY FASHION.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2978. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 21:38:50 UTC
From: tlbryant@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <961o1a0svd@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 3232

In article <960kvpmab1@nnrp1.deja.com>, brianburke@my-deja.com says...
>
>In article <95voct0git@enews3.newsguy.com>,
> tlbryant@my-deja.com (T. L. Bryant) wrote:
>> In article <95v8mtjmt1@nnrp1.deja.com>, brianburke@my-deja.com
>says...
>>
>> >> Still trying to figure out what, if
>> >> anything, you ARE expert at though.
>> >
>> >The greatest hobby in the world - the one everyone talks about!
>> >
>>
>> At the moment, that would be collecting Pokemon cards.
>
>Not the moment most people live in. Guess again.

You don't get out much do you?

2979. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 21:47:02 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <961ogk$nf0$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 3228

In article <vDYg6.151$HH5.959875@news.ntplx.net>,
"Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net> wrote:
>
> How many active devices are inside the transmitter you use for CW?

Nine, not counting the power supply. Two of those is shared with the receiver. The rig is enirely homemade and homedesigned.

> Let's
> assume 10,000 per IC and count from there.

No ICs. Don't need 'em.

>The microprocessors and RAM etc
> probably have quite a few more, but that will be offset by some of the IC
> amplifiers.

No microprocessors. Don't need those either.

> Don't forget to count your keyer, if you use one.

I use a Vibroplex Original bug. Folks I work cannot tell its sending from a top-of-the-line keyer.

Let's see - entire HF station has a total of 20 active devices in the transceiver and a bunch of diodes and regulators in the power supplies and antenna tuner/SWR bridge. Puts 100+ watts of clean RF in the antenna, which is also homemade. Cost about a dollar a watt to build, not counting the antenna tuner, which cost maybe $20 and is good for several hundred watts. Clock is an old mechanical 24 hour digital (Timechron?) job made from the parts of three junkers. The shack table and shelves are also homemade.

It's not top-of-the-line but it does OK. HA1TG and UA3RF last night on 40 CW - the latter called me! And I can fix, align and modify it with no worries.

73 de Jim, N2EY
--
FISTS #4360
BIT #0001

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2980. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 21:58:02 UTC
From: tlbryant@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <961p5a1svd@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 3233

In article <9612e7$7a6$0@208.206.142.113>, dixie@townsqr.com says...

> Yep. And when the first radio experimenters began to develop the
>fledgling RF communications system they very quickly realized that Morse
>was a natural for use with a system where the most basic requirements
>were simply to key a carrier on and off with information encoded in
>those bits of RF....
>It WAS a natural. Still is.

It certainly isn't natural to me. I read, write, and speak in English. I don't walk around "beeping" at people when I want to talk to them.

2981. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 22:01:29 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <961pbj$od4$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 3229

In article <3A845D20.ABE9C7BA@uci.edu>,
Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote:
> Brian wrote:
> > Show where I misunderstood.
>
> You apparently understand nothing. You're an impudent boorish punk
with
> nothing intellectual to bring to a discussion. I expect you find
> pestering people on the newsgroup to be as entertaining as jamming
your
> local repeater and playing telephone pranks.
>
> Blither on, N0IMD.

Jim, you have yet to say anything intellectual, you discuss nothing, you only attack my character. It is likely you really have nothing to say intellectual or not, yet you go on and on and on. You, sir, are the jammer. Be Silent!

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2982. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 22:13:43 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <961q2e$p00$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 3230

In article <3A844472.F298A51E@uci.edu>,
Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote:
>
>
> Brian wrote:
> > Len brings up the fact that the numbers of coded hams are decreasing
and
> > the numbers of non-coded hams are increasing (the "point" of the
> > discussion). He uses a balance scale term.
>
> He use a balance scale analogy to indicate the opposite of the facts
he
> cites.

Fine! I guess balance scales cannot be in a process or a state of
"tip-ping" until they have tipped. Everything is static until,
suddenly, they are tipped. The balance beam cannot move until it
instantly comes in to a state of having been tipped. The beam cannot be
moving downward or upward.

The idea of tipping is impossible for you to grasp. I pity your
waitress.

> > You cannot comment on the
> > facts of the ham population, so instead dissect balance scale
> > engineering, and thus you claim Len's statements false.
>
> I DID not comment on that because no comment was necessary. I have
> nothing to say on the issue other than, great! More new hams.

There - you said it. Great! Not exactly intellectual, but we're making
progress.

> > Ergo coded ham
> > populations are increasing. Nice fantasy.
>
> Yours, not mine.
>
> > Am I still in over my head?

That's your fantasy.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2983. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 22:15:36 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <63_g6.153$HH5.964670@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 3231

Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> wrote:

> > If they ask me to cite from memory what the ascii code is for a
semicolon, I
> > will do just that. I will also wonder why they asked me the question.

> True. But you could also tell them that you can look up how to do polar
> conversions, and path loss calculations, and amplifier stage gains.

I don't think any of those questions has ever come up on any of my job interviews, Jim. I am sure a prospective employer would judge which things, such as the ascii code, are reasonable not to be committed to memory and which things he or she expects an applicant to know. The FCC, through the QPC, does the very same thing (at least in theory); no amateur examination ever has contained all of the knowledge that a ham might acquire during a lifetime of hamming.

> I think one could point to almost anything on the exams and make an
> argument that it didn't need to be there for the same reason you cite in
> the instance of code.

I believe that amateur exams should contain the fundamentals of all that is relevant to amateur radio technology.

> Are you going to claim that there are absolutely zero reasons that can be
> given for having the Morse code as part of amateur radio exams?

I think not. My personal view is that Amateur testing should contain about 5 minutes of transmitted code and the applicant should be asked a reasonable number of questions (perhaps 2 or 3 in the General exam, as an example) about the content of what was sent. This should be part of the overall exam score. This would test Morse code the same way that all other aspects of Amateur Radio knowledge is tested.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2984. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 22:46:28 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <2w_g6.156$HH5.966008@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 3234

Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

> > >Even old fellers like me, who spent the working career AND 44 year ham
> > >radio experience mostly in the technical side of radio find it beyond
> > >reasonable that it be demanded of us that we abandon what we know and
> > >like in favor of some dippy digital engineer's ideal of what radio
> > >communications should be today, just because he has found that he is
> > >capable of scrambling the numbers and inventing some new mode each
week.
> > >In a word, much of it is BORING.

> Why do you insist on dodging my point? Would it destroy your most
> effective weapon, your assertion that I actually DO resist learning new
> things?

I am sorry if I misunderstood your words, Dick. If you feel that telling
everyone here that learning new things is boring means that you want to
learn them, then I will take it that way if you say it again.

> What I said is that I have tried almost every new mode that came along
> and for the most part they are BORING! And yes, I "learned" new things
> about them, contrary to your assertion.

I think that you misunderstand what I mean by modern radiocommunications
techniques, Dick. PSK-31 isn't one of them. Just as one example, many
radio services use various spread-spectrum techniques to access an
information channel, not frequency channelization. How is that being used
in Amateur Radio today? How many hams understand the fundamentals of these
technologies?

> But I gotta tell ya, I prefer the old crystal filter to anything DSP has
offered to date.
> I'm on my fourth DSP and so far I see nothing but disappointment from any
of them.

Much of the difficulty with DSP in modern radios is in the way it is
implemented. There are major differences between the way that DSP is
integrated within or outside of the AGC loops in receivers, and in the
nature of the analog filtering before the DSP. At 12 or 16 bits, there just
isn't enough dynamic range in the DSP in most receivers to be able to handle
it all in software.

OTOH, "software defined radio" is the latest technique just now being
developed in modern radio design. Using DSP, a basic "black box" radio can
be reprogrammed to be anything from a CW rig to a CDMA transceiver. It is
our future, Dick, and I hope that not all hams find it "boring." We are apt
to see technology, and rules changes, that will accomodate this approach to

radio design, and in a few years, or decades, I expect to see DSP develop to the point where one goes directly from code (the software kind) to antenna.

> I also have a little audio autonotch filter that has had much more use against
> the carriers of the many RF spammer/jammers that all this infusion of
> 'new blood' has brought.

I have heard carriers since 1963, Dick. Don't go blaming it on all the "new blood." Of those busted by the FCC for intentional interference of late, what percentage of them were "new blood?"

> > If Amateur Radio were not in touch with the technology of the 40s, we would not
> > be here after being shut down after WW2.

> Dodging the issue? Why so all you "we all just gotta change everything"
> mavens ignore the fact that we hams do this not because we want to just
> communicate- we have cell phones for that- but for much deeper and more
> complex reasons.

Gosh, Dick, you sure do see everything in extremes. How did we get from my belief that more hams need to learn more about modern communications techology to "we gotta change everything." It is very difficult to have a conversation if my words do not mean what words mean to you.

> Evidently FCC and most of the others who seem to be monitoring our
> every teansmission to see what old mode we insist on keeping can't see
> the forest for all the trees.

Do you really believe that the FCC monitors our every transmission?

> In most urban areas, a ham who
> > wants to put up a new repeater is told that "no pairs are available." Yet,
> > tune the band, and most of the repeaters sit idle most of the time. This is not
> > an efficient use of spectrum.

> It sure isn't, but that is not a technical problem, rather one of
> administration that could very easily be resolved. The fact that all
> paris are "assigned" is the problem. You just have to offend those who
> need to be offended since they are too selfcentered to do the right
> thing themselves. No one should have the inherent right to tie up a
> frequency pair just because he asked first. It should be a use it or
> lose it situation. Repeaters should only rarely be approved for
> individuals where they can preclude many other potential users from use
> of spectrum, the rule should be 'show your real data or be denied'. It's
> a failure if administration that the repeater fiasco is allowed to
> continue as it has.

What about the repeater that is used once a month for a club meeting? Lose it? Why would one want to take on the administrative burden of trying to

keep hams off the air when there are technical solutions at hand?

> You don't even understand that CW is NOT my favorite mode, although it
> is one of my favorites. From long experience I know how effective it can
> be. If operators equip themselves to use it. You don't seem to yet
> understand- or do you just prefer to ignore- that my outlook is that it
> is just as irresponsible of ham radio operators to refuse to learn to
> use CW, the basic radiocommunications mode as you believe it to be for
> them to ignore DSP techniquues. It is also irresponsible for ARRL and
> FCC to ignore the most basic radiocommunications mode. Do they all think
> that there will never again be any need for anything basic?

Never be a need? I am sure there will be. There could come a need for me to ride a horse, too, but I don't think I will ever see a horse-riding test included with my driver's license. I think that society believes that if there is a need for me to ride a horse, I will get up on the fool thing somehow and pretty soon be a pretty good horse rider. There is a much more likihood that there will be a need for voice or data communication, and the best regulatory solution for that would be for the FCC to mandate that every ham station be equipped for voice communication on HF and VHF. If they are not willing to address that likely need through the rules, why would they address the need for Morse code communication through mandatory testing? Why do you select that one need and not feel that the FCC should do something to address a much more likely need?

> > I believe in the ability of hams to learn and grow. If more information
is
> > made available in amateur circles, they will come and they will learn
and when
> > such techniques come to be used in Amateur Radio, they will have an
> > understanding of their advantages and disadvantages. Some hams will
continue
> > to thirst for radio knowledge, others will "pause," but as long as the
Service
> > as a whole continues to grow, we will have met the technical components
of our
> > regulatory objectives.

> Taking lessons from Cecil? Your use of "pause" to indicate refusal to
> learn is way out of context and you know it or should.

I used your word, Dick, in the context I thought you meant it. If you need to refresh your memory, do a deja search on yourself and the word "pause."

> I truly believe, indeed KNOW that this continued incessant demamding
> has caused many hams to abandon ham radio, just quit.

Why is it that my view that more hams need to learn more about modern radio technology is "incessant demanding" but your view that all hams need to pass a Morse code test is not? Your view has the force of law, while mine is just an opinion. Which do you feel is expressed more strongly? And if my opinion is enough to drive some away, what must the much stronger "opinion"

about Morse code testing do?

> You ARE taking your cues from Cecil. I rest on my laurals as a ham
> simply in that there are no more ham radio tests for me to take, the
> last one was over thirty years ago. If you believe that I haven't learnd
> anything since that time I'll just lump you in with Cecil, and surely
> you don't want to be there.

Of course I don't believe that of, Dick, but it is hard to interpret your calling my expression of the view that more hams should learn the fundamentals of modern radio technology as "incessant demanding." To me, that appears to say that you do not wish to learn the fundamentals of modern radio technology.

> If a few of you CW lovers whose real beliefs were not trumped by
> Politically Correct demands foisted on you by a few geeks with an Agenda
> would instead just simply state the facts--- that any ham who overlooks
> learning Morse code is missing the very most basic radiocommunications
> mode yet devised, and instead urge all hams to learn it as a matter of
> course, none of this would be necessary. Instead you cower like so many
> sheep.

Did you intend to be insultive there, Dick, or did you just get carried away? With all of those buzzwords, I am not sure what you mean by that paragraph, Dick, but I have very much been encouraging hams to use and enjoy Morse code. Claiming that I am not is, IMHO, appears to me to be an Agenda, too.

> You've got it backwards, again. It is not nearly as hard as they first
> think it is, when they decide they just don't want to, and that has been
> the point. Why do you contradict it?

That's more like it; you are correct, learning Morse code is NOT a big hill to climb that will somehow prove their character. :-)

> Based on knowledge of how things have worked in the past that is most
> unlikely. No one excapt a few of us posting here has a single good word
> to say about it. Extremely few newcomers are informed and with the
> current attitude at HQ and by all the ridicule and criticism it and its
> supporters get here there's not much chance of improvement. The Big Dumb
> Down will just continue until the Big Shutdown.

Is "Dumbdown" your single good word?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2985. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 22:50:05 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <rz_g6.157$HH5.966185@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 3235

Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

> > It is not more difficult to understand the fundamentals of how it works than it
> > is to understand the fundamentals of AM, FM, SSB.

> Understanding the fundamentals is far from "We all gotta adopt the
> latest yada yada yada" crap that is the Cecilian hue and cry, and to
> which you clearly subscribe.

I subscribe to the concept that more hams need to learn the fundamentals of modern radio technology. You seem to be having a lot of difficulty understanding what that means. I can't think of another way to say it, Dick.

> > I am quite aware of the present technical status of hams, Dick; I spend about 2
> > or 3 hours a day on the phone, answering their questions. Most of them don't
> > share your "can't do" viewpoint.

> Really? So what're they doing on the phone asking you simple questions?
> Kindly refrain from misrepresenting my viewpoint if you please. *I* DID.
> "They" seem to resist any such activity, preferring to have "Ed do it"
> for them.

Some of the questions are pretty simple; many are not.

I think we have about beat this one to death, and I can't think of new ways to say the same things again and again. At least for now, the last word is yours.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2986. Re: Morse Code replacement? Bigtime flame war article!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 22:50:31 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <961s7lqrd1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 3237

In article <3a83de57.41990447@news2.dvol.com>,
kelly@dvol (Brian Kelly) wrote:
> On 09 Feb 2001 00:33:05 GMT, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:
>
> >Yeah, but you know, Carl and I have had many an interesting
conversation since
> >and he is now using an entirely different style. I occasionally see
some of his
> >infamous "forcefulness," but I think he has chosen a productive
route. I count
> >Carl among my friends. Even bought him a lobster once. :-)
> >
> Don't bring that sumbitch to Bookbinders for the RV/EY lobsterfest,
> he'll never make it back to Allentown.

You sound like a bad man.

"When you've worked over a FIST, you've worked over a friend!"

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2987. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 22:52:39 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <SB_g6.158$HH5.966289@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 3236

<n2ey@aol.com> wrote:

> Let's see - entire HF station has a total of 20 active devices in the
> transceiver and a bunch of diodes and regulators in the power supplies
> and antenna tuner/SWR bridge. Puts 100+ watts of clean RF in the
> antenna, which is also homemade. Cost about a dollar a watt to build,
> not counting the antenna tuner, which cost maybe $20 and is good for
> several hundred watts. Clock is an old mechanical 24 hour digital
> (Timechron?) job made from the parts of three junkers. The shack table
> and shelves are also homemade.

Now, if this is an original design, I have only one question -- when are we
going to see the article or web page on it? :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2988. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 23:04:49 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A847791.7E3C983D@uci.edu>
Source record: 3238

"Ed Hare, W1RFI" wrote:

> My personal view is that Amateur testing should contain about
> 5 minutes of transmitted code and the applicant should be asked a reasonable
> number of questions (perhaps 2 or 3 in the General exam, as an example)
> about the content of what was sent. This should be part of the overall exam
> score. This would test Morse code the same way that all other aspects of
> Amateur Radio knowledge is tested.

Oh. For some reason I thought you were making a case for looking it up
rather than committing it to memory. Don't know how I got that idea.

73, Jim AC6XG

2989. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 23:14:03 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <961tjk$s6p$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 3241

In article <961o1a0svd@enews4.newsguy.com>,
tlbryant@my-deja.com (T. L. Bryant) wrote:
> In article <960kvpmab1@nnrp1.deja.com>, brianburke@my-deja.com
says...
> >
> >In article <95voct0git@enews3.newsguy.com>,
> > tlbryant@my-deja.com (T. L. Bryant) wrote:
> >> In article <95v8mtjmt1@nnrp1.deja.com>, brianburke@my-deja.com
> >>says...
> >>
> >> >> Still trying to figure out what, if
> >> >> anything, you ARE expert at though.
> >> >
> >> >The greatest hobby in the world - the one everyone talks about!
> >> >
> >>
> >> At the moment, that would be collecting Pokemon cards.
> >
> >Not the moment most people live in. Guess again.
>
> You don't get out much do you?

Not a problem. I visited the public library after work today, I'm going
to the gun show tomorrow, and have a daytrip planned for St. Louis on
Sunday. Back to work Monday morning, will attend a seminar in Cleveland
on Thursday....

My kids like pokeyman. I've treated them to pokeyman toys, books,
videos, "snap" nintendo 64 game, and even a live show at the coleseum.

But pokeyman is still not the world's greatest hobby. Not by any
stretch.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

2990. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 23:14:10 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <961tk2$g11$0@208.206.142.81>
Source record: 3239

Cecil wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> DSP is to ham radio now as SSB was to ham radio in the early 50s.

That shows how little you really know.

2991. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 23:15:55 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <961tnb$g11$1@208.206.142.81>
Source record: 3240

Cecil wrote:
>

> The great majority of hams are stuck in the 60s, Dick. We are already
> stagnating 40 years behind the state of the art in RF communications.
>

That is pure unadulturated bullcrap.

2992. Re: Morse Code replacement? Bigtime flame war article!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 23:27:40 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <Q6%g6.160$HH5.967679@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 3242

<n2ey@aol.com> wrote:

> - QST: The magazine is often a new ham's first contact with the ARRL,
> and a resource for all hams. But when was the last time there was a QST
> article on any of the following?
> + How to learn the code & how to increase your speed
> + How to adjust a key and send good code
> + Types of keys and advantages/disadvantages of each
> + How to set up a CW station and operate it
> + How to build/buy a good CW setup on a slim budget
> + In-depth product reviews of various Morse training materials and
> methods
> + FISTS and other Morse-related organizations and resources

Most of what appears in QST is written by outside authors. Care to write? ARRL pays. :-) I especially like the types of keys/advantages, though I can't speak for the editor. :-) See http://www.arrl.org/qst/aguide/#qst

> I've seen more QST articles on PSK31 in the past two years than
> articles on Morse in the past 20-30 years.

See the list at the end of this post.

> Of course the new modes need to be promoted, but when decades go by with
no attention to a popular
> mode, there's a problem. Newcomers do not have the ability to easily dig
up articles from 30-40 years ago.

As soon as Al, AA1DO, finishes a major indexing project, I will see what we can add to the TIS pages on Morse code. If you have any recommendations for the best articles, that may speed the process up a bit. :-)

> - Other ARRL publications: When I started out, there was an excellent
> ARRL book called "Understanding Amateur Radio". It cost half the price
> of a Handbook of the time, (first $2, then $2.50) and it addressed the
> basics of getting on the air. Some of it was reprints of QST articles
> that a newcomer would not have seen, but most of it was material
> intended to teach the basics without a lot of math. There were two
> versions, then it was dropped. Lots of projects but also lots of plain
> talk about setting up a station, operating, etc. Such a "junior
> Handbook" is needed now more than ever.

Try the following:

http://www.arrl.org/tis/info/frsteps.html
http://www.arrl.org/tis/info/antbegin.html
http://www.arrl.org/tis/info/antproj.html

http://www.arrl.org/tis/info/propagation.html
http://www.arrl.org/tis/info/rigbuy.html
http://www.arrl.org/tis/info/homebrew.html
http://www.arrl.org/tis/info/srvceqpt.html
http://www.arrl.org/tis/info/rfigen.html
http://www.arrl.org/tis/info/labnotes.html
http://www.arrl.org/tis/info/science.html

and of course, lots of other stuff at http://www.arrl.org/tis

When you look at the volume of stuff, you will probably agree that ARRL is quite committed to helping new hams get on the air and active, and the price is right. As to actual publications, there are:

Now You're Talking -- this study guide actually contains a lot of info designed to serve as a ham's first tutorial publication about setting up and using a station. Catalog #7970, http://www.arrl.org/catalog/lm/

Ditto on the other license manuals

Others. (See the catalog at http://www.arrl.org/catalog)
Ham Radio Made Easy
The Best of New Ham Companion
Understanding Basic Electronics
Ride the Airwaves with ALFA & ZULU (more oriented towards children)

> In similar fashion, the fifty cent "Learning The Radiotelegraph Code" booklet needs a new version
> that doesn't cost too much.

Code is best learned aurally. See Your Introduction to Morse Code cassettes and CD.

> Of course the N0HFF book on the MEGS site is excellent, and it's FREE for the
> downloading. Maybe the ARRL could publish it?

Or link to it.

> ARRL Website: Some good info, but the list of Morse links is small and
> many of the best ones are notably absent or buried. Take a look at the
> Morse links at

> http://www.callingcq.org

> for some ideas. My favorites are the MEGS site (Morse Enthusiasts Group
> of Scotland), the AH0A site (for Morse University downloads), Dave
> Finley's (N1IRZ) explanation of the Koch/Farnsworth method, and of
> course the FISTS site. Did I find any of them from the ARRL website?
> Nope.

> A link only costs the work to put it on the site, doesn't it?

Agreed, and I will ask Al to do what can be done. Of late, too many tasks and too little Al. :-)

> - Things the BOD can do: It's interesting that the BOD changed the ARRL
> policy on S25.5 so quickly and so quietly, but that's a done deal.

The Board published their intent to consider S25.5 on the ARRL Web, in QST, in the ARRL Letter and in a W1AW bulletin. In what way was it done "quietly?"

<snippage> Some of your other suggestions have been sent to your Division Director, Bernie Fuller.

> Learning and using Morse is neither difficult nor time consuming for
> most people IF the right methods are used. But a new or prospective ham
> looking at the ARRL website or QST will have a hard time getting info
> on how to go about it, even though such information is readily
> available if you know where to look.

With the mandate from the Board to HQ staff to promote Morse code use on the bands, the ARRL Web site is a natural place to begin. I can do some of that on the Tech pages, not because that is the best place for the info, but because it the area for which I am King. (Ah, it is Good to be King!)

> And that's just my short list.

How about the long one? :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

2993. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 23:48:42 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A8481DA.D8DD9F93@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3243

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> Cecil wrote:
> > The great majority of hams are stuck in the 60s, Dick. We are already
> > stagnating 40 years behind the state of the art in RF communications.
>
> That is pure unadulturated bullcrap.

Nope, it's exactly what is wrong with ham radio today. I remember when
many hams were at the leading edge of communications technology. We
are still at that same edge but now it's the trailing edge.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2994. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 23:55:14 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A848362.DDEB8CF@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3253

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> Cecil wrote:
> >
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > DSP is to ham radio now as SSB was to ham radio in the early 50s.
>
> That shows how little you really know.

Dick, it's the truth. A/Ds and processors are getting faster every year
and every year digital electronics takes over more and more of the
functions from analog by doing the job cheaper and better. Soon, everything
this side of the mixer will be DSP functions. The Kachina radio was just
the first of many.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

2995. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 23:59:11 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010209185911.17176.00001512@nso-ba.aol.com>
Source record: 3249

In article <3A844472.F298A51E@uci.edu>, Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> writes:

>Brian wrote:
>> Len brings up the fact that the numbers of coded hams are decreasing and
>> the numbers of non-coded hams are increasing (the "point" of the
>> discussion). He uses a balance scale term.
>
>He use a balance scale analogy to indicate the opposite of the facts he
>cites.

On the contrary, I used NUMBERS of licensees based on FCC
databases. Those were the FACTS, facts available from the
only US agency granting amateur radio licenses.

A METAPHOR was used to indicate the TREND happening.

Kelley made a Big Thing out of the metaphor at first, didn't
say anything about the numbers or the trend.

>> You cannot comment on the
>> facts of the ham population, so instead dissect balance scale
>> engineering, and thus you claim Len's statements false.
>
>I DID not comment on that because no comment was necessary. I have
>nothing to say on the issue other than, great! More new hams.

Kelley didn't say that at first. Nice job of backtracking and
trying to CYA.

>> Ergo coded ham
>> populations are increasing. Nice fantasy.
>
>Yours, not mine.

Kelley only wants legally licensed Metaphors. :-)

didit

2996. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 23:59:14 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010209185914.17176.00001513@nso-ba.aol.com>
Source record: 3252

In article <961d5lcii1@nnrp1.deja.com>, n2ey@aol.com writes:

>> That is an ESTIMATE.
>
>Yes, it is. It's also true - the FCC renewed 4,870 Technician and
>Technician Plus licenses in that time period, and reclassified the Tech
>Pluses as Technicians. The holders of the licenses - the licensees -
>are responsible for maintaining proof that they have been code tested
>if they want to retain their HF privileges.
>
>This stuff is all explained on the Speroni site. Your failure to
>include it in your analysis is a serious error that reduces your
>credibility.
>
>> By using personal estimates based only
>> on "gut feeling" or something, you are yourself in ERROR.
>
>My estimate is not based on "gut feeling". It is based on a thorough
>knowledge of the information, the applicable regulations and basic math
>as applied to statistics. It's a fair estimate.
>
>Your analysis did not include the fact that the FCC is renewing Tech
>Plus licenses as Technicians, and that by doing so, one cannot
>equate "Technician license" with "non-code-tested licensee". By
>improperly putting code-tested Technicians in the non-code-tested
>category, you overstate their number and understate the number of code
>tested licensees.

I didn't mention at all the renewals of Tech-Plus to Tech because
the exact number of such renewals weren't listed except by
inference on the Speroni tabulation of Renewed licenses.

I did as stated, taking the overall monthly numbers of licensees in
each class, separating code-tested from non-code-tested..

I could have gone into an extensive "analysis" by including
numbers of Expirations of licenses (also tabulated) and doing
all sorts of second-guessing on the "why" of such. I did not.

The FCC renewal shift of Tech-Plus to Tech would put such
Tech-Plus licensees in the CODE-TESTED group, would it
not? The old Technician-Plus class required a code test for a
license. In order to separate code-tested from non-code-tested,
I made an additional posting regarding the 27 months between
the start of 1998 and the end of March 2000. That additional
listing excluded any "renewal" shifts from Tech-Plus to Tech.

The results are still the same -

The total number of code-tested US ARS licensees is decreasing.
The number of non-code-tested US ARS licensees is increasing.
It has been that way for over three years..

<snip>

>End result is that your numbers are way off.

No. I am not ASSUMING anything about "renewals" or expirations
or anything else, just showing the totals of code-tested versus
non-code-tested over the last two-plus years plus the number of
NEW licensees, code-tested versus non-code-tested.

If you start assuming some condition, your "analysis" changes
to mere SPECULATION. That is no longer any valid analysis.

>How do you know? What is faulty in my estimate? I clearly
>said "SUPPOSE" - that makes it hypothetical.

Speculation is still speculation. Such is not analysis.

>> Note the
>> tabulation of NEW licensees which increased at 1184 per
>> month for the 27 months between beginning of January 1998
>> and end of March 2000 for Technician.
>
>The actual numbers jump all over the place from month to month. And the
>tabulation is of new licenses, not new licensees.

An average per-month value based on 27 months totals, divided
by 27. In the 27 months there were 31,971 new non-code-tested
licenses granted and 6,009 new code-tested licenses granted.
If you are really picky about smoothing methods, feel free to
pick out any period you want...but quit trying to say "everything
is faulty." :-)

>The number of new Technician licenses proves one thing: Most people
>starting out in ham radio do so by getting a Technician license.

How do you KNOW that? All I see is the number of licenses granted
for particular classes. Aren't there any "Extra-out-of-the-box"
licensees? Aren't there any "General-out-of-the-box" licensees?

>The
>data does not tell how many of those new licensees later upgrade,
>because upgrades are lumped into "modifications".

None of the publicly-available FCC databases predicts the future.

Can you predict the future? I can't. I don't have crystal balls.

>> but the trend is for
>> NEW Tech licensees still growing after January 2001.

>
>That's an ESTIMATE on your part. Nobody knows what the renewal rate
>will be like until they actually start to expire.

Sure, trends are ESTIMATEs. :-) One plots past data and gets a
"curve" which may be a sort-of-straight line or something that is
curved. That estimate may be continued into the NEAR future for
a few months with some element of certainty.

It is better than picking fly droppings out of pepper to get the
number of Tech-Plusses renewed as Techs, the number of
Advanceds that were dropped to a lower grade for any reason,
or any number of "modifications." You can go to great lengths
to attempt "proving" something in the multi-tiered US amateur
licensing system. The only way you can REALLY "prove" your
numbers is to download the FCC databases yourself and make
your own search program to find EXACTLY what you are looking
for to show those #$%&!!! no-coders they are "all wrong." :-)

>That's simply not correct. I don't "wish" for a 5% dropout rate -
>I "wish" it would be 0%. The 5% is just a highly-educated guess, and
>identified as such.

Ah, "highly eductated!" Presumably there is some certificate or
diploma attesting to such ability? I'd still call it a plain GUESS
and lump it under speculation.

>By ignoring the fact that no Technician licenses have expired yet, your
>analysis is even more faulty. My estimate is closer to the facts than
>yours because it includes relevant corrections. My method is simply
>more accurate.

It is "more accurate" from the pro-coder's viewpoint. It is "more
accurate" because you said so. :-)

>It was identified as a "suppose". You ignored the whole expiration
>thing completely. My analysis is more correct because the relevant
>factors are included, and estimates identified as such.

It is "more accurate" from the pro-coder's viewpoint. It is "more
accurate" because you said so. :-)

>You have no idea how many will expire and how many will renew, either.

Absolutely true...and I NEVER PRESUMED TO KNOW THE
FUTURE. All I stated was a Trend based on PAST data.

>My estimates are accurate within the limits stated. My analysis is more
>accurate than yours. Much more accurate.

It is "more accurate" from the pro-coder's viewpoint. It is "more
accurate" because you said so. :-)

[doing good in the "nyah-nyah" department...:-)]

>The trend is that most new hams start out with Technician licenses.
>That's been the trend for over a decade. Some upgrade, some don't.
>Describing all Technicians as "non-code-tested licensees" is simply not
>correct or accurate.

The US Technician class amateur radio license test did NOT
include a morse code test element...ergo, the Technician class
license can be considered "non-code-tested." That is what I said.

>I'm not denying any trends. I'm just stating the facts and pointing out
>your errors. Which of my facts is not true?

Some of your "facts" were simply SPECULATIONS. One even
had the imprimateur of "highly educated." Speculations aren't
true or untrue, but they sure as hell aren't "facts."

>10 months of data are available, so why not include them? The longer
>the baseline, the more accurate the extrapolation or interpolation.

Oh, geez louise. Jim, if you want to Show The World The Errors
Of The Uncoded, go do your own arithmetic and post the results.

>Basing conclusions on the 10 months of data following the restructuring
>is, by definition, more accurate and correct than basing them on the 9
>months of data following the restructuring.

No sh*t? Is that from the "highly educated" school or something?

>> What about the two years PRIOR to restructuring?
>
>Different ballgame. Different license structure, different test
>requirements, different dynamics. And the FCC was renewing Tech Pluses
>as Tech Pluses back then.

No sh*t? In the period before restructuring too place, was there an
increase in the code-tested license numbers and a decrease in the
non-code-tested license numbers ???

>Which tells us that most new hams start out with the Technician
>license - as I have written many times. Upgrades are not shown as new
>licenses in the Speroni data. Upgrades are not shown separately in the
>Speroni data, either.

I don't think downgrades are shown either...but they exist in the
FCC database files. As I have suggested before, go download
your own database files and do searching for whatever data you
want to "prove" something. They are ASCII files and searchable
with a text-based search program.

>And the restructuring DID have an effect. Once the NPRM was announced,
>hams and prospective hams who kept up with the news knew that changes
>were probably coming. Some of them would act accordingly, perhaps
>delaying upgrading until the new license structure was known. After the
>late December 1999 R&O, those thinking about getting licenses or
>upgrading knew what was on the way and acted accordingly. The exact

>effects can only be guessed at, but there WERE effects.
>
>What do you think the above data says in terms of trends, beyond the
>fact that most new hams today start out as Technicians?

The above "data" paragraph is your own reporter-voice description. :-)

Not all new hams start out as Technicians. In the 27 months
between start of 1998 and end of March 2000 there were
1900 New Novice class licenses granted, 3,504 New Tech-Plus
licenses granted, 459 New Generals, 78 New Advanced, and 68
New Extra. Yes, Jim, "MOST" new hams probably DO start out
as Technician class licensees (they aren't all job technicians,
some may be engineers, housewives, plumbers, etc.). :-)

>"And it is to be expected that the easiest-to-get US amateur radio
>license will have large numbers of licensees."
>
>That's better. I apologize for being vague in that statement the first
>time.

Are you absolutely SURE of the first sentence above? After all,
the FCC is renewing Tech-Plusses who don't re-test on renewal
as Technicians, and "many" of the existing Techs will drop out,
and aliens might invade the earth to be repulsed by morse code.
Or at least repulsed by long-time morsemen who will fight
change (of any kind) to a moral, mortal end. :-)

didit

2997. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 23:59:15 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010209185915.17176.00001515@nso-ba.aol.com>
Source record: 3244

In article <3A83F1BF.564DE8C0@ovis.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net> writes:

>Do you have anything interesting for the group or can we expect more
>number crunching ala Len?

Both. You will try to find fault with both, but that is expected.

Feel free to keep on thinking you and only you Know What
Is Best. :-)

didit

2998. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 23:59:15 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010209185915.17176.00001514@nso-ba.aol.com>
Source record: 3245

In article <961c67bhc1@nnrp1.deja.com>, Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
writes:

>In article <3A83F6F1.FFE2535@ovis.net>,
> Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net> wrote:
>
>I'd
>> describe your perception of amateur radio reality with a term from
>> ionospheric propagation: skewed path.
>>
>> Dave K8MN
>
>Likewise, you seem to hang with what I consider some of the wrong
>elements in amateur radio. You follow the ground wave.

I disagree. Subsurface. :-)

didit

2999. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 23:59:16 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010209185916.17176.00001516@nso-ba.aol.com>
Source record: 3251

In article <960ov5$p9a$1@nnrp1.deja.com>, Steven J Robeson, K4YZ
<k4yz@my-deja.com> writes:

>In article <20010208223637.14870.00001887@nso-fr.aol.com>,
> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
>
>> The "taunt" seems to be 31,971 NEW no-code-test Technicians
>> who came into the US ARS in the 27 months from the
>> beginning of January 1998 and end of March 2000...while only
>> 6009 NEW code-tested US ARS licensees came in during the
>> same time.
>
> And again you try to make it appear that ONLY the "new" Technician
>licenses are making an impact. You fail to account for those who
>transition. You only refer to "new" code tested licensees. NOT those
>who are ALREADY licensed and upgrade.

My balls aren't made of crystal, therefore I can't know who many
are "in transition." [does operating mobile count? :-)]

Poor baby, really struggling for a slam there? Did I deliberately and
maliciously, with callous disregard of sensitive USAMCC feelings,
"make it appear that ONLY "new" Technicians are making an impact?"

You MUST say so, Steebie, because all you have left any more is
insult, belittlement, denigration, etc., etc.

All I did was post a comparison between the code-tested licensees
and the non-code-tested licensees in the US ARS.

If you feel that only the code-tested are "real hams" then you MUST
take the comparison as an insult.

>> Is it "belittling" that over 200 thousand no-code-test Techs are
>> now in the US ARS?
>
> Only to you. Must chap your chops knowing there's all those teen
>and pre-teen ops out there able to do what you CAN'T do after your
>years aas a technician

See, there you go again, being uncivil, rude, insulting...sort of an
extra grade asshole. :-)

Steebie, I've been an ENGINEER doing electronics-radio design work
legally, titularly, and steadily employed as an ENGINEER beginning
in 1964. A whole host of federal agencies, several state agencies
all believed I was an ENGINEER. Fun jobs, all of them, paid fairly

well, too. Interesting work, some of it downright intriguing.

US amateur radio is not about being an engineer or not being an engineer...it isn't even about employment except that no licensee can use that license to gain income from it. Why do you keep insisting that I am a "technician?"

Note: Engineers are not required to learn morse code for engineering skills, diplomas, or titles.

>> Is it "insulting" that such facts are pointed out to those who
>> have been code-tested?
>
> Only when YOU presume us to be ignorant enough to accept your poor
>math as "fact".

Where did I make "errors" on math? Did you read N2EY's "analysis?" His math was the same as mine concerning what I originally stated.

> They are only those things in YOUR mind, Lennie. It's all you
>have left to believe that you are on some noble crusade.

Gosh, thanks, Sancho Panza! Now get on your ass and follow your Don to the next windmill.

didit

PS: Good going, Steebie, you got in early to work to post e-mail at 7:48 AM.

3000. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 23:59:17 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010209185917.17176.00001517@nso-ba.aol.com>
Source record: 3247

In article <960ln202tpc@enews4.newsguy.com>, tlbryant@my-deja.com (T. L. Bryant) writes:

>> It's all he has ever done and is the reason most here just ignore him.
>>He had pretty well dried up for lact of attention when someone engaged
>>him in a drawnout flamefest, and he was rejuvenated.He is not interested
>>in ham radio in the least, other than to slam and criticize it and all
>>who are in it. He lives only to disturb and disrupt and like all such
>>idiots, when he gets no attention he goes away.
>
>I think that if Len wanted to be inflamatory, he would have done a lot more
>than complain about playing word games.

Dickie is doing the Ostrich Thing again. By putting my screen name in his killfile he can't see any postings, therefore the unseen appears to "go away." :-)

didit

3001. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 23:59:18 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010209185918.17176.00001518@nso-ba.aol.com>
Source record: 3248

In article <960odo$or8$1@nnrp1.deja.com>, Steven J Robeson, K4YZ
<k4yz@my-deja.com> writes:

>In article <20010208214540.02997.00002007@nso-mg.aol.com>,
> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
>
>> What are you saying? That code-tested licensees are opting
>> to change over to Technician class from a code-tested previous
>> class not a Technician-Plus?
>
> No...simply YOU try to discount the "Techs" who upgrade. Yes,
>most "new" licensees are Techs. But a LARGE number don't stay there.

Please provide reference for the above "fact" that a "large number
don't stay there."

> You ignore that.

I ignore Urban Myths, falsehoods, folk sayings, etc., in trying to
analyze public data offered by the only US agency that licenses
US radio amateurs.

>> Ah, still doing e-mail from work, ey?
>
> From wherever I do it, it doesn't take much to make a fool out of
>you, Lennie.

You've done nothing of the kind, only shot off your keyboard again.

Try to concentrate on the facts of what is happening to others, by
others, especially concerning newcomers to US amateur radio.

didit

3002. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 23:59:18 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010209185918.17176.00001519@nso-ba.aol.com>
Source record: 3250

In article <960lm1mom1@nnrp1.deja.com>, Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
writes:

>> I think you're over your head Brian. Best let it drop. The subject -
>> not your head.
>
>Yeh, you keep saying that. So let us review.
>
>Len brings up the fact that the numbers of coded hams are decreasing and
>the numbers of non-coded hams are increasing (the "point" of the
>discussion). He uses a balance scale term. You cannot comment on the
>facts of the ham population, so instead dissect balance scale
>engineering, and thus you claim Len's statements false. Ergo coded ham
>populations are increasing. Nice fantasy.
>
>Am I still in over my head?

According to Jim and Dickie you would be classified such. :-)

Denial is a powerful emotional survival skill. When threatened
in any form, especially about an avocational theological
concept, the denial syndrome makes them slightly crazy and
they refuse to admit it.

Part of the denial problem is a strong overlay of ego. If They do
something then "everyone else does it" or should. They climb up
on a pedestal and proclaim They are a role-model for otheres to
emulate. That's denial on afterburner.

didit

3003. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-09 23:59:19 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010209185919.17176.00001520@nso-ba.aol.com>
Source record: 3246

In article <9600ev$8dl$3@208.207.71.143>, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
writes:

>The prisoner tap code was never a radiocommunications mode, and was not
>designed to be. Military men who needed to communicate over radio knew
>enough to use Morse.

When did military men know that, Dickie? When I was in the US
Army and stationed at ADA in Tokyo from 1953 to 1956, ADA had
36 transmitters and not one of them was operating using OOK
CW morse. The only ones who knew Morse were too old to serve
then...

didit

3004. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-10 00:25:20 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <3A848A70.441BBC83@arrl.org>
Source record: 3254

Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> "Ed Hare, W1RFI" wrote:
>
> > My personal view is that Amateur testing should contain about
> > 5 minutes of transmitted code and the applicant should be asked a reasonable
> > number of questions (perhaps 2 or 3 in the General exam, as an example)
> > about the content of what was sent. This should be part of the overall exam
> > score. This would test Morse code the same way that all other aspects of
> > Amateur Radio knowledge is tested.
>
> Oh. For some reason I thought you were making a case for looking it up
> rather than committing it to memory. Don't know how I got that idea.

I know how you got that idea. Ed said the Nokia engineer who programmed
the cell phone that beeps Morse could have just looked up the Morse, and
you took that to mean Ed thinks that amateur Morse testing should be via
look-up because, um.... well, because, er... I guess I *don't* know how
you got that idea!

Jon

3005. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-10 00:54:18 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <tt398t0afju2ju2i0u965onh5uo4bhqlh5@4ax.com>
Source record: 3255

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>[What were the reasons that ham growth stopped dead in 1962?]

>SWLs could no longer easily listen in on ham QSOs, as they did in the AM days.

In 1959 as I recall it was still about half SSB, half AM. I don't
think AM was anywhere near gone by 1962. Further, most of the SW
receivers of the day had a BFO (even the cheapie $29.95 Heathkit AR-3)
which made SSB copy possible. I think that any SWL worth his salt
could still listen to hams...

>The cost and complexity of an SSB setup also had a negative effect
>on prospective hams by making it more expensive to get started on 'phone.

I think it was 1962 or 1963 when I bought my first SSB rig, a Heathkit
HW-22 40 meter monoband transceiver. The price was around $112 bucks
(I think - check your QST collection), in any case it was cheaper than
most of the AM stuff at the time...

>In 1963 the distance requirement was increased from 75 miles to 175 miles,

I could see this causing a 10% drop, but a "stop dead" drop??

>To add insult to injury, the FCC started charging fees of $4 to take the exam

Why would a small fee stop a prospective ham who likely will spend ten
times that amount on his radios...

>- CB: 27 MHz CB had been introduced a few years earlier, but by 1963 the number
>of CBers was greater than the number of hams, and growing fast. The equipment
>was inexpensive, the antennas small and simple, and there was no test at all.

This is certainly a possible reason. Most of the fun of ham radio
without the test. Food for thought: Did CB do to ham radio in the 60s
what the Internet is doing to ham radio today...

>- Cultural changes: ... Very few hams of '60s looked like
>John Lennon or even Austin Powers.

You think that incentive licensing increased the numbers by making
hams look better?? :-)

>TV watching increased all through the '50s and '60s.

How does that explain the sudden stop in '62?

>- Economic conditions: For some reason, ham radio tends to grow more during
>periods of bad economic conditions than during good ones,

Were we in a recession in 1962? I forget...

>Waddya think?

Interesting thoughts Jim. It doesn't seem logical to me for most of these things to account for zero growth, except maybe the CB thing. But I sure don't have any other ideas. In fact I wasn't even aware of the 1962 growth cessation. Thanks for the insight, it was an interesting read...

3006. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-10 00:54:20 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <7t398t4g2iseuq39pgfg02mlsmfv9rbm3s@4ax.com>
Source record: 3256

w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:
>I don't agree that the technology is so advanced that today's intelligent hams
>cannot learn the fundamentals of how it works.

I don't think I said that today's hams can't learn the fundamentals.
And of course just knowing the fundamentals does not a technical ham
make. In the 50s it would be unthinkable for most hams to send a rig
back to the factory to be fixed. Today it is common place...

3007. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-10 01:16:46 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <pj598t091cdq9m0cgear25gs48mq4cjpo5@4ax.com>
Source record: 3257

"Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net> wrote:
>I don't think I will ever see a horse-riding test
>included with my driver's license. I think that society believes that if
>there is a need for me to ride a horse, I will get up on the fool thing
>somehow and pretty soon be a pretty good horse rider.

If there is truly no need for a fast horse riding test, say 13 mph,
included with your drivers license, why would there be a need for a
slow horse riding test, say 5 mph... :-)

3008. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-10 01:16:47 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <cj598tcjp585ej713c7ptnmpr6gjdk7qtt@4ax.com>
Source record: 3258

"Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net> wrote:
>I think we have about beat this one to death, and I can't think of new ways
>to say the same things again and again. At least for now, the last word is
>yours.

Oh oh, more marbles are leaving the table and going home... :-)

3009. Re: I heard a CB'er on 20 meters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-10 01:28:02 UTC
From: h <not@aol.com>
Message-ID: <t89648o0tkkp61@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 3259
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner

Gee sounds like our founding fathers. Guess freedom isn't good unless
sanctioned by third world dictatorships

--
Sincerely,
Ken
pwrguy@intergrafix.net
> Freebanders are generally unexperienced in electronics and not sanctioned
by
> any country in the world.
> Rick

3010. Re: I heard a CB'er on 20 meters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-10 01:30:38 UTC
From: h <not@aol.com>
Message-ID: <t896923k2b7a9f@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 3260
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner
Body handling: HTML body converted to readable text

```
Lucky for me I grew up in a country where BRAVE MEN decided to break some
laws in the year 1776!
And they didn't turn them selves in to some king.

--
Sincerely,
Ken
pwrguy@intergrafix.net
"John" wrote in message
news:eFog6.25402$dC2.713601@newsfeed.intelenet.net...
> guess what freebander! your breaking the law!!! OH but youre so mature and
> can express yourself. Why not express yourself to the FCC office and tell
> them what and where you operate.
> "h" wrote in message
news:t83rrg5hedt400@corp.supernews.com...
> > It's true look at your own foul and filthy mouth!
> > Ham's always use foul language and filthy talk on the radio just like
they
> > do on this newsgroup. Freebanders know better. Freebanders are mature
and
> > can express themselves without spewing forth filthy language.
> >
> > --
> > Sincerely,
> > Ken
> > pwrguy@intergrafix.net
> > wrote in message news:3a81e5c5.3817813@news.idsi.net...
> > > On Wed, 7 Feb 2001 18:01:46 -0500, "h" wrote:
> > >
> > > >If he had a license he is a HAM not a CB'er
> > > >Frankly Freebanders are like the Hams of old. If you look at the FCC
> > > >enforcement logs The Hams are out of control and need enforcement
while
> > > >Freebanders are mature and working to improver thier knowledge, save
> > lives,
> > > >promote freedom and democracy, and gernerally aid and improve the
> > geneneral
> > > >welfare or thier comunities.
> > > >
> > > >--
> > > >Sincerely,
> > > >Ken
> > >
```

> > > Total BULLSHIT. You know and I know it.
> > >
> >
> >
>
>

3011. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-10 01:38:32 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010209203832.29092.00000189@ng-ba1.aol.com>
Source record: 3261

>Subject: Re: Pride
>From: Aaron Jones nomail@nomail.com
>Date: 2/9/01 7:54 PM Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <tt398t0afju2ju2i0u965onh5uo4bhqlh5@4ax.com>
>
>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>>[What were the reasons that ham growth stopped dead in 1962?]
>
>>SWLs could no longer easily listen in on ham QSOs, as they did in the AM
>days.
>
>In 1959 as I recall it was still about half SSB, half AM. I don't
>think AM was anywhere near gone by 1962.

There was still some AM in 65-66, when I started listening. But there was far more SSB.

> Further, most of the SW
>receivers of the day had a BFO (even the cheapie $29.95 Heathkit AR-3)
>which made SSB copy possible.

IF you knew how to work it. Many SWLs did not.

>I think that any SWL worth his salt
>could still listen to hams...

IF their receivers had BFOs and IF they knew how to work them. And if the cheap SWL rx stayed on frequency long enough to copy anything. Point is, it was not nearly so easy to listen to hams on SSB with the SWL sets of the time as it was to listen to hams using AM. That's just as true today.
>
>>The cost and complexity of an SSB setup also had a negative effect
>>on prospective hams by making it more expensive to get started on 'phone.
>
>I think it was 1962 or 1963 when I bought my first SSB rig, a Heathkit
>HW-22 40 meter monoband transceiver. The price was around $112 bucks
>(I think - check your QST collection), in any case it was cheaper than
>most of the AM stuff at the time...

It was $112 bucks or so for the rig itself, then another $30-40 for the power supply. And what you got was an SSB-only monoband rig that needed a 1:1 SWR (or close to it) to work.

On the other hand, a Novice could add a modulator to his MOPA CW rig and go on AM easily and cheaply. Some folks used cathode or screen modulation, which could be added for almost nothing. Sure, the efficiency was awful, but it got

ya started.
>
>>In 1963 the distance requirement was increased from 75 miles to 175 miles,
>
>I could see this causing a 10% drop, but a "stop dead" drop??

Not this reason alone, of course, but it made a dent. None of these reasons alone caused the stop, but each one made a dent. The sun of all of the dents added up to no growth.
>
>>To add insult to injury, the FCC started charging fees of $4 to take the
>exam
>
>Why would a small fee stop a prospective ham who likely will spend ten
>times that amount on his radios...

$4 was not a small fee in 1963. Many newcomers were teenagers, and the minimum wage was maybe $1. So we're talking 4-5 hours minimum wage to take the test, pass or fail. What's 4-5 hours of minimum wage today? More than $20.

Again, it made a dent. Add it to the 175 mile trip, and it gets costly fast.
>
>>- CB: 27 MHz CB had been introduced a few years earlier, but by 1963 the
>number
>>of CBers was greater than the number of hams, and growing fast. The
>equipment
>>was inexpensive, the antennas small and simple, and there was no test at
>all.
>
>This is certainly a possible reason. Most of the fun of ham radio
>without the test. Food for thought: Did CB do to ham radio in the 60s
>what the Internet is doing to ham radio today...

Of course it did. The cheap walkie talkies kids got for Xmas helped feed the frenzy, too. Many kids I knew back then talked their parents into getting CB setups, which they then used. For less than $150 you could have a complete 23 channel CB setup, with antenna, coax, the works. No license, no tests, no nothing. And you could blame the TVI on the ham down the street.
>
>>- Cultural changes: ... Very few hams of '60s looked like
>>John Lennon or even Austin Powers.
>
>You think that incentive licensing increased the numbers by making
>hams look better?? :-)

Not exactly ;-) But how many hams do you think went to Woodstock?
>
>>TV watching increased all through the '50s and '60s.
>
>How does that explain the sudden stop in '62?

It made a dent. And the teenagers of 1962 had been born in the postwar years and grown up with TV.
>
>>- Economic conditions: For some reason, ham radio tends to grow more during
>>periods of bad economic conditions than during good ones,
>
>Were we in a recession in 1962? I forget...

Just the opposite. The '60s were boom times. The recession and inflation came later, as the deficit spending of the Johnson and Nixon administrations caught up with us. Then the oil embargoes hit...
>
>>Waddya think?
>
>Interesting thoughts Jim. It doesn't seem logical to me for most of
>these things to account for zero growth, except maybe the CB thing.

Each one had an impact. If you have five items and four of them take 5% and one takes 25% of the growth, there goes 45% of your newcomers.

>But I sure don't have any other ideas. In fact I wasn't even aware of
>the 1962 growth cessation. Thanks for the insight, it was an
>interesting read...

You're welcome. Some folks moaned back then that "ham radio was dying" because there were only 250,000 hams and they were all getting older. And the new gear was too complex, the tests were too hard, the ARRL was ruining everything, etc., etc. Sound familiar?

73 de Jim, N2EY

3012. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-10 01:54:31 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010209205431.29092.00000191@ng-ba1.aol.com>
Source record: 3262

>Subject: Re: Who Is What?
>From: Steven J Robeson, K4YZ k4yz@my-deja.com
>Date: 2/9/01 4:28 PM Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <961ncnmdn1@nnrp1.deja.com>
>
>In article <961d5lcii1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
> n2ey@aol.com wrote:
>
>> Your analysis did not include the fact that the FCC is renewing Tech
>> Plus licenses as Technicians, and that by doing so, one cannot
>> equate "Technician license" with "non-code-tested licensee". By
>> improperly putting code-tested Technicians in the non-code-tested
>> category, you overstate their number and understate the number of code
>> tested licensees.
>
> You would expect this creep to admit an error?

I'm just pointing out the errors. Name calling won't make my analysis any
stronger.
>
>> The error is not a small one. 4,700 of 13,000+ is more than a third.
>
> Of course if WE made this error, we KNOW what would be coming out
>of Soutern Californication, don't you?

I don't know. I'm just pointing out the errors.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3013. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-10 01:56:54 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <ej1h6.161$HH5.977545@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 3263

Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com> wrote:

> In 1959 as I recall it was still about half SSB, half AM. I don't
> think AM was anywhere near gone by 1962.

It was not. Even by 1968, AM was far from dead in the Amateur Radio
Service.

> Further, most of the SW receivers of the day had a BFO (even the cheapie
$29.95 Heathkit AR-3)
> which made SSB copy possible. I think that any SWL worth his salt could
still listen to hams...

My SWLing was with an old Zenith Transoceanic receiver. I don't recall it
having a BFO.

> I think it was 1962 or 1963 when I bought my first SSB rig, a Heathkit
> HW-22 40 meter monoband transceiver. The price was around $112 bucks
> (I think - check your QST collection), in any case it was cheaper than
> most of the AM stuff at the time...

I bought my used DX-40 for about $35.00, and later a used DX-100 for $75.00.
The DX-100 modulator made a great guitar amp. :-)

> Why would a small fee stop a prospective ham who likely will spend ten
> times that amount on his radios...

Most commercial HF transceivers today cost about $1000, in round numbers.
Lets assume the average ham spends another $1000 on the rest of his or her
station. Would a "small fee" of $100 today, to take the conservative
number, based on your 10%, stop a number of people from becoming hams?

> This is certainly a possible reason. Most of the fun of ham radio
> without the test. Food for thought: Did CB do to ham radio in the 60s
> what the Internet is doing to ham radio today...

What percentage of those CBers went on to become hams? I did.

> >TV watching increased all through the '50s and '60s.

> How does that explain the sudden stop in '62?

And TV watching increased through the 70s and 80s, too, a time of steady
growth in amateur radio.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3014. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-10 02:08:58 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <9627rl$4g6$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 3265

In article <3A83F380.E8041619@ovis.net>,
Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net> wrote:
> Len Over 21 wrote:
> >
> > In article <3A82D670.908ECF5B@uci.edu>, Jim Kelley
<jwkelley@uci.edu> writes:
> >
> > >Brian wrote:
> > >> I knew what Len meant. What was your excuse again?
> > >
> > >My excuse for what? Len was trying to make a mountain out of a
mole
> > >hill - as usual.
> > >
> > >ac6xg
> >
> > You were looking for an excuse...and nit-picked a single phrase
> > for a "critique" that was not on the subject.
> >
> > Apparently you don't want to believe that code-tested US radio
> > amateurs are decreasing in number while non-code-tested
> > US radio amateurs are increasing in number. That trend has
> > been going on for years.
> >
> > The "molehill" is getting bigger, bigger, bigger. The "mountain"
> > is eroding faster and faster. Closing one's eyes or mind won't
> > reverse any trend.
> >
> > didit
>
> You, of course assume that non-code tested licensees will never
upgrade.
> What is this rate of change supposed to mean to us, Len? Why all this
> "mountain eroding" and "scales tipping" guff? It would appear to be
> something which is natural given the current licensing structure and
it
> certainly doesn't worry me. Why should it worry you, a non-licensee?
> I don't think those scales will tip in your lifetime. Would you like
> one of us to give you a report in the afterlife? Please provide a
> forwarding address.
>
> Dave K8MN

Certainly the scales will tip. It will happen in your lifetime. If I go before you, I can be reached at: brianburke@heaven.ngo

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

3015. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-10 02:15:10 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <962879$4t6$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 3267

In article <3A83F775.90B8585B@ovis.net>,
Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net> wrote:
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > In article <3A836AA3.60DA4D4E@IEEE.org>,
> > Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > > Meanwhile, Shirley MacClaine held hands with spiritual guides as
> > they
> > > > looked to the East and focused on preventing the quake.
> > >
> > > Shirley MacClaine was asked who was the most influential person in
> > > her life. She answered, "My own higher self."
> >
> > She's her own God. Kind of like on here. ;)
> >
> > Sent via Deja.com
> > http://www.deja.com/
>
> ...sort of like Cecil and a group of Baptists down his way praying to
> Cecil's inner self as desribed here a couple of years back. Maybe
Cecil
> has been praying to Shirley MacLaine all of these years.
>
> Dave K8MN

It probably had more to do with the ecumenical wine and the movie "Two
Mules..."

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

3016. Re: I heard a CB'er on 20 meters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-10 02:16:47 UTC
From: RiK Larson <Rick__Larson@Hotmail.Com>
Message-ID: <t89927a2jfb90a@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 3264
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner

Too lazy to study theory and the code , ehhhhhhhhhhhh freebander!
Rik

h <not@aol.com> wrote in message news:t89648o0tkkp61@corp.supernews.com...
> Gee sounds like our founding fathers. Guess freedom isn't good unless
> sanctioned by third world dictatorships
>
> --
> Sincerely,
> Ken
> pwrguy@intergrafix.net
> > Freebanders are generally unexperienced in electronics and not
sanctioned
> by
> > any country in the world.
> > Rick
>
>
>

3017. Re: I heard a CB'er on 20 meters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-10 02:28:16 UTC
From: RiK Larson <Rick__Larson@Hotmail.Com>
Message-ID: <t899nocdh29r4b@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 3266
Cross-posted to:
alt.discrimination,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner

I always thought that "break" was an "pseudo emergency" "pro sign" in FFC or
maritime language not to be used routinely.
What do others think.
Rik

Glen Quarnstrom <glenq@rmci.net> wrote in message
news:lit68tgui5h5fnrmtmuorkanmcnumbgj79@4ax.com...
> Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote:
>
> >Kevin Alfred Strom at kevin.strom@innocent.com wrote:
>
> >> But "contact," meaning "I want
> >> to contact you" is quite new, less
> >> than a decade of commonplace use I
> >> think. I think it migrated to
> >> amateur radio from the Citizen's
> >> Band, [snip]
> >>
> >>
> > Heck, for all we know it could be coming from the contact managers
> >everyone has on their computers today. Or it could be coming from the
> >business world. I've noticed a lot of business people saying that
today -
> >the word "contact" both as a question and statement (meaning "will you
> >contact..." as a question or "yes, I'll contact..." when answered back).
In
> >other words, who knows where this stuff comes from.
>
> It came from CB sidebanders back in the mid-70s or so. They wanted to
> talk like hams, but they didn't want to say "break" because it sounded
> too much like AM CBers, so they started that idiotic "contact" crap when
> they wanted to break in.
>
> When I want to break in, I just give my call letters. It gets the job
> done, and saves time letting people know who's breaking in.
> --
> glenq@rmci.net
> WB7DOW
> http://home.rmci.net/glenq/

3018. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-10 02:37:30 UTC
From: Xara Thustra <sparks@bigfoot.com>
Message-ID: <94a98tgo2ho2ab97ujrnvik9h1qmvnqrp0@news.mindspring.com>
Source record: 3268

On Sun, 28 Jan 2001 21:00:52 GMT, "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nospam.spam>
wrote:

>On 28 Jan 2001 13:31:30 GMT, W1RFI wrote:
>
>>>From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
>>
>>>QFU isn't on my Q-signal list. I've never heard it on the air.
>>
>>I have heard it on the air and I didn't need a list to know exactly what it
>>meant.
>
> QFU is in the series assigned to the Aeronautical Services -
> that series does not appear in the ITU Radio Regs so I don't
> know its exact (legal) meaning. The "de facto" meaning is
> obvious.....
>
> Anyone have access to the ICAO Regs?

I was a maritime shipboard radio officer many years ago, and can't
resist passing on to the more recent folks, a couple of Q signals
that also were not in the books, but were quite commonly encountered:

QWC - "Water Closet" the British equivalent of toilet; in other words,
I will be away from the key for a moment or so......

QLF - Please send with your left foot; your right foot sounds tired.

Paul Martin W4SXD

3019. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-10 02:50:39 UTC
From: tlbryant@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <962a9v01e36@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 3273

In article <3A845D20.ABE9C7BA@uci.edu>, jwkelley@uci.edu says...
>
>Brian wrote:
>> Show where I misunderstood.
>
>You apparently understand nothing. You're an impudent boorish punk with
>nothing intellectual to bring to a discussion. I expect you find
>pestering people on the newsgroup to be as entertaining as jamming your
>local repeater and playing telephone pranks.
>
>Blither on, N0IMD.

IOW, unless his sig. has a callsign in it, his opinions mean nothing?

3020. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-10 02:58:50 UTC
From: tlbryant@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <962apa11e36@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 3274

In article <961tjk$s6p$1@nnrp1.deja.com>, brianburke@my-deja.com says...
>> >Not the moment most people live in. Guess again.
>>
>> You don't get out much do you?
>
>Not a problem. I visited the public library after work today, I'm going
>to the gun show tomorrow, and have a daytrip planned for St. Louis on
>Sunday. Back to work Monday morning, will attend a seminar in Cleveland
>on Thursday....
>
>My kids like pokeyman. I've treated them to pokeyman toys, books,
>videos, "snap" nintendo 64 game, and even a live show at the coleseum.
>
>But pokeyman is still not the world's greatest hobby. Not by any
>stretch.

While it may not have the endurance as others you've mentioned, Pokemon is a major obsession with many people. As the fad passes, it will probably be regulated to comic book and/or sports card shows, where such collectables thrive.

Besides, when I posted my original comment, I was being facetious, so lighten up!

3021. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-10 03:04:24 UTC
From: tlbryant@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <962b3o21e36@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 3275

In article <961tnb$g11$1@208.206.142.81>, dixie@townsqr.com says...
>
>
>
>Cecil wrote:
>>
>
>> The great majority of hams are stuck in the 60s, Dick. We are already
>> stagnating 40 years behind the state of the art in RF communications.
>>
>
>That is pure unadulturated bullcrap.

You're absolutely right, Dick. He should have that most hams are stuck in the
50s.

3022. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-10 03:14:32 UTC
From: dennis@wawa.juniper.net
Message-ID: <962bmo$1ggc$1@heap.juniper.net>
Source record: 3270

Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
>Dick Carroll wrote:
>>
>> Cecil wrote:
>> >
>> > Dick Carroll wrote:
>> >
>> > DSP is to ham radio now as SSB was to ham radio in the early 50s.
>>
>> That shows how little you really know.
>
>Dick, it's the truth. A/Ds and processors are getting faster every year
>and every year digital electronics takes over more and more of the
>functions from analog by doing the job cheaper and better. Soon, everything
>this side of the mixer will be DSP functions. The Kachina radio was just
>the first of many.

Tentec also sells both an HF and a VHF transceiver that work this way.
Tentec's shortwave receivers also use DSPs for everything from IF
to audio, as does the JRC NRD-545. Watkins-Johnson sold the first
receiver I was aware of that did this, but they've since gone out
of the business.

For transmitters it is in principle possible to avoid mixing stages
altogether, instead generating the modulated RF directly using a
DDS chip as the DSP's output device. Unfortunately, I discovered that
the outputs of current DDS chips can have more spurs than a Texas saloon,
so this may need to wait for another generation of the technology.

Dennis Ferguson

3023. Re: I heard a CB'er on 20 meters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-10 03:17:26 UTC
From: Glen Quarnstrom <glenq@rmci.net>
Message-ID: <tec98tstgg01go2ivl3uo3ubqgqadeb159@4ax.com>
Source record: 3269
Cross-posted to:
alt.discrimination,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner

"RiK Larson" <Rick__Larson@Hotmail.Com> wrote:

>I always thought that "break" was an "pseudo emergency" "pro sign" in FFC or
>maritime language not to be used routinely.

A double break ("break, break") or triple break used to be used to
indicate priority or emergency traffic. The FCC doesn't have any
guidelines on the matter.
--
glenq@rmci.net
WB7DOW
http://home.rmci.net/glenq/

3024. Re: I heard a CB'er on 20 meters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-10 03:27:44 UTC
From: tlbryant@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <962cfg31e36@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 3277
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner

With freedom, comes responsibilty. Freebanders aren't acting responsible
when they interfere with other communications services. It's the "yelling fire"
cliche.

I do, however, have a problem with the FCC telling me what topics I may or may
not talk about. Example: During an interview several years ago, an FCC official
said that discussing controversial subjects over the amateur frequencies
basically violated 97.1(e), because such subjects, as he put it, "did nothing
to enhance international good will."

In article <t89648o0tkkp61@corp.supernews.com>, not@aol.com says...
>
>Gee sounds like our founding fathers. Guess freedom isn't good unless
>sanctioned by third world dictatorships
>
>--
>Sincerely,
>Ken
>pwrguy@intergrafix.net
>> Freebanders are generally unexperienced in electronics and not sanctioned
>by
>> any country in the world.
>> Rick

3025. Re: Engineers, Technicians, and Appliance Operators

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-10 03:36:11 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010209223611.00739.00000207@ng-fg1.aol.com>
Source record: 3271

>Subject: Re: Engineers, Technicians, and Appliance Operators
>From: Steven J Robeson, K4YZ k4yz@my-deja.com

>Very good, Lennie! All those days of retired bliss sitting in front of the
>'puter paid off! It's only half right, but then you usually are.

Oooops....I attributed this to the wrong retiree.....Sorry Hans.

3026. Re: Engineers, Technicians, and Appliance Operators

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-10 03:38:37 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010209223837.00739.00000208@ng-fg1.aol.com>
Source record: 3272

>Subject: Re: Engineers, Technicians, and Appliance Operators
>From: Steven J Robeson, K4YZ k4yz@my-deja.com

>> when I check my eQSL list, here is one from K4YZ.

By the way...you're welcome.

73

K4YZ

3027. Re: I heard a CB'er on 20 meters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-10 04:07:47 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <B6AA28C3.11EE%stewartx@sccoast.net>
Source record: 3276
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner

Glen Quarnstrom at glenq@rmci.net wrote:

> It came from CB sidebanders back in the
> mid-70s or so. They wanted to talk like
> hams, but they didn't want to say "break"
> because it sounded too much like AM CBers,
> so they started that idiotic "contact" crap
> when they wanted to break in.

This is a regional thing. I don't remember any SSB CB'ers using "contact" instead of "break" in the 70's (Washington, California, or North Carolina). And I haven't heard a single ham operator around here using it today, but I did hear it one time in Washington state recently.

Because it is so regional in nature, I really don't think we can so easily blame this on "those CB'ers." Instead, I suspect this is coming from somewhere within the ham community itself, or coming from plain language outside of radio.

> When I want to break in, I just give my
> call letters. It gets the job done, and
> saves time letting people know who's
> breaking in.

Most people do that, but I don't know how much it really saves time by letting people know who's breaking in. In my case, unless I already know the person (and callsign), I rarely ever catch the callsign of those breaking in this way.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net

3028. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-10 04:49:30 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net>
Message-ID: <3A84C85A.F68FD2DA@ovis.net>
Source record: 3278

Brian wrote:
>
> In article <3A83F6F1.FFE2535@ovis.net>,
> Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net> wrote:
>
> I'd
> > describe your perception of amateur radio reality with a term from
> > ionospheric propagation: skewed path.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> Likewise, you seem to hang with what I consider some of the wrong
> elements in amateur radio. You follow the ground wave.
>
> Sent via Deja.com
> http://www.deja.com/

I'm proud to "hang" with the element I'm associated with. They are good ops and active ones. I've been walking the walk and, as far as I can tell, you pretty much just talk the talk. That you consider some of my friends "the wrong elements" speaks volumes.

Dave K8MN

3029. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-10 04:54:15 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net>
Message-ID: <3A84C977.3A6E44CF@ovis.net>
Source record: 3279

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3A83F1BF.564DE8C0@ovis.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net> writes:
>
> >Do you have anything interesting for the group or can we expect more
> >number crunching ala Len?
>
> Both. You will try to find fault with both, but that is expected.
>
> Feel free to keep on thinking you and only you Know What
> Is Best. :-)
>
> didit

That isn't my view, Len. Quite a few here have interesting or funny
things to say. You just aren't one of them.

Dave K8MN

3030. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-10 05:00:26 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net>
Message-ID: <3A84CAEA.190BE790@ovis.net>
Source record: 3280

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3A844472.F298A51E@uci.edu>, Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> writes:
>
> >Brian wrote:
> >> Len brings up the fact that the numbers of coded hams are decreasing and
> >> the numbers of non-coded hams are increasing (the "point" of the
> >> discussion). He uses a balance scale term.
> >>
> >He use a balance scale analogy to indicate the opposite of the facts he
> >cites.
>
> On the contrary, I used NUMBERS of licensees based on FCC
> databases. Those were the FACTS, facts available from the
> only US agency granting amateur radio licenses.

This new "only US agency granting amateur radio licenses" thing is
beginning to sound tedious. Do you believe that anyone here doesn't
know that the FCC grants amateur licenses? If you follow procedure, you
can get one too. Good luck with the exam.

> A METAPHOR was used to indicate the TREND happening.

...a poorly chosen metaphor which is not indicative of the situation at
all. Other than being wrong, it was fine.

> Kelley made a Big Thing out of the metaphor at first, didn't
> say anything about the numbers or the trend.
>
> >> You cannot comment on the
> >> facts of the ham population, so instead dissect balance scale
> >> engineering, and thus you claim Len's statements false.
> >>
> >I DID not comment on that because no comment was necessary. I have
> >nothing to say on the issue other than, great! More new hams.
>
> Kelley didn't say that at first. Nice job of backtracking and
> trying to CYA.

He just told you that your poorly chosen metaphor was wrong. It was and
is.

> >> Ergo coded ham
> >> populations are increasing. Nice fantasy.
> >>
> >Yours, not mine.

>
> Kelley only wants legally licensed Metaphors. :-)
>
> didit

I suspect he'd like to see some which fit the situation being described.
Think you're up to it?

Dave K8MN

3031. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-10 05:39:34 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010210003934.13655.00003457@nso-mq.aol.com>
Source record: 3282

In article <vzYg6.150$HH5.959195@news.ntplx.net>, "Ed Hare, W1RFI"
<w1rfi@arrl.net> writes:

>
>Nothing. I am pleased that there are 37,980 new hams.

How many of them have joined the ARRL as of today?

73 de Larry, K3LT

3032. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-10 05:39:35 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010210003935.13655.00003459@nso-mq.aol.com>
Source record: 3281

In article <20010208191426.21807.00000082@ng-cr1.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>
>No-coders have been authorized to work CW without any testing for code
>whatver
>for about a decade now. What harm have they caused CW operators?

Ed:

A better question would be -- What CW operating have no-coders done?
Have you ever worked a no-coder on VHF/CW?

73 de Larry, K3LT

3033. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-10 05:39:35 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010210003935.13655.00003460@nso-mq.aol.com>
Source record: 3283

In article <3A81BCD5.B30DC604@uci.edu>, Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> writes:

>
>I knew you guys would come up with some great ideas. But I think that
>nothing short of a federally mandated 'no lids, no kids, no space
>cadets' requirement would satisfy the malcontents out here.

Now, THAT's one of the most reasonable statements I've ever seen
posted in this newsgripe!

OBTW -- "kids" are OK as long as they are not lids or space cadets!

73 de Larry, K3LT

3034. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-10 05:39:35 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010210003935.13655.00003458@nso-mq.aol.com>
Source record: 3288

In article <20010208190939.21807.00000080@ng-cr1.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>
>But I thought CW gets through when no other mode will. Is that true only if
>the other mode is not allowed to be used?

Ed:

I don't recall ever reading or hearing anyone say that CW gets through even in the presence of overpowering QRM from signals of other modes. A .5 Watt CW signal can be heard and understood under extremely adverse conditions -- conditions which would make a phone signal at a similar power level hopelessly unreadable. However, this same CW signal, when wedged between high-powered, over-modulated, over-compressed, over-everything'd phone signals, won't be heard at all. Now -- a similarly powered CW signal would probably get through just fine, in spite of the QRM -- but one of the main benefits of CW is to be able to avoid using high power.

In any scenario where CW subbands are shared with phone signals, CW will tend to lose out. Its only natural.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3035. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-10 05:39:36 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010210003936.13655.00003461@nso-mq.aol.com>
Source record: 3284

In article <95sml10ion@enews4.newsguy.com>, tlbryant@my-deja.com (T. L. Bryant) writes:

>
>...uphill, both ways, through six feet of snow, yadda yadda...
>
>Did I say it pissed off *all* the hams that lost privileges? No. But it did
>piss off a lot. I can't speak for the sheeple, such as yourself, that go
>along
>with whatever the ARRL says and does.

Nor can you speak for people who willingly embrace a challenge and go out and achieve a worthwhile accomplishment instead of whining that the rules have been changed! I never could understand the post-Incentive Licensing General and Advanced licensees that refused to upgrade to Extra, except for the fact that most of them are primarily phone operators! I wonder -- if the FCC had grandfathered them with Extra-class phone privileges, would the whining have subsided? I'll bet it would!

I believe the FCC should always make liberal use of grandfathering of privileges, just so hams like myself, who don't have a problem accepting a challenge, don't have to be bothered to listen to the whining!

73 de Larry, K3LT

3036. Re: Morse Code replacement? Bigtime flame war article!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-10 05:39:36 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010210003936.13655.00003462@nso-mq.aol.com>
Source record: 3287

In article <95vf0povn1@nnrp1.deja.com>, Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
writes:

>
>Reminds me of 10-10. I worked a guy in Florida when I was stationed in
>Nebraska. Then I worked him again from Guam and he told me I was a
>dupe. When I tried working him from my new duty assignment in Illinois,
>he kind of got perturbed with me.

Brian:

Ah, yes, the 10-10 club. You just ran into the very attitude which
has made me an avid "no-phoner" ever since! The Ten-Ten organization,
and all of its drooling, toothless, slack-jawed, knuckle-dragging,
mouth-breathing, bottom-feeding members are, collectively, proof
that any idiot can pick up a microphone and talk -- and most
idiots do!

73 de Larry, K3LT

3037. Re: ARRL HQ "Attitude" (Was: Re: Pride)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-10 05:39:37 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010210003937.13655.00003463@nso-mq.aol.com>
Source record: 3285

In article <3A836587.7F71B628@IEEE.org>, Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>> And while I'm naming names, K1ZZ has managed to
>> completely annoy me literally ever time we met, starting with the
>> '84 Dayton Hamvention and every time since.
>
>Got news for you, Larry. You are the one who *chooses* to be annoyed
>unless he literally hit you with a stick.

Cecil:

That's where you'd be wrong, again! You're pretty annoying at times,
but you've never hit me with a stick! Where did this stick-hitting
requirement for annoyance come from, anyway? You don' need no
steenking sticks in order to be annoying!

73 de Larry, K3LT

3038. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-10 05:39:38 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010210003938.13655.00003464@nso-mq.aol.com>
Source record: 3286

In article <t2Vg6.145$HH5.947011@news.ntplx.net>, "Ed Hare, W1RFI"
<w1rfi@arrl.net> writes:

>> Wrong again. I could care less if they can beep at all -- as long as
>> they're not whining about learning how to beep in order to attain higher
>> HF privileges.
>
>How do you feel about those that have learned how to send and receive Morse
>code, but believe that changes need to be made in the way Morse code is
>tested?

Ed:

I would say that their objections to the way Morse code is tested
sounds a lot like whining -- as it always does!

>> However, its a moot point now. Pretty soon we'll have the beepless ARS
>you've always dreamed about.
>
>I do not believe that Morse code use will end any time soon, Larry.

Notice, one and all, that Ed didn't say that its use would NOT come
to an end -- which it certainly will now that the testing requirement is
all but gone.

>Do you
>feel that the mode has so little value to ham radio that no one will learn
>it and use it unless it is tested?

Asked and answered, many times. Whether or not people will learn
and use the Morse code in the absence of testing has nothing to do
with its value -- the testing requirement provided the incentive to
learn Morse code at a useful level. I did not learn the Morse code
due to the "usefulness" of this mode, which I was certainly not
interested in at the time. That usefulness was made clear to me
only after I gained fairly good proficiency in using the mode. The
requirement is what kept the mode alive. I dare you to gather 30
prospective new hams, none of whom have been exposed to any
part of the hobby beforehand, for the purpose of "Elmering" them
into the hobby from scratch, and end up with more than two of
them becoming proficient (capable of handling message traffic at
18 WPM) CW operators with no *requirement* that they do so. It
is impossible. That was not conjecture; that is a statement of
absolute fact. I'd be more than willing to bet that what you'd end
up with is ZERO.

>I disagree; all of the other modes have
>avid proponents without such testing.

And none of these other modes require the physical development of
an operating skill which requires a great deal of personal motivation,
dedication, and perseverence to master. Hell, the majority of hams
utilizing "high-speed digital modes" can't even get a message out
without the use of pre-programmed buffers. If you want to discuss
replacing CW tests with high-speed (> 40 WPM) typing tests, then
maybe we can reach some sort of compromise!

>I do not agree with you that those
>modes that use code are the bottom of the pile.

Well, then, Ed, I guess you'll have to disagree with me then. This
is America -- disagreement is allowed. Of course, in this case,
disagreeing with me makes you wrong, but that's *your* problem!

73 de Larry, K3LT

3039. Re: Engineers, Technicians, and Appliance Operators

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-10 06:02:59 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010210010259.01651.00001357@nso-fp.aol.com>
Source record: 3290

In article <20010209072205.16867.00000161@ng-mj1.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>
>>No real "detective work" needed then, but it is surprising
>>that a proud employee wouldn't name his employer. :-)
>
>Now, Len, look what some (you included) have done to me when they learned who
>I work for. :-)

Well, Ed, you admitted it up front in the signature to a message body. Some others have to have their occupational information squeezed out, sort of like whacking the old glass bottles of ketchup to get anything. :-)

BTW, I have nothing at all against what the ARRL does as services. It does PLENTY of them and amateurs should be more grateful for such. My only dispute is with some of the ARRL's policy decisions...which is coming around from their 1930's standards and practices basis slowly. :-)

didit

3040. Re: Engineers, Technicians, and Appliance Operators

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-10 06:03:01 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010210010301.01651.00001358@nso-fp.aol.com>
Source record: 3293

In article <960pvapud1@nnrp1.deja.com>, Steven J Robeson, K4YZ
<k4yz@my-deja.com> writes:

>In article <20010208214612.02997.00002012@nso-mg.aol.com>,
> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
>
>> A novella is about 10,000 words in the publishing trade. I didn't
>> write that many words. Just some third-party references for my
>> claims for the last 45 years. Where are yours?
>
> Same place they were when offered to you in the first place...but
>rebuffed by AOL's "postmaster" as "this recipient is not accepting mail
>from your account".

That's not a third-party disnterested reference. :-)
>
> So much for showing you anything. You ask for "proof" then close
>your eyes.

Nope. Where do you work? You didn't say, for either states
of Tennessee or Georgia. Hans Brakob broke it first. Then I
looked at the websites for the states of Tennessee and Georgia
for your LPN certificate numbers...and posted them. You have
never posted such information.

>> Don't try to bluff or play e-poker, here. Show your references
>> about non-amateur experience.
>
> Did. You refused it. Oh well.

You don't understand poker. The cards have to be SHOWN to
everyone else. :-)

>> Digitize-scan those commission papters, block out your
>> private data if you wish, and post them somewhere. Or
>> provide some indisputable proof of this "commission" through
>> a third-party reference. Until then everyone has to assume
>> you are not telling the truth.
>
> How's the State Adjutant General of the State of Tennessee. It's
>a matter of public record. Call them and ask.

Is it on a website or printed in a written document? :-)

Doesn't your employer have a digital image scanner? One
scan should take less than typing in a message during
company time. :-)

>> You sent this message at 1:38 PM EST according to the footer
>> on this message. That is after normal lunch hours at WORK.
>
> The operative word being "normal". And yes, it's a cushy job. I
>get paid an obscene wage for the easiest job I have ever had.

You get paid in pornography? My, my, that IS a cushy job!

> I am sure that would make you happy...AND give you more
>opportunity to spread your decitful and lecherous tripe completely
>unchecked.

"Deceitful and LECHEROUS tripe?!?" Oh, my!

First of all, the information I've presented in public here can be verified by anyone else accessing www.state.tn.us or www.state.ga.us and then following the buttons to get to LPN license registry. [Georgia's a bit harder to get to than Tennessee, but that was just for getting to the license search pages] No "deceit" there.

I'm not certain what is meant by "lecherous tripe." A "lecher" is a lewd, grossly sexual man according to my handy Websters. "Tripe" has two definitions, one of which is the lining of the stomach and intestines, colloquially known as the "gut." :-) That would imply "lecherous tripe" as being something sexual involving guts. :-) :-) :-)

Maybe humorist Dave Barry could make more of this but I'm laughing too hard to type more...!

didit

3041. Re: Engineers, Technicians, and Appliance Operators

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-10 06:03:02 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010210010302.01651.00001359@nso-fp.aol.com>
Source record: 3291

In article <960ql9qlm1@nnrp1.deja.com>, Steven J Robeson, K4YZ
<k4yz@my-deja.com> writes:

>In article <20010208214615.02997.00002014@nso-mg.aol.com>,
> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
>
>> Something missing in the above considering there are only
>> 24 hours in a terrestrial day.
>
> I guess the concept of two residences is beyond you.

Not at all. Having a second residence for yourself gives you
some free time to do as you wish.

>> Driving 6 hours a day? Doing e-mail and newsgrouping from
>> one of those jobs? Which one?
>
> Actually, it's three hours on Monday and three on Friday. The
>nursing's in the middle when I choose to take an Agency shift.

Better get in contact with Macon, GA, and renew Georgia LPN
certificate #52241 since it expires 03/31/01. It was first taken
out on 07/12/95. No problem on the Tennessee LPN license
#49513 since that won't expire until September 30, 2001. :-)
[original issue 1 November 1994]

That took only a few minutes going through state websites
However, those state websites do not reveal whether or not
a licensee is actually USING those licenses for nursing.
Anyone who is proud of what they do should be able to
tell one and all what the license numbers are and where
they can be found. It's in public view and listed by a state
agency. :-)

Previously, Robeson stated that he took the purchasing agent
job because of "burn-out" from nursing. Now it is revealed that
he works as some kind of temp (?) nurse after regular company
hours? Inconsistency there or a lack of full explanation.

There is also some curiosity as to why someone has to travel
about 170 miles or so (3 hours driving time) away from home
when there most certainly are some electronics-radio related
companies in the Tennessee area closer to Dunlap.

>> If someone posts an uncivil message, they might get a reply
>> IN KIND. Those are deserving. I've never said otherwise.
>

> Then you have absolutely NOTHING to complain about. You are
>reaping your own reward.

I have no complaint here except the Dill Sergeant of the USAMCC
tried to "keep the troops in line" long ago and has never stopped.
:-)

> Again...you are free to call the Adjutant General of the State of
>Tennessee. Want me to get the numbr for you too? I offered you my 800
>number hre, but you haven't moved on THAT either.

I don't think the State of Tennessee's website carries home-
grown Militia organization Nice website organization, better
than Georgia's in my opinion.

>> ...yes, the employee may wind up fired for doing personal things
>> on company time
>
> If the company's business wasn't getting done, you MIGHT be
>correct. You are, as usual, not.

Okay, so it was a slow time at the office. :-)

Must be a real cushy job to be able to do newsgroups on company
time. :-)

didit

3042. Re: Engineers, Technicians, and Appliance Operators

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-10 06:03:08 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010210010308.01651.00001360@nso-fp.aol.com>
Source record: 3292

In article <960r5k$qu6$1@nnrp1.deja.com>, Steven J Robeson, K4YZ
<k4yz@my-deja.com> writes:

>In article <20010208214613.02997.00002013@nso-mg.aol.com>,
> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
>
>> The name "Antec" appeared in message headers some months
>> ago. No real "detective work" needed then, but it is surprising
>> that a proud employee wouldn't name his employer.
>
> Very good, Lennie! All those days of retired bliss sitting in
>front of the 'puter paid off! It's only half right, but then you
>usually are.

No "sitting in front of a computer" pay-offs. Long ago I selected
message headers to be included in all newsgroup downloads.
A past message (some months ago) contained HEADER info
on the origin of one of your messages. You have never said
who your employer was in the body of a message.

>> On the other hand, someone who sits around doing newsgroups
>> and e-mail on company time might not want it known...
>
> I am sure you will tell them!

Why should I do that? Any MIS manager will be able to look
back at employee computer use and be able to pin-point
when-where-who of employee terminals.

>> BTW, their company phone number is 678-473-2000
>
>> 800-FIBER-ME.
>
> I have no doubt taht a bit of fiber in your diet would go a long
>way towards changing your attitudes on life.

The "800-FIBER-ME" is from the Antec home page under "how to
reach us" button.

> You can change that to "8515" if you have the intestinal fortitude
>to engage in a personal conversation. Knowing you for the coward you
>are, I'll just go on about my day.

Why should anyone bother to communicate to one who will do
nothing but insult others and generally act like some sort of
USAMCC Dill Sergeant?

> Past events would indicate that you don't have that fortitude.
>Not even to say "I am busy right now". However you then have great fun
>creating fictional events SUBSEQUENT to that. You always do.

Poor baby...Steebie once broke into my Buddy Chat session
with my wife who was on a trip up north. He didn't get any
"satisfaction" out of DEMANDING to break in. His royal
hynie hasn't been the same since. :-)

> And by the way, we are a subsidiary of Antec, "Electronic System
>Products". Bob's stock problems are his own, thankfully.

What your employer does is your employer's business. Since
you've never admitted to working for them before, I doubt you
care much for them...but that is between you and your employer.

didit

3043. Re: Engineers, Technicians, and Appliance Operators

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-10 06:03:11 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010210010311.01651.00001361@nso-fp.aol.com>
Source record: 3289

In article <960stdsdl1@nnrp1.deja.com>, Steven J Robeson, K4YZ
<k4yz@my-deja.com> writes:

>In article <960r5k$qu6$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
> Steven J Robeson, K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com> wrote:
>> In article <20010208214613.02997.00002013@nso-mg.aol.com>,
>> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
>>
>> > The name "Antec" appeared in message headers some months
>> > ago. No real "detective work" needed then, but it is surprising
>> > that a proud employee wouldn't name his employer.
>
> By the way, Lennie and others, it has been on my "bio" page of QRZ
>for some time, along with the call sign of the club call sign for the
>company.

Then why not post it in public here for all to see?

You have never said it publicly as to employer or an employer's
amateur radio club. Is that so difficult to admit?

didit

3044. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-10 06:22:57 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010210012257.26444.00002074@nso-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 3294

In article <3A84C977.3A6E44CF@ovis.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net> writes:

>> Feel free to keep on thinking you and only you Know What
>> Is Best. :-)
>>
>> didit
>
>That isn't my view, Len. Quite a few here have interesting or funny
>things to say. You just aren't one of them.

Feel free to keep on thinking you Know What Is Funny! :-)

A Dave Barry you AIN'T...!

didit

3045. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-10 07:24:30 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <8qq98tk287cm7ophn4v7mu6gjfpremimc1@4ax.com>
Source record: 3295

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>it was not nearly so easy to listen to hams on SSB with the SWL sets of
>the time as it was to listen to hams using AM.

If an SWL couldn't figure out how to use a BFO to listen to SSB I
doubt that he would make it as a ham back then...

>It was $112 bucks or so for the rig itself,
>then another $30-40 for the power supply.

I didn't get the power supply. I made one from old TV set parts. It
sported a couple of 5U4s. Great regulation... :-)

>And what you got was an SSB-only monoband rig

I bought some parts (crystals and coils) from Heathkit that were
designed for the 80 and 20 meter models. I used a few switches and
presto it was a tri-band rig: 80, 40 and 20 meters...

>that needed a 1:1 SWR (or close to it) to work.

That was easily solved by putting a broadcast receiver type 360
micky-mike (remember that word?) variable cap across the output which
made it into a pi net, and then it would load almost anything...

>On the other hand, a Novice could add a modulator to his MOPA CW rig and go on
>AM easily and cheaply.

I'll agree that AM was cheaper (using used old used gear). I was just
saying that SSB didn't have to be all that expensive...

>Some folks used cathode or screen modulation, which
>could be added for almost nothing. Sure, the efficiency was awful, but it got

Remember the old Heathkit DX35 and it's "controlled carrier" (screen)
modulation? I think it measured in the neighborhood of 25 watts AM.
That really didn't cut it...

>$4 was not a small fee in 1963. Many newcomers were teenagers, and the minimum
>wage was maybe $1. So we're talking 4-5 hours minimum wage to take the test,
>pass or fail. What's 4-5 hours of minimum wage today? More than $20.

Do you really think that $20 would stop a teenager today from becoming
a ham if that's what he wanted? Have you priced some of the teenage
toys these days...

BTW I was making $88.25 a week at Motorola in 1963 with a wife and
soon to be kid. That $112 for the SSB rig was hard to cough up, but
heck what's more important anyway... :-)

>how many hams do you think went to Woodstock?

Dunno. But I think the Woodstock populace might be an improvement over
some of the characters I see at the ham swapmeets here... :-)

>Some folks moaned back then that "ham radio was dying" because
>there were only 250,000 hams and they were all getting older. And the new gear
>was too complex, the tests were too hard, the ARRL was ruining everything,
>etc., etc. Sound familiar?

Yeah, but it's all true now,
(except for the tests being hard)... :-)

3046. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-10 07:24:33 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <96q98tc5votil4726dv0q1sj4c5rav06n0@4ax.com>
Source record: 3296

"Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net> wrote:
>My SWLing was with an old Zenith Transoceanic receiver.
>I don't recall it having a BFO.

Well Ed, the resourceful kids/SWLs of my youth used to place a broadcast receiver physically next to the BFO-less SW receiver. Then you tuned the broadcast receiver until it's oscillator beat (in the IF) with the signal on the SW receiver. Worked great...

>Most commercial HF transceivers today cost about $1000, in round numbers.
>Lets assume the average ham spends another $1000 on the rest of his or her
>station. Would a "small fee" of $100 today, to take the conservative
>number, based on your 10%, stop a number of people from becoming hams?

If they planned to buy a $1000 dollar rig, I doubt that even a $100 dollars would stop them. I pay a fee of $240 a year for internet service. My laptop cost $1300. If this machine has a useful 4 year life, I will have paid around 75% of my hardware costs in fees. I suspect that many teenagers pay as I do for the net, so why not a small 10$ a year ($100 fee/ license term) fee for hamming if that was their desire...

>What percentage of those CBers went on to become hams? I did.

What percentage of hams became CBers? Everybody I knew in the 60s did. We all got those nifty call letters/numbers... :-)

3047. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-10 07:24:35 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <c3q98t0c0036qh8gv4a50ci8kd5ppa1joa@4ax.com>
Source record: 3297

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote:
> I wonder -- if the FCC had grandfathered
>them with Extra-class phone privileges,

I would have been happy to have been grandfathered with the privileges
that I earned in 1959 which were General privileges...

> would the whining have subsided? I'll bet it would!

I would stop whining if I got my privileges back. Trouble is I have no
need of the Extra privileges. It's just a matter of fairness...

>I believe the FCC should always make liberal use of grandfathering
>of privileges, just so hams like myself, who don't have a problem
>accepting a challenge, don't have to be bothered to listen to the
>whining!

Me too... :-)

3048. Re: Morse Code replacement? Bigtime flame war article!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-10 09:32:13 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <9631qu$ni5$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 3298

In article <20010210003936.13655.00003462@nso-mq.aol.com>,
yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote:
> In article <95vf0povn1@nnrp1.deja.com>, Brian
<brianburke@my-deja.com>
> writes:
>
> >
> >Reminds me of 10-10. I worked a guy in Florida when I was stationed
in
> >Nebraska. Then I worked him again from Guam and he told me I was a
> >dupe. When I tried working him from my new duty assignment in
Illinois,
> >he kind of got perturbed with me.
>
> Brian:
>
> Ah, yes, the 10-10 club. You just ran into the very attitude which
> has made me an avid "no-phoner" ever since! The Ten-Ten organization,
> and all of its drooling, toothless, slack-jawed, knuckle-dragging,
> mouth-breathing, bottom-feeding members are, collectively, proof
> that any idiot can pick up a microphone and talk -- and most
> idiots do!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Apparently, according to Hans, FISTS members work you once, get your
number, and are more than happy to send you on your way. Can it be than
idiots can pick up a paddle?

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

3049. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-10 09:47:55 UTC
From: "Steven J Robeson", K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <9632ob$o6t$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 3299

In article <20010209185918.17176.00001518@nso-ba.aol.com>,
lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:

> Please provide reference for the above "fact" that a "large number
> don't stay there."

As a VE, watching them upgrade. ARRL >>AND<< W5YI reports on VE
seesions elsewhere. FCC Reports on on administrative actions.

> I ignore Urban Myths, falsehoods, folk sayings, etc., in trying to
> analyze public data offered by the only US agency that licenses
> US radio amateurs.

No you don't. You do your damned best to create a few.

> You've done nothing of the kind, only shot off your keyboard again.

Keep telling yourself that, Lennie. I am sue it makes you feel
good THINKING that.

> Try to concentrate on the facts of what is happening to others, by
> others, especially concerning newcomers to US amateur radio.

As an ACTIVE licensee I am acutely aware of more than YOU will
know. You should try it sometime.

HOW MANY antennas have you helped erect for "newcomers" in the
last 30 days, Lennie?

HOW MANY VE sessions have you proctored?

HOW MANY nets have you participated in that introduced "new hams".
Lennie?

I can assure you that the answer in MY case exceeds "1" by a large
margin in EACH of the above cases.

Which in only ONE month exceeds your total for the DECADE.

Adios, Chump. Get a life.

--
"It Could Be That Your Life's Only Meaning Is To Serve As A Warning To
Others Of How Bad It Could REALLY Be!"

"Just Remember...An Amateur Built The Ark, Engineers Built The Titanic"

PLEASE SEND PRIVATE E MAIL COMMENTS TO K4YZ@AOL.COM. RESPONSES TO THE
DEJA MAY OR MAY NOT BE RETRIEVED IN A TIMELY FASHION.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

3050. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-10 10:14:54 UTC
From: "Steven J Robeson", K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <9634at$p17$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 3300

In article <20010209185916.17176.00001516@nso-ba.aol.com>,
lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:

> My balls aren't made of crystal,...(SNIP)

Having probably not been able to see them, find them or use them
for quite a few years, I am sure you probably ahve NO idea WHAT theya
re made of.

> Poor baby, really struggling for a slam there? Did I deliberately and
> maliciously, with callous disregard of sensitive USAMCC feelings,
> "make it appear that ONLY "new" Technicians are making an impact?"

Lenni, almost every post you make is intended to insult or troll.
The first post of this thread is pure proof of that. It had absolutely
NOTHING to do with the implementation of ANY policy. Just your
attempts to further incite discontent.

> You MUST say so, Steebie, because all you have left any more is
> insult, belittlement, denigration, etc., etc.

Hmmmm....call me "Steebie" (pablum caught in your dentures again?)
and THEN attempt to cahstise ME for "insult(s), belittlement,
denigration, etc, etc"...?!?!?

If THAT'S not pure Lennism, I don't know what is... ! ! !

> All I did was post a comparison between the code-tested licensees
> and the non-code-tested licensees in the US ARS.

No what you did was troll. You succeeded.

> If you feel that only the code-tested are "real hams" then you MUST
> take the comparison as an insult.

You ATTEMPT to ask one of those "Do you LIKE having sex with your
sister" questions. Of course they are "real hams". The "arguement" is
NOT are they real hams, but are YOUR numbers valid. THAT answer is NO.

> See, there you go again, being uncivil, rude, insulting...sort of an
> extra grade asshole.

And now the resulting profanity.

> Steebie, I've been an ENGINEER ...(SNIP)

And WE (yes, WE) DON'T CARE! NONE of that makes a didly squat
difference because THIS NG is about HAM radio...NOT "Ex Engineers With
A Chip On Thier Shoulders".

Of course if we created an NG just FOR those persons, you'd
pretty much be talking to yourself.

> Why do you keep insisting that I am a "technician?"

Probably for the same reason YOU keep lying, using profanity and
generally being an annoying little twerp. Because I CAN.

> Note: Engineers are not required to learn morse code for
> engineering skills, diplomas, or titles.

Who said they had to?

> Gosh, thanks, Sancho Panza! Now get on your ass and follow
> your Don to the next windmill.

I am not the one jousting the windmill, Lennie. That's YOUR claim
to fame.

> PS: Good going, Steebie, you got in early to work to post e-mail
> at 7:48 AM.

You have done ONE positive thing for me, Lenni. I will not retire
until I just can't go on any longer. If all you can do is check date-
time-groups to find some percieved impropriety in when/how someone
responds to YOUR tripe, then I guess there's not much left to do in
life.

Maybe you should write a letter to Uncle Jack in care of the
Michigan Department of Corrections and see if he can make any
suggestions, in as much as he's out of service at the moment. Since
you have lost all remaining vestiges of productive life, I am sure
he'll be glad to usher you to the next life.

--
"It Could Be That Your Life's Only Meaning Is To Serve As A Warning To
Others Of How Bad It Could REALLY Be!"

"Just Remember...An Amateur Built The Ark, Engineers Built The Titanic"

PLEASE SEND PRIVATE E MAIL COMMENTS TO K4YZ@AOL.COM. RESPONSES TO THE
DEJA MAY OR MAY NOT BE RETRIEVED IN A TIMELY FASHION.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

3051. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-10 10:23:47 UTC
From: "Steven J Robeson", K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <9634rh$pc9$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 3301

In article <3A84CAEA.190BE790@ovis.net>,
Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net> wrote:

> Len Over 21 wrote:

>>A METAPHOR was used to indicate the TREND happening.

>...a poorly chosen metaphor which is not indicative of the situation
>at all. Other than being wrong, it was fine.--

Of course LENNIE is the only one who can use "metaphors"
or "analogies" to make a point. Anytime anyone ELSE uses one, Lennie
launches into another one of his slatherings about how the application
allegedly doesn't fit HIS interpretation.

Pot/kettle/black....AGAIN

"It Could Be That Your Life's Only Meaning Is To Serve As A Warning To
Others Of How Bad It Could REALLY Be!"

"Just Remember...An Amateur Built The Ark, Engineers Built The Titanic"

PLEASE SEND PRIVATE E MAIL COMMENTS TO K4YZ@AOL.COM. RESPONSES TO THE
DEJA MAY OR MAY NOT BE RETRIEVED IN A TIMELY FASHION.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

3052. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-10 10:27:11 UTC
From: "Steven J Robeson", K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <96351t$pl6$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 3302

In article <20010209185915.17176.00001515@nso-ba.aol.com>,
lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:

> Feel free to keep on thinking you and only you Know What
> Is Best

THERE is a bit of advice YOU should be taking yourself, Oh
Narrowminded One.

TO THE LETTER!

--
"It Could Be That Your Life's Only Meaning Is To Serve As A Warning To
Others Of How Bad It Could REALLY Be!"

"Just Remember...An Amateur Built The Ark, Engineers Built The Titanic"

PLEASE SEND PRIVATE E MAIL COMMENTS TO K4YZ@AOL.COM. RESPONSES TO THE
DEJA MAY OR MAY NOT BE RETRIEVED IN A TIMELY FASHION.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

3053. Re: Engineers, Technicians, and Appliance Operators

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-10 10:39:45 UTC
From: "Steven J Robeson", K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <9635ph$q3c$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 3303

In article <20010210010301.01651.00001358@nso-fp.aol.com>,
lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:

> That's not a third-party disnterested reference.

Yeah, Lennie. I gues copies of the same documents you asked to
see weren't. Oh well. I knew you weren't man enough to go it alone
anyway.

> Nope. Where do you work? You didn't say, for either states
> of Tennessee or Georgia. Hans Brakob broke it first. Then I
> looked at the websites for the states of Tennessee and Georgia
> for your LPN certificate numbers...and posted them. You have
> never posted such information.

You missed Arkansas licensure, too, although that one's been
inactive a while. Not to mention EMS certifications in four states,
FAA licensure (albiet not professional) and numerous endorsements from
the AHA, ARC, other agencies that I am sure you might recognize.

> Is it on a website or printed in a written document?

What part of "public information" don't you undersatnd, Lennie.
Believe it or not, the presence or lack of presence on the Internet
does not substantiate validity. You are invited to contact TAG
Tennessee and find out for yourself.

> First of all, the information I've presented in public here can be
> verified by anyone else accessing www.state.tn.us or
> www.state.ga.us and then following the buttons to get to LPN
> license registry. [Georgia's a bit harder to get to than
> Tennessee, but that was just for getting to the license search
> pages] No "deceit" there.

Hmmmm.....now I am wondering what MY licensure as a nurse in ANY
state has to do with your trolling in Amateur Radio related
newsgroups...?!?! THIS is an interesting stretch, and a sorrowful one
for you to follow in order to deflect from the fact that you have been
bested by Hams again.

> I'm not certain what is meant by "lecherous tripe." A "lecher"
> is a lewd, grossly sexual man according to my handy Websters.

In as much as your previous AOL posts said your "hobby" was being
beaten with purses by Ruth Buzzy on park benches, I wonder too...?!?!?

> Maybe humorist Dave Barry could make more of this but I'm
> laughing too hard to type more...!

And I am sure that in YOUR mind, the laughter is frequent and plentiful. It usually is for folks so afflicted.

--
"It Could Be That Your Life's Only Meaning Is To Serve As A Warning To Others Of How Bad It Could REALLY Be!"

"Just Remember...An Amateur Built The Ark, Engineers Built The Titanic"

PLEASE SEND PRIVATE E MAIL COMMENTS TO K4YZ@AOL.COM. RESPONSES TO THE DEJA MAY OR MAY NOT BE RETRIEVED IN A TIMELY FASHION.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

3054. Re: Engineers, Technicians, and Appliance Operators

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-10 10:48:56 UTC
From: "Steven J Robeson", K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <9636aoqeq1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 3305

In article <20010210010302.01651.00001359@nso-fp.aol.com>,
lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:

> Better get in contact with Macon, GA, and renew Georgia LPN
> certificate #52241 since it expires 03/31/01

Actually it's already renewed(or at least I have forwarded the
package) but thanks for your concern. And it's "P052241" to be
accurate.

> Previously, Robeson stated that he took the purchasing agent
> job because of "burn-out" from nursing. Now it is revealed that
> he works as some kind of temp (?) nurse after regular company
> hours? Inconsistency there or a lack of full explanation.

I said I took the job to "take a break", Lennie...NOT to
completely disassociate myself. Of course, not having never held a job
that had such responsiblity, I doubt you can "relate".

> There is also some curiosity as to why someone has to travel
> about 170 miles or so (3 hours driving time) away from home
> when there most certainly are some electronics-radio related
> companies in the Tennessee area closer to Dunlap.

Ummm....unfortunately, not at this pay scale.

> I have no complaint here except the Dill Sergeant of the USAMCC
> tried to "keep the troops in line" long ago and has never stopped.

Nope...just you. You deserve it, since YOU have been trolling
this and other HAM RADIO related NG's for years and never stopped
either.

> I don't think the State of Tennessee's website carries home-
> grown Militia organization Nice website organization, better
> than Georgia's in my opinion.

I am sure you wish it WEREN'T so.

> Must be a real cushy job to be able to do newsgroups on company
> time.

If I wasn't doing my job in a timely fashion, I wouldn't be doing
anything else.

--
"It Could Be That Your Life's Only Meaning Is To Serve As A Warning To
Others Of How Bad It Could REALLY Be!"

"Just Remember...An Amateur Built The Ark, Engineers Built The Titanic"

PLEASE SEND PRIVATE E MAIL COMMENTS TO K4YZ@AOL.COM. RESPONSES TO THE DEJA MAY OR MAY NOT BE RETRIEVED IN A TIMELY FASHION.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

3055. Re: Engineers, Technicians, and Appliance Operators

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-10 10:53:19 UTC
From: "Steven J Robeson", K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <9636ivqgt1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 3304

In article <20010210010311.01651.00001361@nso-fp.aol.com>,
lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:

> You have never said it publicly as to employer or an employer's
> amateur radio club. Is that so difficult to admit?

"Admit", Lennie? This is an interrogation..?!?!

As for the club call.it HAS been discussed here before. I forget
the other party, but I was asked if I was going to acquire a handful
like some have. My answer then (as it is now) just one is enough and
it's there for all to see.

Even you, Oh Licenseless One.
--
"It Could Be That Your Life's Only Meaning Is To Serve As A Warning To
Others Of How Bad It Could REALLY Be!"

"Just Remember...An Amateur Built The Ark, Engineers Built The Titanic"

PLEASE SEND PRIVATE E MAIL COMMENTS TO K4YZ@AOL.COM. RESPONSES TO THE
DEJA MAY OR MAY NOT BE RETRIEVED IN A TIMELY FASHION.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

3056. Re: Engineers, Technicians, and Appliance Operators

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-10 11:06:48 UTC
From: "Steven J Robeson", K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <9637c7$r55$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 3306

In article <20010210010308.01651.00001360@nso-fp.aol.com>,
lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:

> >> 800-FIBER-ME.
> >
> > I have no doubt taht a bit of fiber in your diet would go a long
> >way towards changing your attitudes on life.
>
> The "800-FIBER-ME" is from the Antec home page under "how to
> reach us" button.

NO KIDDING, Lennie....?!?! GEEEZ! I DIDN'T KNOW THAT.. ! ! !

(arrogant putz!)

> Why should anyone bother to communicate to one who will do
> nothing but insult others and generally act like some sort of
> USAMCC Dill Sergeant?

Again...not intestinal fortitude to be a man.

> Poor baby...Steebie once broke into my Buddy Chat session
> with my wife who was on a trip up north. He didn't get any
> "satisfaction" out of DEMANDING to break in. His royal
> hynie hasn't been the same since.

No, Lennie, acutally by not blocking your IM's to others, you are
patently allowing others to "enter" the conversation. It's only when
you block the IM's or say "I am busy right now" (or words to the effect
of "get lost") that an incursion has occured. You COULD have "allowed"
only your wife's (or other specific friends or families) screen name
while blocking others, but you didn't.

Actually, I think there was probably no such "emergency", and that
this is just some make-believe "event" conjured to further substantiate
the victim role. Otherwise you would have been civil enough to at
least express the circumstances. "Family emergency. Can't talk.
Sorry" Thirty six keystrokes in all, less than 10 seconds. Your "wife"
wouldn't have noticed you were "gone".

But I see you are CLINGING to the "victim" role. At least you are
consistent

> What your employer does is your employer's business. Since
> you've never admitted to working for them before, I doubt you
> care much for them...but that is between you and your employer.

What I don't care for much are liars who insist on defaming that
which I have enjoyed for three decades.

--
"It Could Be That Your Life's Only Meaning Is To Serve As A Warning To
Others Of How Bad It Could REALLY Be!"

"Just Remember...An Amateur Built The Ark, Engineers Built The Titanic"

PLEASE SEND PRIVATE E MAIL COMMENTS TO K4YZ@AOL.COM. RESPONSES TO THE
DEJA MAY OR MAY NOT BE RETRIEVED IN A TIMELY FASHION.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

3057. Re: Morse Code replacement? Bigtime flame war article!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-10 12:09:16 UTC
From: tlbryant@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <963b1c02dgu@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 3311

In article <20010210003936.13655.00003462@nso-mq.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam says...
>
>In article <95vf0povn1@nnrp1.deja.com>, Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
>writes:
>
>>
>>Reminds me of 10-10. I worked a guy in Florida when I was stationed in
>>Nebraska. Then I worked him again from Guam and he told me I was a
>>dupe. When I tried working him from my new duty assignment in Illinois,
>>he kind of got perturbed with me.
>
>Brian:
>
>Ah, yes, the 10-10 club. You just ran into the very attitude which
>has made me an avid "no-phoner" ever since! The Ten-Ten organization,
>and all of its drooling, toothless, slack-jawed, knuckle-dragging,
>mouth-breathing, bottom-feeding members are, collectively, proof
>that any idiot can pick up a microphone and talk -- and most
>idiots do!
>
>73 de Larry, K3LT

I didn't realize exchanging 10-10 numbers was restricted to phone. Must be something in 10-10 International's charter that I missed.

3058. Re: ARRL HQ "Attitude" (Was: Re: Pride)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-10 12:11:23 UTC
From: tlbryant@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <963b5b12dgu@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 3312

In article <20010210003937.13655.00003463@nso-mq.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam says...
>
>In article <3A836587.7F71B628@IEEE.org>, Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>
>>
>>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>>> And while I'm naming names, K1ZZ has managed to
>>> completely annoy me literally ever time we met, starting with the
>>> '84 Dayton Hamvention and every time since.
>>
>>Got news for you, Larry. You are the one who *chooses* to be annoyed
>>unless he literally hit you with a stick.
>
>Cecil:
>
>That's where you'd be wrong, again! You're pretty annoying at times,
>but you've never hit me with a stick! Where did this stick-hitting
>requirement for annoyance come from, anyway? You don' need no
>steenking sticks in order to be annoying!
>
>73 de Larry, K3LT

So now you're saying that K1ZZ hit you with a stick at Dayton?

3059. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-10 12:19:06 UTC
From: tlbryant@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <963bjq22dgu@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 3320

In article <20010210003936.13655.00003461@nso-mq.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam says...

>I believe the FCC should always make liberal use of grandfathering
>of privileges, just so hams like myself, who don't have a problem
>accepting a challenge, don't have to be bothered to listen to the
>whining!
>
>73 de Larry, K3LT

AH Yes! The old "You don't post a callsign, so you must not have passed" reponse.

3060. Re: Engineers, Technicians, and Appliance Operators

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-10 12:34:30 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net>
Message-ID: <3A853556.A24CFED6@ovis.net>
Source record: 3307

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <960ql9qlm1@nnrp1.deja.com>, Steven J Robeson, K4YZ
> <k4yz@my-deja.com> writes:
>
> >In article <20010208214615.02997.00002014@nso-mg.aol.com>,
> > lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
> > >
> >> Something missing in the above considering there are only
> >> 24 hours in a terrestrial day.
> > >
> > > I guess the concept of two residences is beyond you.
> >
> > Not at all. Having a second residence for yourself gives you
> > some free time to do as you wish.
> >
> >> Driving 6 hours a day? Doing e-mail and newsgrouping from
> >> one of those jobs? Which one?
> > >
> > > Actually, it's three hours on Monday and three on Friday. The
> > >nursing's in the middle when I choose to take an Agency shift.
> >
> > Better get in contact with Macon, GA, and renew Georgia LPN
> > certificate #52241 since it expires 03/31/01. It was first taken
> > out on 07/12/95. No problem on the Tennessee LPN license
> > #49513 since that won't expire until Septermber 30, 2001. :-)
> > [original issue 1 November 1994]
> >
> > That took only a few minutes going through state websites
> > However, those state websites do not reveal whether or not
> > a licensee is actually USING those licenses for nursing.
> > Anyone who is proud of what they do should be able to
> > tell one and all what the license numbers are and where
> > they can be found. It's in public view and listed by a state
> > agency. :-)
> >
> > Previously, Robeson stated that he took the purchasing agent
> > job because of "burn-out" from nursing. Now it is revealed that
> > he works as some kind of temp (?) nurse after regular company
> > hours? Inconsistency there or a lack of full explanation.
> >
> > There is also some curiosity as to why someone has to travel
> > about 170 miles or so (3 hours driving time) away from home
> > when there most certainly are some electronics-radio related

> companies in the Tennessee area closer to Dunlap.
>
> >> If someone posts an uncivil message, they might get a reply
> >> IN KIND. Those are deserving. I've never said otherwise.
> >
> > Then you have absolutely NOTHING to complain about. You are
> >reaping your own reward.
>
> I have no complaint here except the Dill Sergeant of the USAMCC
> tried to "keep the troops in line" long ago and has never stopped.
> :-)
>
> > Again...you are free to call the Adjutant General of the State of
> >Tennessee. Want me to get the numbr for you too? I offered you my 800
> >number hre, but you haven't moved on THAT either.
>
> I don't think the State of Tennessee's website carries home-
> grown Militia organization Nice website organization, better
> than Georgia's in my opinion.
>
> >> ...yes, the employee may wind up fired for doing personal things
> >> on company time
> >
> > If the company's business wasn't getting done, you MIGHT be
> >correct. You are, as usual, not.
>
> Okay, so it was a slow time at the office. :-)
>
> Must be a real cushy job to be able to do newsgroups on company
> time. :-)
>
> didit

Len, you've turned into an aging cyber stalker. Why the peculiar
fixation on Steve's personal life? I find it rather peculiar.

Dave K8MN

3061. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-10 12:45:54 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net>
Message-ID: <3A853802.3790D3CB@ovis.net>
Source record: 3308

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3A84C977.3A6E44CF@ovis.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net> writes:
>
> >> Feel free to keep on thinking you and only you Know What
> >> Is Best. :-)
> >>
> >> didit
> >
> >That isn't my view, Len. Quite a few here have interesting or funny
> >things to say. You just aren't one of them.
>
> Feel free to keep on thinking you Know What Is Funny! :-)

A situation containing incongruity is funny. We laugh at the
incongruous. You occasionally make me laugh, Len. I'm positive that
the humor isn't intentional on your part.

> A Dave Barry you AIN'T...!
>
> didit

I dunno, Len. Dave Barry is a minister's son. I'm a minister's son.
Dave Barry plays guitar. I play guitar. Then there is the Miami
connection. Oh yeah--we're both named "Dave". My sister's kid played
the older boy in the "Dave's World" series. That should be enough to
set you off on a round of cyber sleuthing.

Do you know much about amateur radio? Fill us in.

Dave K8MN

3062. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-10 12:48:01 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010210074801.23230.00000022@ng-fm1.aol.com>
Source record: 3309

>From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

>In any scenario where CW subbands are shared with phone
>signals, CW will tend to lose out. Its only natural.

Then you believe that CW is the less-robust mode.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3063. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-10 12:49:08 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010210074908.23230.00000023@ng-fm1.aol.com>
Source record: 3310

>From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

>I believe the FCC should always make liberal use of grandfathering
>of privileges, just so hams like myself, who don't have a problem
>accepting a challenge, don't have to be bothered to listen to the
>whining!

Would it also put an end to your whining about whining?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3064. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-10 12:51:03 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010210075103.23230.00000024@ng-fm1.aol.com>
Source record: 3313

>From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

>Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> writes:

>>I knew you guys would come up with some great ideas. But I think that
>>nothing short of a federally mandated 'no lids, no kids, no space
>>cadets' requirement would satisfy the malcontents out here.

>Now, THAT's one of the most reasonable statements I've ever seen
>posted in this newsgripe!

Jim, you were right.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3065. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-10 12:53:39 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010210075339.23230.00000025@ng-fm1.aol.com>
Source record: 3315

>From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

>>No-coders have been authorized to work CW without any testing for code
>>whatver
>>for about a decade now. What harm have they caused CW operators?

>A better question would be -- What CW operating have no-coders done?
>Have you ever worked a no-coder on VHF/CW?

That is not a better question in the context of the original premise that if no-code folks are allowed to use CW without being tested, they will foul our nest. I think my original question is more apropos.

Your question, however, is a good answer to my question. The answer is that I don't think so. This pretty much demonstrates that people don't operate Morse code unless they know the code, so they won't be causing anyone to "stumble" over they on "our" bands.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
>73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>
>
>
>
>

3066. Re: I heard a CB'er on 20 meters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-10 12:53:54 UTC
From: TR@sky.net
Message-ID: <3a84bd6e.10119603@news.idsi.net>
Source record: 3314
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner
Body handling: HTML body converted to readable text

On Wed, 7 Feb 2001 20:02:09 -0500, "h" wrote:

>It's true look at your own foul and filthy mouth!
>Ham's always use foul language and filthy talk on the radio just like they
>do on this newsgroup. Freebanders know better. Freebanders are mature and
>can express themselves without spewing forth filthy language.
>
>--
>Sincerely,
>Ken

You are wrong. On all counts. Nice try though.

> wrote in message news:3a81e5c5.3817813@news.idsi.net...
>> On Wed, 7 Feb 2001 18:01:46 -0500, "h" wrote:
>>
>> >If he had a license he is a HAM not a CB'er
>> >Frankly Freebanders are like the Hams of old. If you look at the FCC
>> >enforcement logs The Hams are out of control and need enforcement while
>> >Freebanders are mature and working to improver thier knowledge, save
>lives,
>> >promote freedom and democracy, and gernerally aid and improve the
>geneneral
>> >welfare or thier comunities.
>> >
>> >--
>> >Sincerely,
>> >Ken
>>
>> Total BULLSHIT. You know and I know it.
>>
>
>

3067. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-10 12:59:13 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010210075913.23230.00000027@ng-fm1.aol.com>
Source record: 3316

>From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

>I would say that their objections to the way Morse code is tested
>sounds a lot like whining -- as it always does!

Your objection to my views is noted.

>>I do not believe that Morse code use will end any time soon, Larry.

>Notice, one and all, that Ed didn't say that its use would NOT come
>to an end -- which it certainly will now that the testing requirement is
>all but gone.

What year do you estimate that the last Morse code QSO will take place on Amateur Radio, Larry? Can you explain why you believe that year will be the one?

>> Do you feel that the mode has so little value to ham radio that no one
>> will learn it and use it unless it is tested?

>Asked and answered, many times.

Yes, you have; you do not believe that Morse code can survive without government support and welfare through an affirmative-action testing program.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3068. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-10 13:03:16 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010210080316.23230.00000028@ng-fm1.aol.com>
Source record: 3317

>From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

>>Nothing. I am pleased that there are 37,980 new hams.

>How many of them have joined the ARRL as of today?

I don't know, Larry. I was a ham (off and on) for about 20 years before I joined ARRL. Maybe that gives me a different perspective on new hams' joining and supporting organizations.

Is whether they are League members really more important to you than the fact that there are 37,980 new hams?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3069. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-10 13:05:19 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010210080519.23230.00000029@ng-fm1.aol.com>
Source record: 3318

>From: tlbryant@my-deja.com (T. L. Bryant)

>>Not till nearly ten years later. He did his thing in the late 70's, and
>>it led directly to the adoption of the question pools and VE testing
>>system.

> That. and the fact that having to administer amateur license exams
> was a very big boil on the FCC's behind.

"Privatization" was the governement buzzword of the era. I think that the major social forces that were sweeping the country were a bit more influential on the FCC's decision than the fact that one ham published some reasonable accurate "question pools."

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3070. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-10 13:15:59 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010210081559.23230.00000030@ng-fm1.aol.com>
Source record: 3319

>From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

>Naw, you didn't figure it out at all. I was in QSO when the PSker
>landed on top of us and flailed away, clueless.

If he was able to conduct his QSO, you were outside of his necessary bandwidth. He was probably outside of yours, but many hams cannot copy a CW signal if another signal is less than 100 Hz away from the station they are trying to listen to. I am good for about 20 Hz separation on a good day, but I find it very fatiguing and I don't enjoy it.

Now, you have cited a case where a PSK-31 signal jumped on top of you. How many times has that happened compared the number of times that another CW signal jumped on top of you.

>I on the other hand was (or easily could have been) running
>my Tuna Tin Deuce and a single stage regen. So now who has the
>efficiency edge?

It depends. WERE you using your TT2 and a regen at the time, "could" you have been?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3071. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-10 13:19:58 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010210081958.23230.00000031@ng-fm1.aol.com>
Source record: 3321

>From: Aaron Jones nomail@nomail.com

>In the 50s it would be unthinkable for most hams to send a rig
>back to the factory to be fixed. Today it is common place...

I think that hams of today are under the impression that the factory will do component-level troubleshooting rather than replace the board that the ham could have replaced directly.

I own an old Ten Tec OMNI D, built in the early 80s. Do you think most hams of that day would have fixed it themselves, or sent it to the factory?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3072. Re: I heard a CB'er on 20 meters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-10 13:27:49 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010210082749.23230.00000032@ng-fm1.aol.com>
Source record: 3322

>I always thought that "break" was an "pseudo emergency" "pro sign" in FFC or
>maritime language not to be used routinely.
>What do others think.

I know that on the County Hunters and Mobile Emergency Net, "Break Break" is
used only in actual emergencies.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3073. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-10 13:32:47 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010210083247.17176.00001543@nso-ba.aol.com>
Source record: 3323

In article <HZUg6.144$HH5.946717@news.ntplx.net>, "Ed Hare, W1RFI"
<w1rfi@arrl.net> writes:

>The Extra Class license is still required to obtain all amateur priveleges.

Yup - same as before.

>The number of steps required to get there have been reduced, with each step
>being more difficult than it was before.

Nope. The number of steps has been reduced, with each step EASIER than it was
before.

>The Technician with HF endorsement
>is now the entry-level HF license -- how much harder is is than the Novice
>used to be?

It's easier than the Novice used to be.

The above are based on taking practice exams on the qrz.website - both the old
ones and the new ones.

> Is this your idea of a 180-degree phase shift?

Not at all. It's just a continuing trend that's been going on for 20-30 years.
.
>
>I have said often that I believe that amateurs need to learn more about
>modern radio technology; you have disagreed with me.

Well, I agree with you, Ed. Learning is a Basis and Purpose of the ARS, I
think.

The big question is whether the learning needs to be heavily "incentivized" by
the license tests, or not.
>
73 de Jim, N2EY

3074. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-10 13:32:49 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010210083249.17176.00001544@nso-ba.aol.com>
Source record: 3325

In article <SB_g6.158$HH5.966289@news.ntplx.net>, "Ed Hare, W1RFI"
<w1rfi@arrl.net> writes:

><n2ey@aol.com> wrote:
>
>> Let's see - entire HF station has a total of 20 active devices in the
>> transceiver and a bunch of diodes and regulators in the power supplies
>> and antenna tuner/SWR bridge. Puts 100+ watts of clean RF in the
>> antenna, which is also homemade. Cost about a dollar a watt to build,
>> not counting the antenna tuner, which cost maybe $20 and is good for
>> several hundred watts. Clock is an old mechanical 24 hour digital
>> (Timechron?) job made from the parts of three junkers. The shack table
>> and shelves are also homemade.
>
>Now, if this is an original design,

It is. I know of none like it. It was designed around available parts. I have a
few more available parts than the average ham. ;-)

> I have only one question -- when are we
>going to see the article or web page on it? :-)
>
Electric Radio, July 1995, under the title "The Fifty Cent Filter". If you want
a complete description, that will take some time. I don't think QST or QEX
would be interested.

73 de Jim, N2EY

73 de Jim, N2EY

3075. Calling the "Roll"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-10 13:33:14 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <3A85431A.154777B2@arrl.org>
Source record: 3324

Just to keep track, I thought we could use a list of classes of people
that irritate Larry, as evidenced by recent NG postings:

(1) Hams who haven't taken a code test (e.g., not "Real Hams").
(2) Hams who have an Extra without a 20 WPM test (e.g., "PseudoExtras").
(3) People who think (1) and (2) are real hams/Extras (e.g.,
"Politically Correct whiners").
(4) Ten-Ten members. ("Collectively, proof that any idiot can pick up a
microphone and talk.")
(5) Everyone at ARRL HQ except Ed (although stay tuned: Ed is teetering
on the brink).
(6) "The majority of hams utilizing 'high-speed digital modes.'"
(7) "People hired under Affirmative Action programs."
...more to come, no doubt. That's only a couple days' worth.

We could shorten the list dramatically by just making it:
(1) Anyone who's not Larry.
But that wouldn't be as much fun!

Jon

3076. Re: ARRL HQ "Attitude" (Was: Re: Pride)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-10 13:44:53 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010210084453.21325.00000060@ng-fm1.aol.com>
Source record: 3326

>From: tlbryant@my-deja.com (T. L. Bryant)

>So now you're saying that K1ZZ hit <K3LT> with a stick at Dayton?

Nothing said about it in the ARRL HQ rumor mill, nor were there any memos that if Larry shows up at HQ we should all hit him with a stick. In fact, such activities are pretty much forbidden by some general policy in the ARRL HQ employees manual.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3077. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-10 13:49:00 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010210084900.21325.00000063@ng-fm1.aol.com>
Source record: 3327

>From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

>> Do you think you could pass a multiple-choice test on this technology?

> Of course- all I'd have to do is download the Question Pool and read it
>awhile!

If that is the only way you can learn and pass a test, why are you so critical
of others who you believe are doing the same thing.

Tell you what, how about we give your a 400 question test on the subject and
you can tell me how easy it was and whether you learned anything studying the
right answers.

73,
Ed ahare, W1RFI
>
>
>> >BUT--- if, like Cecil, you're telling me that Riley and his buddy Dale
>> >Hatfield insist that I and any serious percentage of ham radio licensees
>> >must become digital designers just to assure the survival of the ARS,
>> >you might as well go ahead and pass the word to them that they can begin
>> >the Big Shutdown anytime now.
>>
>> I don't recall iether of them saying any such thing. Can you supply a
>quote?
>
>
> Sure, they both said "Hey you dumbass hams better get your rears in
>gear and get off that old mundane stuff, you're not doing our engineers
>nor the rest of the economy any good by sticking with that old reliable
>gear. You gotta do what the Maritime services did, get rid of that old
>stuff and take up the new, hoswever flawed and no matter what complex
>gear you have to get, so we can progress....."
>
> Well? What were we supposed to get out of paragraphs of nonspecific
>chatter that said essentially that in paraphrase?
>
>
>
>> They are both telling Amateur Radio, each in their own way, that Amateur
>Radio
>> needs to modernize.
>
>
>When no such thing is needed in any way!!

>
>
> Why do you think they are saying that? My interpretation
>> is not that all hams need to become design engineers, but that hams should
>be
>> making use of modern radio communications techniques within the Service.
>
>
> And many DO! That is what shows that they will not be satisfied with
>anything that hams do. The Carl Stevensons and Cecil Moores out there
>are the root of it. Barely ever a ham at all, -hams have fun- they now
>can do little but bitch about what everyone but they are doing. For
>reasons known only to themselves FCC et all find themselves unable to
>effectively shrug off that sort of crap and instead we get nothing but
>criticism that we don't do all that they do! Looks like a terminal case
>of envy! We actually have fun with what we do. It's a shame they can't.
>
>
>
>
>
>

3078. Re: Morse Code replacement? Bigtime flame war article!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-10 14:54:38 UTC
From: kelly@dvol
Message-ID: <3a85557d.138035384@news2.dvol.com>
Source record: 3328

On Fri, 09 Feb 2001 22:50:31 GMT, Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
wrote:

>> Don't bring that sumbitch to Bookbinders for the RV/EY lobsterfest,
>> he'll never make it back to Allentown.
>
>You sound like a bad man.
>
. . I can provide references . .
>
>"When you've worked over a FIST, you've worked over a friend!"
>
Squiggy doesn't qualify as either.
>

3079. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-10 15:22:46 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <963mc6$cp1$0@208.206.142.95>
Source record: 3329

"Ed Hare, W1RFI" wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>
> > So smirk, smirk. the PSk31 station requies many thousands of active
> > devices plus all the cabling, setup and crossed fingers required to get
> > it running.
>
> > CW? well, you already know.....
>
> Yes, I do; CW can be done with a single active device on transmit.
>
> How many active devices are inside the transmitter you use for CW?

Depends on which rig I use. I have a few which have 1 or 2.

Let's
> assume 10,000 per IC and count from there. The microprocessors and RAM etc
> probably have quite a few more, but that will be offset by some of the IC
> amplifiers. Don't forget to count your keyer, if you use one.

Not many PN junctions in a Vibroplex or J38!

But we all know that none of those many active devices are necessary to
run radiotelegraphy, don't we? It really in thoughtful of manufacturers
to see to it that CW mode is preserved on all these newly manufactured
rigs, though, they must know what Real Hams like.

3080. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-10 15:34:05 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <963n1d$e9v$0@208.206.142.95>
Source record: 3330

"Ed Hare, W1RFI" wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>
> > > It is not more difficult to understand the fundamentals of how it works
> than it
> > > is to understand the fundamentals of AM, FM, SSB.
>
> > Understanding the fundamentals is far from "We all gotta adopt the
> > latest yada yada yada" crap that is the Cecilian hue and cry, and to
> > which you clearly subscribe.
>
> I subscribe to the concept that more hams need to learn the fundamentals of
> modern radio technology. You seem to be having a lot of difficulty
> understanding what that means. I can't think of another way to say it,
> Dick.

As you well know by now, so do I- Just as long as they don't jump
right over and bypass the basic modes as well.

If one wished to maintain the communications mode which would be
likely to be useable under the widest range of situations and
conditions, would he not decide to keep the most universally available,
easily implemented mode, at least as a reserve? Why is that so obscure a
point ot view to so many techies? Agenda time again?

> > > I am quite aware of the present technical status of hams, Dick; I spend
> about 2
> > > or 3 hours a day on the phone, answering their questions. Most of them
> don't
> > > share your "can't do" viewpoint.
>

I sereiously doubt it. You meet and converse with seek out your
services and those of ARRL. For every one you contact there are many
thousands you never know about. No one I know personally has had contact
with you. ARRL memebeship amounts to less than 25% of US hams. I don't
think you know that much about the majority of them.

3081. Re: Morse Code replacement? Bigtime flame war article!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-10 15:37:49 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <963n8d$e9v$1@208.206.142.95>
Source record: 3331

Brian wrote:
>
> "When you've worked over a FIST, you've worked over a friend!"

So when did you OR Carl ever work a FIST?

3082. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-10 15:41:02 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <963nee$f60$0@208.206.142.95>
Source record: 3332

Cecil wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > Cecil wrote:
> > > The great majority of hams are stuck in the 60s, Dick. We are already
> > > stagnating 40 years behind the state of the art in RF communications.
> >
> > That is pure unadulturated bullcrap.
>
> Nope, it's exactly what is wrong with ham radio today. I remember when
> many hams were at the leading edge of communications technology. We
> are still at that same edge but now it's the trailing edge.

I'm afraid the facts are, pretty much as always regardless of your
selective memorizing, that the engineer-hobbyists who are also hams will
-again; as always, be1 the portion of ham who do "leading edge" design.
It has never been different except that once it was much easier for an
ordinary individual to learn to be a communications (radio) engineer.

3083. Re: I heard a CB'er on 20 meters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-10 15:46:34 UTC
From: Robert Watson <rwatson@westsound.com>
Message-ID: <3A85625A.F1240A21@westsound.com>
Source record: 3333
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner

```
>
> >> On Wed, 7 Feb 2001 18:01:46 -0500, "h" <not@aol.com> wrote:
> >>
> >> >If he had a license he is a HAM not a CB'er
> >> >Frankly Freebanders are like the Hams of old. If you look at the FCC
> >> >enforcement logs The Hams are out of control and need enforcement while

> >> >Freebanders are mature and working to improver thier knowledge, save
> >lives,

Lets hope that you are trying to improve your spelling .......

> >geneneral

Yes, once again we see a fine example of knowledge in action.......

Maybe you could learn how to use spellcheck so at least you could fake us
out......

> >> >--
> >> >Sincerely,
> >> >Ken
```

3084. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-10 16:08:39 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <963p27$j9l$0@208.206.142.95>
Source record: 3334

Cecil wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > Cecil wrote:
> > >
> > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > >
> > > DSP is to ham radio now as SSB was to ham radio in the early 50s.
> >
> > That shows how little you really know.
>
> Dick, it's the truth. A/Ds and processors are getting faster every year
> and every year digital electronics takes over more and more of the
> functions from analog by doing the job cheaper and better. Soon, everything
> this side of the mixer will be DSP functions. The Kachina radio was just
> the first of many.

And the output of the Kachina is undistinguishable from a non-DSP rig.
You say we must do it because someone can. Not because there is any
compelling reason, such as was the case when SSB surperseded AM. Anyone
who listened to 75 meters in the AM days when the band was a massive
series of heterodyne squeals as cinoared with the relative order of SSB
there later knows. There is simply no way to compare that change with
DSP.

You're not telling me anything I don't alrady know. You *are* showing
how ham radio is being morphed into just another internet style
gabblegibberish mishmash. About the same thing happened to VHF packet
radio, and was gthe exact reason I and many others abandoned it. All the
"visioaries" insisted on converting it into something virtually useless
and at once dull and uninteresting, just to persue some elusive uneeded
"efficiencies" which mean nothing whatever to the individual ham radio
operator and only served the agendas of the perpetrators.
No one **EVER** suggested that hams should refrain from learning about
new technolies, and code supporters have repeatedly stated that from the
outset, along with strong support for current modern tests. WE DO RESIST
the continued assertion that we must "modernize" by dumnping everything
that interests us just because it might have been around longer than the
latest digital dream. We've listed dozens of other objects which are
also obsolete, and are still in universal use today, but that makes no
difference.

It is clear that the entire movement to "modernize" is nothing more
than another push to get rid of the code. And a very lame one at that.

We are already modernized. And we refuse to be intimidated or browbeat
by those who want their agenda to prevail.

3085. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-10 16:30:46 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A856CB6.DA7C20E4@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3335

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> >How do you feel about those that have learned how to send and receive Morse
> >code, but believe that changes need to be made in the way Morse code is
> >tested?
>
> I would say that their objections to the way Morse code is tested
> sounds a lot like whining -- as it always does!

Why would you say that, Larry. Ed and I have nothing to whine about.

> Whether or not people will learn
> and use the Morse code in the absence of testing has nothing to do
> with its value --

What a strangely false statement, Larry. If Morse code has enough value,
of course people will learn and use it.

> And none of these other modes require the physical development of
> an operating skill which requires a great deal of personal motivation,
> dedication, and perseverence to master.

So you are saying the value of the return on investment for Morse code
is too low for the cost/effort involved. You might be right, Larry, but
Ed and I disagree with you. Only time will tell.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

3086. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-10 16:34:46 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A856DA6.F9727BA@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3337

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> I never could understand the
> post-Incentive Licensing General and Advanced licensees that
> refused to upgrade to Extra, except for the fact that most of them are
> primarily phone operators!

I am primarily an experimenter and rarely operate. Most of the hams
I know who are primarily experimenters were Advanced class hams.
There simply was no need for an Extra license.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

3087. Re: ARRL HQ "Attitude" (Was: Re: Pride)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-10 16:38:51 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A856E9B.ECA0DA50@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3339

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> That's where you'd be wrong, again! You're pretty annoying at times,
> but you've never hit me with a stick! Where did this stick-hitting
> requirement for annoyance come from, anyway? You don' need no
> steenking sticks in order to be annoying!

Just shows how little you know about human psychology, Larry.
Anyone who gets annoyed on a news group is choosing to be
annoyed. The basic question is: Why do you choose to allow
people to annoy you on a news group?
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

3088. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-10 16:42:46 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <963r26$o1t$0@208.206.142.95>
Source record: 3336

"Ed Hare, W1RFI" wrote:
>
>

> I have said often that I believe that amateurs need to learn more about
> modern radio technology; you have disagreed with me. Just what basket are
> you saying I am in?

No I have NOT disagreed with you, rather I have agreed with you. But I gotta tell you-- If ARRL(or anyone else) wants any serious numbers of hams to learn the advanced techniques it will take more than just haranguing and a few references in the Handbook to do it. There must be an effort that involves a lot more than lip service. I'd suggest the BOD start a true basic level educational initiative to do just that. Start by cocmparing the basic level differences with a a conventional superhet then a ground-up model of a DSP radio transciever, on the most basic operational level that will function, then publissh the whole thing in a series of magazine articles- and NOT in QEX. Most of the hams who are not techies don't get QEX. A book wouldn't hurt a thing. With all the yelling at us that goes on here SURELY there are plenty of experts that could handle this in stride - aren't there?????

Bottom line, all this noise is just that so long as it isn't followed by actual movement to accomplish. It really becomes mundane, all the "we gotta modernize" stuff with nothing to back it up.

3089. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-10 16:43:31 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A856FB3.4AFE8E7C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3340

N2EY wrote:
> >The Technician with HF endorsement
> >is now the entry-level HF license -- how much harder is is than the Novice
> >used to be?
>
> It's easier than the Novice used to be.

I haven't looked at the Tech exam but I seriously doubt that it is easier
than the Novice exam I took in 1951 which was based on only 33 total Q&A
in the ARRL License Manual. I memorized it in two hours.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

3090. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-10 16:47:49 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <963rbl$o1t$1@208.206.142.95>
Source record: 3338

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> In article <3A81BCD5.B30DC604@uci.edu>, Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> writes:
>
> >
> >I knew you guys would come up with some great ideas. But I think that
> >nothing short of a federally mandated 'no lids, no kids, no space
> >cadets' requirement would satisfy the malcontents out here.
>
> Now, THAT's one of the most reasonable statements I've ever seen
> posted in this newsgripe!
>
> OBTW -- "kids" are OK as long as they are not lids or space cadets!

We'll take it even further - lids are OK as long as they are willing to
learn. But space cadets, well......

3091. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-10 16:49:51 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A85712F.B4500C74@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3341

Dick Carroll wrote:
> If one wished to maintain the communications mode which would be
> likely to be useable under the widest range of situations and
> conditions, would he not decide to keep the most universally available,
> easily implemented mode, at least as a reserve? Why is that so obscure a
> point ot view to so many techies? Agenda time again?

The great majority of people who don't know Morse code don't consider
it to be universal or easily implemented. If you want to use Morse code
for emergencies, Dick, by all means do it. Most of the rest of the world
has given up on Morse code for emergency use.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

3092. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-10 17:00:06 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A857396.E0EF5CFE@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3343

Dick Carroll wrote:
> And the output of the Kachina is undistinguishable from a non-DSP rig.

I doubt that's true, Dick, but if it is true, then the Kachina is a poorly designed DSP rig. Properly implemented DSP is better than analog.

> You're not telling me anything I don't alrady know. You *are* showing
> how ham radio is being morphed into just another internet style
> gabblegibberish mishmash.

So we hams should deliberately become a case of arrested development in the electronic dark ages?

> It is clear that the entire movement to "modernize" is nothing more
> than another push to get rid of the code. And a very lame one at that.

No one wants to get rid of the code, only the code tests. What we are advocating is that hams know as much about modern modes as they know about CW.

> We are already modernized. And we refuse to be intimidated or browbeat
> by those who want their agenda to prevail.

Spoken like a true knuckle-dragging Neanderthal, Dick. Latest theory is that the Neanderthals were absorbed into the Homo Sapien line. You seen to have got the majority of their genes. :-)
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

3093. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-10 17:01:42 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <963s5mqsa0@208.206.142.95>
Source record: 3342

W1RFI wrote:
>
> >From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
>
> >In any scenario where CW subbands are shared with phone
> >signals, CW will tend to lose out. Its only natural.
>
> Then you believe that CW is the less-robust mode.

????? Wake up, Ed. He compared a 5 watt CW signal with a KW SSB. Then he said one major advantage of CW is the fact that you don't need high power, while most of the SSBers use it anyway, words to that effect. That means that CW is the less robust mode? When you can clearly copy a CW signal at levels where SSB voice is totally unintelligible? Fellow, you're beginning to sound like this is getting to you, you're losing your technical edge. Why?

3094. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-10 17:11:41 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <963sodqsa1@208.206.142.95>
Source record: 3344

W1RFI wrote:
>
> >From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
>
> >> Do you think you could pass a multiple-choice test on this technology?
>
> > Of course- all I'd have to do is download the Question Pool and read it
> >awhile!
>
> If that is the only way you can learn and pass a test, why are you so critical
> of others who you believe are doing the same thing.

Did the point slip past you? You asked if I could pass a test on it.
I could- the same way many pass all the tests. Whether or not I knew
anything about it.

3095. Re: I heard a CB'er on 20 meters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-10 18:22:51 UTC
From: h <not@aol.com>
Message-ID: <t8b1iuo38fvfda@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 3345
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner

Discussing controversial subjects! Gee sounds like "no political dissent allowed!"
Of course Hams will willingly bend their knee and kiss ass.
Freebanders will carry on and will remain THE LAST BEST HOPE FOR FREEDOM!!!

btw most freebanders have equal knowledge in electronics and SUPERIOR knowledge of human freedom.

....act irresponsibly and break the law.
Adolf Hitler-1935

--
Sincerely,
Ken
pwrguy@intergrafix.net
"T. L. Bryant" <tlbryant@my-deja.com> wrote in message news:962cfg31e36@enews4.newsguy.com...
> With freedom, comes responsibilty. Freebanders aren't acting responsible
> when they interfere with other communications services. It's the "yelling fire"
> cliche.
>
> I do, however, have a problem with the FCC telling me what topics I may or may
> not talk about. Example: During an interview several years ago, an FCC official
> said that discussing controversial subjects over the amateur frequencies
> basically violated 97.1(e), because such subjects, as he put it, "did nothing
> to enhance international good will."
>
>
> In article <t89648o0tkkp61@corp.supernews.com>, not@aol.com says...
> >
> >Gee sounds like our founding fathers. Guess freedom isn't good unless
> >sanctioned by third world dictatorships
> >
> >--
> >Sincerely,
> >Ken
> >pwrguy@intergrafix.net
> >> Freebanders are generally unexperienced in electronics and not sanctioned
> >by

> >> any country in the world.
> >> Rick
>

3096. Re: Calling the "Roll"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-10 18:28:22 UTC
From: Kim <w8ing2001@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <aLfh6.6131$ZJ5.537204@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 3346

Ya left two out...

Happy New Year, Everyone (No, I'm not back)...I needed to see if I could
find Phil Kane's email address.

--
73 de W5TIT - Kim

"Jon Bloom" <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
news:3A85431A.154777B2@arrl.org...
> Just to keep track, I thought we could use a list of classes of people
> that irritate Larry, as evidenced by recent NG postings:
>
> (1) Hams who haven't taken a code test (e.g., not "Real Hams").
> (2) Hams who have an Extra without a 20 WPM test (e.g., "PseudoExtras").
> (3) People who think (1) and (2) are real hams/Extras (e.g.,
> "Politically Correct whiners").
> (4) Ten-Ten members. ("Collectively, proof that any idiot can pick up a
> microphone and talk.")
> (5) Everyone at ARRL HQ except Ed (although stay tuned: Ed is teetering
> on the brink).
> (6) "The majority of hams utilizing 'high-speed digital modes.'"
> (7) "People hired under Affirmative Action programs."
> ...more to come, no doubt. That's only a couple days' worth.
>
> We could shorten the list dramatically by just making it:
> (1) Anyone who's not Larry.
> But that wouldn't be as much fun!
>
> Jon
>

3097. Re: Engineers, Technicians, and Appliance Operators

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-10 19:53:44 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010210145344.01651.00001387@nso-fp.aol.com>
Source record: 3347

In article <3A853556.A24CFED6@ovis.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net> writes:

>Len, you've turned into an aging cyber stalker. Why the peculiar
>fixation on Steve's personal life? I find it rather peculiar.

I find you rather peculiar. :-)

didit

3098. Re: Engineers, Technicians, and Appliance Operators

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-10 19:53:45 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010210145345.01651.00001388@nso-fp.aol.com>
Source record: 3348

In article <9636aoqeq1@nnrp1.deja.com>, Steven J Robeson, K4YZ
<k4yz@my-deja.com> writes:

>In article <20010210010302.01651.00001359@nso-fp.aol.com>,
> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
>
>> Better get in contact with Macon, GA, and renew Georgia LPN
>> certificate #52241 since it expires 03/31/01
>
> Actually it's already renewed(or at least I have forwarded the
>package) but thanks for your concern. And it's "P052241" to be
>accurate.

Correction noted. Please advise the webmasters at the Macon
site...they only indicate the last five numbers.

>> Previously, Robeson stated that he took the purchasing agent
>> job because of "burn-out" from nursing. Now it is revealed that
>> he works as some kind of temp (?) nurse after regular company
>> hours? Inconsistency there or a lack of full explanation.
>
> I said I took the job to "take a break", Lennie...NOT to
>completely disassociate myself. Of course, not having never held a job
>that had such responsiblity, I doubt you can "relate".

As a design electronics engineer, I've had as much responsibility
as any other design electronics engineer. That can run to
several tens of million dollars on a project. You can find my
name in the approval sign-off block for the drawings of the
AN/ASM-416 Test Set, as one example.

How can you possibly "know" what I've done in the aerospace
community over the last 46 years? Have you checked with my
past employers? I gave you a list of them. Have you checked
with the two radio amateurs who I've included as personal
references? Have you bothered checking anything at all?

I don't think so. All you did was make a blanket accusation
cum insult based on personal rage. Tsk, tsk, not nice.

>> There is also some curiosity as to why someone has to travel
>> about 170 miles or so (3 hours driving time) away from home
>> when there most certainly are some electronics-radio related
>> companies in the Tennessee area closer to Dunlap.
>
> Ummm....unfortunately, not at this pay scale.

Chatanooga has no electronics industry? Nothing closer than
3 hours distance? Seems strange considering the east coasters
have been bragging for years about being the center for all the
"good" industries. :-)

Purchasing agents must be making bundles of money now!

Just think what you could do with a little hard work and study
to get an engineering diploma...you could be making bundles
upon bundles of money and specifying what purchasing buys
instead of placing orders. Of course, that wouldn't be
amateur work anymore. Engineers get "tested" every day in
design and the only certificate/diploma they get for that is a
continuing paycheck. Not a callsign you can use for bragging
rights but you can, literally, take it to the bank. :-)

> Nope...just you. You deserve it, since YOU have been trolling
>this and other HAM RADIO related NG's for years and never stopped
>either.

I have? Must be another one with my screen name then. :-)

> If I wasn't doing my job in a timely fashion, I wouldn't be doing
>anything else.

Whatever you say...keep saying that until you get caught... :-)

didit

3099. Re: Engineers, Technicians, and Appliance Operators

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-10 19:53:49 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010210145349.01651.00001389@nso-fp.aol.com>
Source record: 3452

In article <9635ph$q3c$1@nnrp1.deja.com>, Steven J Robeson, K4YZ
<k4yz@my-deja.com> writes:

>In article <20010210010301.01651.00001358@nso-fp.aol.com>,
> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
>
>> That's not a third-party disnterested reference.
>
> Yeah, Lennie. I gues copies of the same documents you asked to
>see weren't. Oh well. I knew you weren't man enough to go it alone
>anyway.

You can scan any document you wish and present it somewhere
for ALL to see...or you can just mouth off that "it is in your wallet"
as if it exists. No one can see in your wallet...or imagination.

> You missed Arkansas licensure, too, although that one's been
>inactive a while. Not to mention EMS certifications in four states,
>FAA licensure (albiet not professional) and numerous endorsements from
>the AHA, ARC, other agencies that I am sure you might recognize.

This is an amateur radio policy newsgroup, not a health professional
resume newsgroup. :-)

>> Is it on a website or printed in a written document?
>
> What part of "public information" don't you undersatnd, Lennie.
>Believe it or not, the presence or lack of presence on the Internet
>does not substantiate validity. You are invited to contact TAG
>Tennessee and find out for yourself.

Do they have a printed, official document with a listing of THE
radio officer for some "4th Infantry Brigade?" [maybe with
embossed edges, sort of like a frame, perhaps with an eagle
rampant on a field of J-38s?] I think that would be very nice.

> Hmmmm.....now I am wondering what MY licensure as a nurse in ANY
>state has to do with your trolling in Amateur Radio related
>newsgroups...?!?! THIS is an interesting stretch, and a sorrowful one
>for you to follow in order to deflect from the fact that you have been
>bested by Hams again.

"Bested?!?" :-) :-) :-)

In a manner of speaking I've been "bested" only once. Alan
Walston, W6MJN, was Best Man at my wedding. :-)

>> I'm not certain what is meant by "lecherous tripe." A "lecher"
>> is a lewd, grossly sexual man according to my handy Websters.
>
> In as much as your previous AOL posts said your "hobby" was being
>beaten with purses by Ruth Buzzy on park benches, I wonder too...?!?!?

I've never met actress-comedienne Ruth Buzzy. What has that to
do with a humorous reposting of old material by Hans Brakob
on what an engineer is?

It must be that overconcern with code skills and keeping standards
and practices of the USAMCC dulls the sense of humor. :-)

didit

3100. Re: Morse Code replacement? Bigtime flame war article!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-10 19:53:50 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010210145350.01651.00001391@nso-fp.aol.com>
Source record: 3349

In article <20010210003936.13655.00003462@nso-mq.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>Ah, yes, the 10-10 club. You just ran into the very attitude which
>has made me an avid "no-phoner" ever since! The Ten-Ten organization,
>and all of its drooling, toothless, slack-jawed, knuckle-dragging,
>mouth-breathing, bottom-feeding members are, collectively, proof
>that any idiot can pick up a microphone and talk -- and most
>idiots do!

...and some folks wonder why tRoll was beaten with a stick!

:-)

didit

3101. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-10 19:53:50 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010210145350.01651.00001390@nso-fp.aol.com>
Source record: 3451

In article <20010210081958.23230.00000031@ng-fm1.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>>From: Aaron Jones nomail@nomail.com
>
>>In the 50s it would be unthinkable for most hams to send a rig
>>back to the factory to be fixed. Today it is common place...
>
>I think that hams of today are under the impression that the factory will do
>component-level troubleshooting rather than replace the board that the ham
>could have replaced directly.

The electronics industry in general simply replaces board assemblies because it is cheaper to do so in the long run.

Faulty boards are often processed to recover gold and other precious metals. There exist several companies that make a profit on doing so...addresses in many industry Buyer's Guides.

>I own an old Ten Tec OMNI D, built in the early 80s. Do you think most hams
>of that day would have fixed it themselves, or sent it to the factory?

Is that the Ten Tec that floats? tRoll said he was once marooned on an island and was rescued via CW when one floated ashore. :-)

didit

3102. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-10 19:53:51 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010210145351.01651.00001392@nso-fp.aol.com>
Source record: 3350

In article <3A853802.3790D3CB@ovis.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net> writes:

>> Feel free to keep on thinking you Know What Is Funny! :-)
>
>A situation containing incongruity is funny. We laugh at the
>incongruous. You occasionally make me laugh, Len. I'm positive that
>the humor isn't intentional on your part.

Ja, Herr Obersturmbandsfuhrer, it is nice to know that even the high-ranking superior ones are able to enjoy life and find amusements.

Gruss Gott and didit

3103. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-10 19:53:59 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010210145359.01651.00001393@nso-fp.aol.com>
Source record: 3454

In article <9634at$p17$1@nnrp1.deja.com>, Steven J Robeson, K4YZ
<k4yz@my-deja.com> writes:

>In article <20010209185916.17176.00001516@nso-ba.aol.com>,
> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
>
>> My balls aren't made of crystal,...(SNIP)
>
> Having probably not been able to see them, find them or use them
>for quite a few years, I am sure you probably ahve NO idea WHAT theya
>re made of.

Heh heh heh...I don't have a singular crystal ball, Steebie.

Interesting reaction due to Fury and Rage! :-)

> Lenni, almost every post you make is intended to insult or troll.
>The first post of this thread is pure proof of that. It had absolutely
>NOTHING to do with the implementation of ANY policy. Just your
>attempts to further incite discontent.

No doubt the Service Members of the United States Amateur
Marine Code Corps think so.

Policy: What the FCC instituted in 1990 (Technician class
amateur license, no code test) has proved to be quite popular
and continues to be the fastest-growing license class. That's
according to public data from the FCC. In only a decade it is
responsible for attracting roughly a quarter million licensees.

It's obvious that some do not wish to hear of that, especially the
stalwart, superior Dill Sergeants of the USAMCC. :-)

> Hmmmm....call me "Steebie" (pablum caught in your dentures again?)
>and THEN attempt to cahstise ME for "insult(s), belittlement,
>denigration, etc, etc"...?!?!?

Oh, my, I was guilty of thinking that replies in kind were okay,
especially after having been addressed as such for over a year.

Is everyone to call you "Sir" because of your rank, status, and
general superiority in the USAMCC?

>> All I did was post a comparison between the code-tested licensees
>> and the non-code-tested licensees in the US ARS.
>
> No what you did was troll. You succeeded.

All I did was post a comparison between the code-tested licensees
and non-code-tested licensees in the US ARS. Another Extra
class argued on the numbers presented and we have had a debate
and argument over what should have been presented. You have
neither argued nor debated those numbers or what should have
been presented.

> You ATTEMPT to ask one of those "Do you LIKE having sex with your
>sister" questions.

I've never asked you about having sex with your sister. I don't
know if you have a sister. :-)

> Of course they are "real hams". The "arguement" is
>NOT are they real hams, but are YOUR numbers valid. THAT answer is NO.

"NO" based on what? Public data from the FCC? Are you calling
the FCC Liars?!?

>> See, there you go again, being uncivil, rude, insulting...sort of an
>> extra grade asshole.
>
> And now the resulting profanity.

Heh heh heh...ex-marines complaining of profanity! :-) :-) :-)

> And WE (yes, WE) DON'T CARE! NONE of that makes a didly squat
>difference because THIS NG is about HAM radio...NOT "Ex Engineers With
>A Chip On Thier Shoulders".

Now, now, calm down. You said I was a "technician" in industry
and I replied that I was an engineer. I was and still am.

I've not had a Chip on my shoulders but I once got a pair of
cuff links for my father made from old thin-film hybrid circuits.
Unique...only jewelry that came with a schematic!

This newsgroup is, similarly, not about nursing, health care, or
industrial purchasing agents (who use company computers on
company time to Internet). :-)

> Probably for the same reason YOU keep lying, using profanity and
>generally being an annoying little twerp. Because I CAN.

You civility and genteel nature has not been noted here for a long
time. :-)

>> PS: Good going, Steebie, you got in early to work to post e-mail
>> at 7:48 AM.
>
> You have done ONE positive thing for me, Lenni. I will not retire
>until I just can't go on any longer. If all you can do is check date-
>time-groups to find some percieved impropriety in when/how someone
>responds to YOUR tripe, then I guess there's not much left to do in
>life.

Tsk, tsk, being overly sensitive to a guilty conscience? :-)

> Maybe you should write a letter to Uncle Jack in care of the
>Michigan Department of Corrections and see if he can make any
>suggestions, in as much as he's out of service at the moment. Since
>you have lost all remaining vestiges of productive life, I am sure
>he'll be glad to usher you to the next life.

????

didit

3104. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-10 19:54:02 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010210145402.01651.00001394@nso-fp.aol.com>
Source record: 3453

In article <9632ob$o6t$1@nnrp1.deja.com>, Steven J Robeson, K4YZ
<k4yz@my-deja.com> writes:

>In article <20010209185918.17176.00001518@nso-ba.aol.com>,
> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
>
>> Please provide reference for the above "fact" that a "large number
>> don't stay there."
>
> As a VE, watching them upgrade. ARRL >>AND<< W5YI reports on VE
>seesions elsewhere. FCC Reports on on administrative actions.

Subjective opinions. :-)

>> I ignore Urban Myths, falsehoods, folk sayings, etc., in trying to
>> analyze public data offered by the only US agency that licenses
>> US radio amateurs.
>
> No you don't. You do your damned best to create a few.

Nope. Just pointing out Urban Myths, falsehoods, folk sayings,
etc., etc.

Are you saying the FCC is NOT the only US agency that licenses
US radio amateurs?

Are you saying that FCC databases are NOT public?

>> You've done nothing of the kind, only shot off your keyboard again.
>
> Keep telling yourself that, Lennie. I am sue it makes you feel
>good THINKING that.

You are "sue?" ? [strange transgendering going on!]

>> Try to concentrate on the facts of what is happening to others, by
>> others, especially concerning newcomers to US amateur radio.
>
> As an ACTIVE licensee I am acutely aware of more than YOU will
>know. You should try it sometime.

You "know" more than anyone, Steebie. You keep saying so. :-)

Nobody else can possibly know as much as you...except tRoll,
Heil, Carroll, etc., etc. [you guys ought to get together...]

> HOW MANY antennas have you helped erect for "newcomers" in the
>last 30 days, Lennie?

One. An auto antenna for the granddaughter of the neighbors
across the street...she just got her first driver's license and a
used car as her first auto. :-)

> HOW MANY VE sessions have you proctored?
>
> HOW MANY nets have you participated in that introduced "new hams".
>Lennie?
>
> I can assure you that the answer in MY case exceeds "1" by a large
>margin in EACH of the above cases.

I'm sure you have extra-wide margins on everything. :-)

> Which in only ONE month exceeds your total for the DECADE.

Amazing! Well, don't just stand there, go out and hump up someone
to nominate you for the Nobel Prize. [they DO have a ham radio
category, don't they? if not, I'm sure you will want to go whip them
into shape, put them through close-order drill, make MEN out of
the Committee. :-)]

> Adios, Chump. Get a life.

Thank you, I have one. No worries about second jobs, money,
living away from home, or damaged ego in newsgroups.

Now, let's return to the original thread start. Newcomers to US
amateur radio are mostly NOT choosing to go through the hoops
of seeking a code-tested amateur license. Why is that?

For damn certain, they aren't choosing to join some United States
Amateur Marine Code Corps, to march in ranks under the
militant "leadership" of abusive Dill Sergeants who religiously
follow the Proper Code (of conduct).

You and the obersturmbandsfuhrer keep saying that No One Can
Possibly Know Anything About Amateur Radio Until They
Become Properly Licensed. If that is so, why should there be
any interest in becoming a US radio amateur through a test?

Seems to me that such an attitude turns people away...unless
they like living under self-professed, self-appointed non-comms
with a superior control-freak compulsion.

It is doubtful that many will want to Follow Orders from those
Who Know Better Than Everyone Else. You and the obersturm-
bandsfuhrer act that way. It is Your Way or Die. No quarter.

US amateur radio must be a real tough military Service
according to you! :-)

didit

3105. Industry Canada Proposal to Lower Code Speed to 5 wpm;

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-10 20:19:51 UTC
From: "M. Soft" <abuse@home.net>
Message-ID: <Hnhh6.66551$t94.882370@news1.rdc1.bc.home.com>
Source record: 3455
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.nocode,can.general,rec.radio.amateur.policy

I am posting this message for discussion.....

FROM : Carl R. Stevenson - WA6VSE
Executive Director, No Code International

TO:

SUBJECT: Industry Canada Proposal to Lower Code Speed to 5 wpm;
NCI Needs to Establish a National Chapter in Canada to Support
Adoption of this Proposal - YOUR Help is Needed!

DATE: Saturday, February 10, 2001

Dear ?,

As you may be aware, Industry Canada recently issued a proposal aimed at lowering the Morse code test speed for "full privilege" licenses in Canada to 5 wpm. Complete information on this proposal may be obtained by following the link in the following article copied from the NCI website.
Canada Issues Public Notice Proposing Rules Change to Replace 12 wpm Morse test with 5 wpm test!!!
For more information, click on the following link to a copy of the Notice with some live links to an e-mail address where comments may be sent and to an Industry Canada website where comments may reportedly be viewed.
At a bare minimum, we need all of our Canadian members to file comments with Industry Canada in support of this proposal. Comments are due 60 days from the Publication Date, which was 2001-01-06.

However, the Board of Directors of NCI also feels that it is very important that we establish a National Chapter of NCI in Canada to represent our Canadian members' interests. In order to establish a National Chapter of NCI in Canada, we need a National Chapter Chairperson.

Therefore, we are seeking suitably qualified volunteers for the position, who are presentable, articulate, able to deal with regulators and those with opposing views in a diplomatic fashion, and passionate about NCI's goal of ultimately eliminating ALL Morse proficiency testing as a prerequisite for all classes of amateur license. Familiarity with Canadian regulatory practices and officials, good writing skills, and either being located near or having the ability to travel occasionally to Industry Canada's main offices to lobby for the cause, would be also be highly desirable attributes.

Please take a few moments to review the material (including the Bylaws provisions relating to National Chapters) at:
http://www.nocode.org/National_Chapt_Notice.html If you are interested in

being considered as a candidate for NCI's Canadian National Chapter Chairperson, please e-mail a brief letter stating your interest, why you think you would be a good representative for NCI in Canada, and a brief "resume" of your amateur radio background and interests to me at: wa6vse@fast.net for consideration by the Board of Directors.

We NEED to fill this position . please don't assume "Someone else will do it." . if you're interested and feel you could contribute in this role, PLEASE take the initiative and indicate your willingness to help!

73,
Carl R. Stevenson - WA6VSE
Executive Director, No Code International

3106. Re: ARRL HQ "Attitude" (Was: Re: Pride)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-10 20:46:02 UTC
From: Rick Tannehill <rickw7rt@firstinter.net>
Message-ID: <3A85A88A.D884FF07@firstinter.net>
Source record: 3456

But..but what about the Wouf Hong? Has it been retired?
Rick T.

W1RFI wrote:
>
> >From: tlbryant@my-deja.com (T. L. Bryant)
>
> >So now you're saying that K1ZZ hit <K3LT> with a stick at Dayton?
>
> Nothing said about it in the ARRL HQ rumor mill, nor were there any memos that
> if Larry shows up at HQ we should all hit him with a stick. In fact, such
> activities are pretty much forbidden by some general policy in the ARRL HQ
> employees manual.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

3107. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-10 21:27:20 UTC
From: tlbryant@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <964bno0244b@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 3457

In article <20010210074801.23230.00000022@ng-fm1.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com says...
>
>>From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
>
>>In any scenario where CW subbands are shared with phone
>>signals, CW will tend to lose out. Its only natural.
>
>Then you believe that CW is the less-robust mode.
>
>73,
>Ed Hare, W1RFI

I didn' think that there was anything such thing as a "CW sub-band". I thought that CW was permitted on all amateur bands.

3108. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-10 21:29:47 UTC
From: tlbryant@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <964bsb1244b@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 3458

In article <20010210074908.23230.00000023@ng-fm1.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com says...
>
>>From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
>
>>I believe the FCC should always make liberal use of grandfathering
>>of privileges, just so hams like myself, who don't have a problem
>>accepting a challenge, don't have to be bothered to listen to the
>>whining!
>
>Would it also put an end to your whining about whining?
>
>73,
>Ed Hare, W1RFI

Larry would find something else to whine about. I think it's his favorite hobby next to beeping.

3109. Re: Calling the "Roll"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-10 21:39:34 UTC
From: tlbryant@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <964cem2244b@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 3459

In article <3A85431A.154777B2@arrl.org>, jbloom@arrl.org says...
>
>Just to keep track, I thought we could use a list of classes of people
>that irritate Larry, as evidenced by recent NG postings:
>
>(1) Hams who haven't taken a code test (e.g., not "Real Hams").
>(2) Hams who have an Extra without a 20 WPM test (e.g., "PseudoExtras").
>(3) People who think (1) and (2) are real hams/Extras (e.g.,
>"Politically Correct whiners").
>(4) Ten-Ten members. ("Collectively, proof that any idiot can pick up a
>microphone and talk.")
>(5) Everyone at ARRL HQ except Ed (although stay tuned: Ed is teetering
>on the brink).
>(6) "The majority of hams utilizing 'high-speed digital modes.'"
>(7) "People hired under Affirmative Action programs."
>...more to come, no doubt. That's only a couple days' worth.
>
>We could shorten the list dramatically by just making it:
>(1) Anyone who's not Larry.
>But that wouldn't be as much fun!
>
>Jon

I can think of one to add to your list; Anyone who has a naughty callsign, such as K5TIT.

3110. Re: Calling the "Roll"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-10 21:41:24 UTC
From: tlbryant@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <964ci43244b@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 3460

In article <aLfh6.6131$ZJ5.537204@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>,
w8ing2001@yahoo.com says...
>
>Ya left two out...
>
>Happy New Year, Everyone (No, I'm not back)...I needed to see if I could
>find Phil Kane's email address.
>
>--
>73 de W5TIT - Kim

Whoops! I posted the wrong callsign. Sorry, Kim.

3111. Re: I heard a CB'er on 20 meters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-10 21:58:34 UTC
From: tlbryant@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <964dia4244b@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 3461
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner

In article <t8b1iuo38fvfda@corp.supernews.com>, not@aol.com says...
>
>Discussing controversial subjects! Gee sounds like "no political dissent
>allowed!"
>Of course Hams will willingly bend their knee and kiss ass.
>Freebanders will carry on and will remain THE LAST BEST HOPE FOR FREEDOM!!!

Have you ever heard of the Liberty Net? Those guys certainly don't bend their knees and kiss ass.

>btw most freebanders have equal knowledge in electronics and SUPERIOR
>knowledge of human freedom.

I wouldn't know, since I don't know any freebanders.

>....act irresponsibly and break the law.
>Adolf Hitler-1935

Hmmm...You preach freedom, yet quote someone whose entire life was devoted to depriving others of their freedom.

3112. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-10 23:08:15 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A85C9DF.BCDCFD69@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3462

"T. L. Bryant" wrote:
> Larry would find something else to whine about. I think it's his favorite hobby
> next to beeping.

Wonder if Larry can whine in Morse code? :-)
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

3113. Re: I heard a CB'er on 20 meters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-10 23:58:23 UTC
From: Kathy <"John or Kathy Ryding"@southwind.net>
Message-ID: <3A85D586.DAB6847@southwind.net>
Source record: 3463
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner

Well said.

By the way, who is "Ken"? and if freebanders are so mature, why are they ignoring the FCC, breaking the law, and putting all of our frequencies in jeopardy, ham, CB, and freebander? Doesn't sound all that mature to me.

Rev. John A. Ryding
WW0H

3114. Re: ARRL HQ "Attitude" (Was: Re: Pride)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 00:23:04 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nospam.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.g8k7tv2.pminews@ca.news.verio.net>
Source record: 3464

On 09 Feb 2001 12:15:55 GMT, W1RFI wrote:

>Perhaps others here who have visited HQ can share their
>experiences, to confirm or contrast the bad one that you appear
>to have had.

I have had nothing but good experiences with HQ staff people,
starting with Dick Baldwin and going up to the present time,
both in my too-few visits to HQ and when I met them "in the
field".

They may not have always agreed with me (ask Steve Mansfield
about our heated differences on the Feingold Bill) but we never
failed to show mutual respect for each other.

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP
ARRL Volunteer Counsel
ARRL Volunter Consulting Engineer
ARRL Life Member

3115. Re: Calling the "Roll"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 00:23:56 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <964m2nuai1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 3465

In article <3A85431A.154777B2@arrl.org>,
Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote:
> Just to keep track, I thought we could use a list of classes of people
> that irritate Larry, as evidenced by recent NG postings:
>
> (1) Hams who haven't taken a code test (e.g., not "Real Hams").
> (2) Hams who have an Extra without a 20 WPM test (e.g.,
"PseudoExtras").
> (3) People who think (1) and (2) are real hams/Extras (e.g.,
> "Politically Correct whiners").
> (4) Ten-Ten members. ("Collectively, proof that any idiot can pick up
a
> microphone and talk.")
> (5) Everyone at ARRL HQ except Ed (although stay tuned: Ed is
teetering
> on the brink).
> (6) "The majority of hams utilizing 'high-speed digital modes.'"
> (7) "People hired under Affirmative Action programs."
> ...more to come, no doubt. That's only a couple days' worth.
>
> We could shorten the list dramatically by just making it:
> (1) Anyone who's not Larry.
> But that wouldn't be as much fun!
>
> Jon

Jon, now let's be fair to Larry. He does have some favorite people.
For instance, he once posted that his favorite Black on the bus was the
driver. Because he was the only one with a job.

Brian

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

3116. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 00:39:56 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <964n0sutc1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 3466

In article <3A84C85A.F68FD2DA@ovis.net>,
Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net> wrote:
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > In article <3A83F6F1.FFE2535@ovis.net>,
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net> wrote:
> >
> > I'd
> > > describe your perception of amateur radio reality with a term from
> > > ionospheric propagation: skewed path.
> > >
> > > Dave K8MN
> >
> > Likewise, you seem to hang with what I consider some of the wrong
> > elements in amateur radio. You follow the ground wave.
> >
> > Sent via Deja.com
> > http://www.deja.com/
>
> I'm proud to "hang" with the element I'm associated with. They are
good
> ops and active ones. I've been walking the walk and, as far as I can
> tell, you pretty much just talk the talk. That you consider some of
my
> friends "the wrong elements" speaks volumes.
>
> Dave K8MN

Then you are in complete disagreement with some of your other ground
wavers, except in one respect: you are all arrogant. Good Ops or not,
you're rather shitty to other hams on here.

Jim Kelley thinks I have nothing to say, you say I speak "volumes." Why
don't you two huddle, then get back to me. I'm almost curious which way
you'll decide.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

3117. Re: Morse Code replacement? Bigtime flame war article!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 00:49:51 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <964njevbq1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 3467

In article <963b1c02dgu@enews4.newsguy.com>,
tlbryant@my-deja.com (T. L. Bryant) wrote:
> In article <20010210003936.13655.00003462@nso-mq.aol.com>,
yodoc@aol.comnospam
> says...
> >
> >In article <95vf0povn1@nnrp1.deja.com>, Brian
<brianburke@my-deja.com>
> >writes:
> >
> >>
> >>Reminds me of 10-10. I worked a guy in Florida when I was stationed
in
> >>Nebraska. Then I worked him again from Guam and he told me I was a
> >>dupe. When I tried working him from my new duty assignment in
Illinois,
> >>he kind of got perturbed with me.
> >
> >Brian:
> >
> >Ah, yes, the 10-10 club. You just ran into the very attitude which
> >has made me an avid "no-phoner" ever since! The Ten-Ten
organization,
> >and all of its drooling, toothless, slack-jawed, knuckle-dragging,
> >mouth-breathing, bottom-feeding members are, collectively, proof
> >that any idiot can pick up a microphone and talk -- and most
> >idiots do!
> >
> >73 de Larry, K3LT
>
> I didn't realize exchanging 10-10 numbers was restricted to phone.
Must be
> something in 10-10 International's charter that I missed.

Makes me wonder what they are actually doing during the 10-10 CW
contest. ;)

My comment was directed toward the single-mindedness of collecting
10x numbers, and the inability to ragchew by a few of the herd. Not
anything pro or con about modes.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

3118. Re: Morse Code replacement? Bigtime flame war article!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 00:51:39 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <964nmqvkr1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 3468

In article <3a85557d.138035384@news2.dvol.com>,
kelly@dvol (Brian Kelly, w3rv) wrote:
> On Fri, 09 Feb 2001 22:50:31 GMT, Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
> wrote:
>
> >> Don't bring that sumbitch to Bookbinders for the RV/EY lobsterfest,
> >> he'll never make it back to Allentown.
> > >
> > >You sound like a bad man.
> > >
> > . . I can provide references . .
> > >
> > >"When you've worked over a FIST, you've worked over a friend!"
> > >
> > Squiggy doesn't qualify as either.

Why not?

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

3119. Re: Morse Code replacement? Bigtime flame war article!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 00:54:02 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <964nr8$vm5$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 3469

In article <963n8d$e9v$1@208.206.142.95>,
Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>
>
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > "When you've worked over a FIST, you've worked over a friend!"
>
> So when did you OR Carl ever work a FIST?

Did you get your bills in the mail on time or are you still making late
payments?

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

3120. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 01:32:58 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010210203258.02997.00002158@nso-mg.aol.com>
Source record: 3471

In article <ej1h6.161$HH5.977545@news.ntplx.net>, "Ed Hare, W1RFI"
<w1rfi@arrl.net> writes:

>Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com> wrote:
>
>> In 1959 as I recall it was still about half SSB, half AM. I don't
>> think AM was anywhere near gone by 1962.
>
>It was not. Even by 1968, AM was far from dead in the Amateur Radio
>Service.

All true - but that's not the point.

When AM was the predominant voice mode on the HF/MF ham bands, an SWL could tune across almost any of the 'phone parts of those bands and find ham QSOs that were easy to tune in and easy to understand. Many hams of the that era tell of discovering ham radio by accidentally coming across hams using AM.

When SSB took over the prime spot, and AM became less common, the chances of that sort of thing happening decreased markedly. And to find the remaining AM hams, an SWL had to crawl through lots of SSB signals. End result: What was once a good source of new hams was greatly reduced.
>
>> Further, most of the SW receivers of the day had a BFO (even the cheapie
>$29.95 Heathkit AR-3)
>> which made SSB copy possible.

The AR-3 had a "reflex" BFO - the first audio stage was made to oscillate. The results were far from optimum.

I had the predecessor AR-2 receiver, which had a separate BFO. It was not a very good SSB receiver.

A WW2 surplus "Command set" receiver was much better. But SWLs rarely used those.

> I think that any SWL worth his salt could still listen to hams...

Sure - but there were not as many that were EASY to listen to. That's the point. It must be remembered that the unskilled SWL probably didn't know to turn on the BFO, turn down the RF gain, turn up the AF gain and tune very slowly. And most of the inexpensive receivers of that time would win the Zelda Fitzgerald award for stability.
>
>My SWLing was with an old Zenith Transoceanic receiver. I don't recall it
>having a BFO.

Those things are prized items today. 1L6s are even more prized.
>
>> I think it was 1962 or 1963 when I bought my first SSB rig, a Heathkit
>> HW-22 40 meter monoband transceiver. The price was around $112 bucks
>> (I think - check your QST collection), in any case it was cheaper than
>> most of the AM stuff at the time...
>
>I bought my used DX-40 for about $35.00, and later a used DX-100 for $75.00.
>The DX-100 modulator made a great guitar amp. :-)

Pair of 1625s. Not a Marshall, but nice.
>
>> Why would a small fee stop a prospective ham who likely will spend ten
>> times that amount on his radios...
>
>Most commercial HF transceivers today cost about $1000, in round numbers.
>Lets assume the average ham spends another $1000 on the rest of his or her
>station. Would a "small fee" of $100 today, to take the conservative
>number, based on your 10%, stop a number of people from becoming hams?

Particularly when the tests were previously FREE?
>
>> This is certainly a possible reason. Most of the fun of ham radio
>> without the test. Food for thought: Did CB do to ham radio in the 60s
>> what the Internet is doing to ham radio today...

It was worse.
>
>What percentage of those CBers went on to become hams? I did.
>
I never touched the dern things. Went straight to ham radio.

>> >TV watching increased all through the '50s and '60s.
>
>> How does that explain the sudden stop in '62?

All of those factors were slowly increasing their effects on ham radio growth.
>
>And TV watching increased through the 70s and 80s, too, a time of steady
>growth in amateur radio.

But the novelty was gone. When TV was new, it was a big deal, but the viewing
was limited by the limited number of stations and the limited time they were on
the air. TV was expensive and many areas did not have good TV coverage. By the
early '60s, the prices had dropped, stations were everywhere and "almost 24/7"
telecasting was starting to show up. (I remember when seeing a "test pattern"
on TV was common, and listening to the national anthem as the station signed
off after the 11 pm news. That's all gone).

Point is that a new thing like TV eats up people's spare time, money and
interest for awhile. Then, as it becomes commonplace, it fades into the fabric
of life.

PCs and the Internet are doing the same thing. Eventually home computers and internet connections will be as common as TV, if not more so.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3121. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 01:32:59 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010210203259.02997.00002159@nso-mg.aol.com>
Source record: 3470

In article <962bmo$1ggc$1@heap.juniper.net>, dennis@wawa.juniper.net (Dennis Ferguson) writes:

>Tentec also sells both an HF and a VHF transceiver that work this way.

I don't know about the VHF models, but the HF/MF ones are the Pegasus and Jupiter. They are actually the same basic unit - the Jupiter has a "front panel" with controls and the Pegasus needs a PC to control it. (The Pegasus has been called the "poor man's Kachina" by some).

But the receiver dynamic range (blocking and IMD) on them are not very good. The old Ten Tec Corsair 2, designed in the mid '80s, has much better performance in that area. The Elecraft K2 blows it away on those specs.

It's a matter of bells and whistles vs. genuine receiver performance. DSP filtering at the tail end of a receiver isn't going to fix overloading and intermod ahead of it. This is not new stuff - By Goodman wrote about it in 1957 ("What's Wrong With Our Present Receivers?")
>
>For transmitters it is in principle possible to avoid mixing stages
>altogether, instead generating the modulated RF directly using a
>DDS chip as the DSP's output device. Unfortunately, I discovered that
>the outputs of current DDS chips can have more spurs than a Texas saloon,
>so this may need to wait for another generation of the technology.

That basically says it all. DDS spurs will also cause all sorts of receiver spurious responses, too.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3122. Re: Engineers, Technicians, and Appliance Operators

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 02:47:20 UTC
From: "Steven J Robeson", K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <964ufn$4pv$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 3472

In article <20010210145349.01651.00001389@nso-fp.aol.com>,
lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:

> This is an amateur radio policy newsgroup, not a health professional
> resume newsgroup.

Then why have YOU been posting my license numbers, Lennie? I sure
didn't.

Again, "rules" only apply to others...NOT to Lennie.

--
"It Could Be That Your Life's Only Meaning Is To Serve As A Warning To
Others Of How Bad It Could REALLY Be!"

"Just Remember...An Amateur Built The Ark, Engineers Built The Titanic"

PLEASE SEND PRIVATE E MAIL COMMENTS TO K4YZ@AOL.COM. RESPONSES TO THE
DEJA MAY OR MAY NOT BE RETRIEVED IN A TIMELY FASHION.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

3123. Re: Engineers, Technicians, and Appliance Operators

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 02:58:06 UTC
From: "Steven J Robeson", K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <964v3s$57i$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 3473

In article <20010210145345.01651.00001388@nso-fp.aol.com>,
lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:

> Chatanooga has no electronics industry? Nothing closer than
> 3 hours distance? Seems strange considering the east coasters
> have been bragging for years about being the center for all the
> "good" industries.

It's Chattanooga. No, I am afraid that Chattanooga doesn't yet
have the concentration of electronics inductry that Atlanta does. I am
sure, however, when many of them tire of the bumper-to-bumper traffic
and being afraid to go anywhere without armed escort, Chattanooga will
catch the overflow.

> Purchasing agents must be making bundles of money now!

I wouldn't call it bundles, but ANTEC's stock falterings are not a
complete view of it's performance.

Again, like your "views" of Ham Radio, you look from the outside
in and make poorly substantiated judgements on that. Oh well. Nothing
we haven't become accustomed to.

>Not a callsign you can use for bragging rights but you can,
>literally, take it to the bank.

I already DO have "bragging rights", Lennie. In more than one
field of endeavour.

G'night, Lennie. Mrs A has your dose of Geritol ready.

--
"It Could Be That Your Life's Only Meaning Is To Serve As A Warning To
Others Of How Bad It Could REALLY Be!"

"Just Remember...An Amateur Built The Ark, Engineers Built The Titanic"

PLEASE SEND PRIVATE E MAIL COMMENTS TO K4YZ@AOL.COM. RESPONSES TO THE
DEJA MAY OR MAY NOT BE RETRIEVED IN A TIMELY FASHION.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

3124. Re: Morse Code replacement? Bigtime flame war article!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 03:30:48 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <so1c8tgpiccr6j8i0oqf078cscthc2b9gu@4ax.com>
Source record: 3474

Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com> wrote:
>Apparently, according to Hans, FISTS members work you once, get your
>number, and are more than happy to send you on your way.

While I am not a contester or DXer, I see no harm in collecting
numbers. What harm is there in giving someone a number if that's all
that he wants?

>Can it be than idiots can pick up a paddle?

I think that there are likely just as many idiot hams on CW as there
are on phone. Thankfully the mode makes it difficult to act like one
when your using it... :-)

3125. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 03:30:50 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <hl1c8tohgfgv8gjs4gdmdncnq8kpptf9cr@4ax.com>
Source record: 3475

w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:
>I own an old Ten Tec OMNI D, built in the early 80s. Do you think most hams of
>that day would have fixed it themselves, or sent it to the factory?

I said that I think that most hams of the *50's* could fix their own
gear. Things had somewhat changed by the 80's. I've never seen the
inside of an Omni D, but if it is non-digital and has discrete
components, I think that I could probably fix about anything that
would go wrong with it. Am I the average ham...

3126. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 03:41:29 UTC
From: billsohl@mindspring.com
Message-ID: <3a85f86a.8773309@news.mindspring.com>
Source record: 3477

On 8 Feb 2001 04:22:55 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

>Bill Sohl wrote:
>
>> > So you don't believe that radiotelegraphy is the most simple, easily
>> >implemented means of radio communication yet devised?
>>
>> Not so at all. I agree with that statement, I don't agree that
>> anyone needs to be knowledgeable in the USE of morse
>> to be considered accomplished in the radio arts (be it
>> technically or on an operational basis). Indeed, for Dick's
>> claim to be valid one would then want to question why
>> engineering schools have never required even a working knowledge
>> of the morse code itself before graduating engineers.
>
> Ah, so now because engineers aren't required to know Morse code is
>reason enough for hams to not know it either. Pure logic, we see.

Far more logical than anything claimed as a justification
as to why ONLY hams should be required to have
such knowledge.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3127. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 03:41:30 UTC
From: billsohl@mindspring.com
Message-ID: <3a85fa38.9235618@news.mindspring.com>
Source record: 3476

On Thu, 08 Feb 2001 03:50:40 GMT, Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
wrote:

>"Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net> wrote:
>> IMHO, the very survival of our Service could depend on the number
>>of hams who learn enough about new technology to stay relevant.
>
>Unless you intend to leave out the lay people, it is unrealistic to
>believe that average hams can keep up with current technology to the
>extent that they can advance the state of the art, or be of any value
>to the military. And if they can't do those things, what good are they
>to the government (as they once were)...

A point that some hams don't seem to understand or
ackowledge. Well said!

>>survival may also depend on the number of hams who say "***NO***!!!" to
>>learning that new technology, too.
>
>These non-technical hams just might save the hobby by providing
>emergency communications, something that is still valuable to the
>government...

Agree completely.

>>Riley Hollingsworth has been telling hams that we should not let Amateur
>>Radio become obsolete under our watch.
>
>Unfortunately Riley has been trying to get us to stop fighting amongst
>ourselves and to stop profaning the airwaves. Technical stuff seems to
>be a secondary problem for him these days..

Has anyone, other than some hams, made any complaint
regarding the technical ability of hams today? That is
clearly a non-issue for the FCC and other non-ham folks.
In contrast, the garbage that some hams spout on the
air can be heard by anyone. I applaud Riley's
efforts because there's certainly nothing that Riley
would be involved in regarding the techhnical issues.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3128. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 03:41:32 UTC
From: billsohl@mindspring.com
Message-ID: <3a85fb23.9470611@news.mindspring.com>
Source record: 3478

On 08 Feb 2001 23:36:09 GMT, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:

>>From: Aaron Jones nomail@nomail.com
>
>>Unless you intend to leave out the lay people, it is unrealistic to
>>believe that average hams can keep up with current technology to the
>>extent that they can advance the state of the art, or be of any value
>>to the military. And if they can't do those things, what good are they
>>to the government (as they once were)...
>
>I don't think the number of hams who advance the state of the art has ever been
>very high. But the number of hams today who have a fundamental grasp of modern
>communications technology is smaller than it was in years past, IMHO.

I agree Ed and that is more the function of the greater
amount of information/knowledge it takes to have
that fundamental grasp today vs the old CW and AM
only days.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3129. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 04:14:33 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net>
Message-ID: <3A8611A9.F6CCB653@ovis.net>
Source record: 3479

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3A853802.3790D3CB@ovis.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net> writes:
>
> >> Feel free to keep on thinking you Know What Is Funny! :-)
> > >
> > >A situation containing incongruity is funny. We laugh at the
> > >incongruous. You occasionally make me laugh, Len. I'm positive that
> > >the humor isn't intentional on your part.
>
> Ja, Herr Obersturmbandsfuhrer, it is nice to know that even the
> high-ranking superior ones are able to enjoy life and find
> amusements.
>
> Gruss Gott and didit

That's a real knee slapper, Len! Keep the yuks coming. Have any
amateur radio related material?

Dave K8MN

3130. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 04:21:11 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <ol4c8tc4s9mfoffc7p05co38dvrh07029m@4ax.com>
Source record: 3480

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>The AR-3 had a "reflex" BFO - the first audio stage was made to oscillate.
>The results were far from optimum.

SWLs could listen to ham SSB on one if they wanted...

>the unskilled SWL probably didn't know to turn on the BFO,
>turn down the RF gain, turn up the AF gain and tune very
>slowly.

I think that you underrate SWLs who spend hours at
their receivers and know them well, perhaps even
better than a (gasp) ham... :-)

>Eventually home computers and internet connections
>will be as common as TV, if not more so.

Eventually TV and the Internet will be the same thing...

3131. Re: Calling the "Roll"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 04:21:55 UTC
From: kelly@dvol
Message-ID: <3a8612ad.186470847@news2.dvol.com>
Source record: 3481

On Sat, 10 Feb 2001 18:28:22 GMT, "Kim" <w8ing2001@yahoo.com> wrote:

>
>Happy New Year, Everyone (No, I'm not back)..
>
Whew: Thought for a minute that you might be back.
>--
>73 de W5TIT - Kim
>

3132. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 04:34:43 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <9654p4$9eq$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 3483

In article <20010209185914.17176.00001513@nso-ba.aol.com>,
lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
> In article <961d5lcii1@nnrp1.deja.com>, n2ey@aol.com writes:
>
> >> That is an ESTIMATE.
> >
> >Yes, it is. It's also true - the FCC renewed 4,870 Technician and
> >Technician Plus licenses in that time period, and reclassified the
Tech
> >Pluses as Technicians. The holders of the licenses - the licensees -
> >are responsible for maintaining proof that they have been code tested
> >if they want to retain their HF privileges.
> >
> >This stuff is all explained on the Speroni site. Your failure to
> >include it in your analysis is a serious error that reduces your
> >credibility.
> >
> >> By using personal estimates based only
> >> on "gut feeling" or something, you are yourself in ERROR.
> >
> >My estimate is not based on "gut feeling". It is based on a thorough
> >knowledge of the information, the applicable regulations and basic
math
> >as applied to statistics. It's a fair estimate.
> >
> >Your analysis did not include the fact that the FCC is renewing Tech
> >Plus licenses as Technicians, and that by doing so, one cannot
> >equate "Technician license" with "non-code-tested licensee". By
> >improperly putting code-tested Technicians in the non-code-tested
> >category, you overstate their number and understate the number of
code
> >tested licensees.
>
> I didn't mention at all the renewals of Tech-Plus to Tech because
> the exact number of such renewals weren't listed except by
> inference on the Speroni tabulation of Renewed licenses.

It's easy to figure them out, though.

The AH0A site lists renewals by class. Looking at those results, we see
Tech Plus renewals at the rate of several hundred per month, and Tech
renewals at the rate of 1 or two per month until April, 2000. Then, in
April 2000, the number of Tech and Tech plus renewals is almost equal
(339 Tech Plus vs. 332 Tech). In May 200, the trend reverses - Tech
renewals suddenly jump to several hundred per month, and Tech plus drop

to a few per month.

It's clear what happened: On April 15, the FCC started renewing Tech Pluses as Techs.

Last time I looked, the FCC would not renew a ham license unless it was within 90 days of expiring. Since the Tech lost its code test on Feb 14, 2001, no Technicians were eligible for renewal until Nov 16, 2000 (90 days before Feb 14, 2001).

So ALL renewals of Tech or Tech Plus from April to October 2000 are Tech Plus renewals. The renewals of November and December 2000 are a mixture of Tech and Tech Plus renewals.

The total number of Tech Plus to Tech renewals from mid April 2000 to October 2000 is 3303. That number represents a lower bound on the number of Tech Pluses that the FCC renewed as Techs during the time you cited. The actual number is higher because of additional Tech Plus to Tech renewals in November and December of 2000.
>
> I did as stated, taking the overall monthly numbers of licensees in
> each class, separating code-tested from non-code-tested..

No, you did not. You equated "Technician license" with "non-code-tested licensee". The two are NOT equivalent, as has been demonstrated.

There are at least 3303 Technicians who are code tested because they are renewals from Tech Plus, as the above analysis proves. The actual number is much higher because November and December of 2000 are left out of the total. In addition, there are an unknown number of Technicians who have passed the code test but who had not upgraded during the cited time period because they hadn't passed the written yet.

End result is that you miscategorized several thousand code-tested licensees as non-code-tested, even though the data to properly categorize them was readily available from the same source.
>
> I could have gone into an extensive "analysis" by including
> numbers of Expirations of licenses (also tabulated) and doing
> all sorts of second-guessing on the "why" of such. I did not.

No, that wasn't necessary at all. The information needed is on the renewals page.

And we haven't even mentioned vanity call renewals, which are shown separately.
>
> The FCC renewal shift of Tech-Plus to Tech would put such
> Tech-Plus licensees in the CODE-TESTED group, would it
> not?

Nope. See above. FCC expects Tech Pluses who renew to keep some sort of record that they are code-tested on their own. An old license is

adequate.

> The old Technician-Plus class required a code test for a
> license.

True.

> In order to separate code-tested from non-code-tested,
> I made an additional posting regarding the 27 months between
> the start of 1998 and the end of March 2000.

Which has no effect on the errors in your analysis of the period
following the restructuring.

> That additional
> listing excluded any "renewal" shifts from Tech-Plus to Tech.

There were no such shifts before April 15, 2000.

> The results are still the same -
>
> The total number of code-tested US ARS licensees is decreasing.
> The number of non-code-tested US ARS licensees is increasing.
> It has been that way for over three years..

Nobody questions that. The probelm is that you unnecessarily misstate
both the increase in "non-code-tested" and the decrease in "code-
tested" by a very significant percentage.
>
> <snip>
>
> >End result is that your numbers are way off.
>
> No.

Yes, they are way off.

> I am not ASSUMING anything about "renewals" or expirations
> or anything else,

Yes, you are. You are assuming that ALL Technicians are "noncodetested"
even though it is clear that thousands of them ARE "codetested".

> just showing the totals of code-tested versus
> non-code-tested over the last two-plus years plus the number of
> NEW licensees, code-tested versus non-code-tested.

The original numbers posted were derived from the totals, not from new
licenses.
>
> If you start assuming some condition, your "analysis" changes
> to mere SPECULATION.

Not at all. Every analysis assumes some conditions. You assume that the
Speroni data is correct, even though AH0A himself says it contains

anomalies. You assume that "Technician" always equals "noncodetested" even though plenty of proof exists to the contrary in thousands of cases.

> That is no longer any valid analysis.

Estimating is a valid analysis tool.
>
> >How do you know? What is faulty in my estimate? I clearly
> >said "SUPPOSE" - that makes it hypothetical.
>
> Speculation is still speculation. Such is not analysis.

It's an estimate, not a speculation.

> >
> If you are really picky about smoothing methods, feel free to
> pick out any period you want...but quit trying to say "everything
> is faulty." :-)

I'm not saying everything is faulty. Just some of your methods.
>
> >The number of new Technician licenses proves one thing: Most people
> >starting out in ham radio do so by getting a Technician license.
>
> How do you KNOW that?

Simple: Most new licenses are granted to new hams. Most new licenses are Techncian licenses.

> All I see is the number of licenses granted
> for particular classes.

Sure. Just look at the "new licenses" page on the AH0A site. It's right there.

> Aren't there any "Extra-out-of-the-box"
> licensees? Aren't there any "General-out-of-the-box" licensees?

Sure - plenty of them. See the above page. But the most new licenses are Technicians. Nobody disputes that.
>
> >The
> >data does not tell how many of those new licensees later upgrade,
> >because upgrades are lumped into "modifications".
>
> None of the publicly-available FCC databases predicts the future.

It's not the future that is in question. It's how many upgrades have occurred in a given time period. The Speroni site doesn't say.
>
> Can you predict the future? I can't.

I can make reasonable predictions based on past information and
experience.

>I don't have crystal balls.

I have no idea what that is supposed to mean.
>
> >> but the trend is for
> >> NEW Tech licensees still growing after January 2001.
> >
> >That's an ESTIMATE on your part. Nobody knows what the renewal rate
> >will be like until they actually start to expire.
>
> Sure, trends are ESTIMATEs. :-)

Then you ARE predicting the future when you make statements like the
one above.

> One plots past data and gets a
> "curve" which may be a sort-of-straight line or something that is
> curved. That estimate may be continued into the NEAR future for
> a few months with some element of certainty.

Unless the conditions change in that time period. Like the fact that
the first post-Feb-14-1991 Technician licenses will start to expire
very soon.
>
> It is better than picking fly droppings out of pepper to get the
> number of Tech-Plusses renewed as Techs,

I have no idea what that is supposed to mean. The numbers are right on
the Speroni site. You ignored them - I didn't.

> the number of
> Advanceds that were dropped to a lower grade for any reason,

I know of no loss of amateur license grade as part of FCC rules for the
past 50 years except for the renewals of Tech Pluses as Techs since
April 15, 2001. Do you have any such information?

> or any number of "modifications."

Those are on the Speroni site, too.

> You can go to great lengths
> to attempt "proving" something in the multi-tiered US amateur
> licensing system.

All I'm doing is pointing out some easily-avoided errors in your
methods.

> The only way you can REALLY "prove" your
> numbers is to download the FCC databases yourself and make
> your own search program to find EXACTLY what you are looking
> for to show those #$%&!!! no-coders they are "all wrong." :-)

I have no idea what you are talking about, Len. I'm just pointing out
some easily-avoided errors in your methods.
>
> >That's simply not correct. I don't "wish" for a 5% dropout rate -
> >I "wish" it would be 0%. The 5% is just a highly-educated guess, and
> >identified as such.
>
> Ah, "highly eductated!"

Yep. Always looking to learn more, though.

> Presumably there is some certificate or
> diploma attesting to such ability?

Yep - got a couple of them.

> I'd still call it a plain GUESS and lump it under speculation.

Why? I have shown the exact methodology and used the same source. 3303
is a clear, absolute lower bound on the number of "codetested"
Techncians.
>
> >By ignoring the fact that no Technician licenses have expired yet,
your
> >analysis is even more faulty. My estimate is closer to the facts than
> >yours because it includes relevant corrections. My method is simply
> >more accurate.
>
> It is "more accurate" from the pro-coder's viewpoint.

No. It's more accurate, period.

> It is "more accurate" because you said so. :-)

No, it's more accurate because the method takes into account relevant
data that your method ignores. The errors introduced by your methods
and assumptions are significant.
>
> >It was identified as a "suppose". You ignored the whole expiration
> >thing completely. My analysis is more correct because the relevant
> >factors are included, and estimates identified as such.
>
> It is "more accurate" from the pro-coder's viewpoint.

No, it's more accurate, period.

> It is "more accurate" because you said so. :-)

No, it's more accurate because the method is better.
>
> >You have no idea how many will expire and how many will renew,
either.
>
> Absolutely true...and I NEVER PRESUMED TO KNOW THE
> FUTURE. All I stated was a Trend based on PAST data.

Stating a trend IS predicting the future, Len, because you assume the
trend will continue.
>
> >My estimates are accurate within the limits stated. My analysis is
more
> >accurate than yours. Much more accurate.
>
> >The trend is that most new hams start out with Technician licenses.
> >That's been the trend for over a decade. Some upgrade, some don't.
> >Describing all Technicians as "non-code-tested licensees" is simply
not
> >correct or accurate.
>
> The US Technician class amateur radio license test did NOT
> include a morse code test element...ergo, the Technician class
> license can be considered "non-code-tested." That is what I said.

No. You said "non-code-tested" LICENSEES. Not the same thing as
LICENSES. If it was one time, I'd mark it up to a typo, but it was
repeated.

And the current Technician DOES provide for code testing. A ham who
gets a Tech and then passes the code test has Novice/Tech Plus HF
privileges.
>
> >I'm not denying any trends. I'm just stating the facts and pointing
out
> >your errors. Which of my facts is not true?
>
> Some of your "facts" were simply SPECULATIONS.

No, they were reasonable estimates.

> One even
> had the imprimateur of "highly educated."

It's an accurate description.

> Speculations aren't
> true or untrue, but they sure as hell aren't "facts."

They are estimates, not speculations. And only a few of my facts are
estimates.
>
> >10 months of data are available, so why not include them? The longer
> >the baseline, the more accurate the extrapolation or interpolation.
>
> Oh, geez louise.

I have no idea what that is supposed to mean.

> Jim, if you want to Show The World The Errors
> Of The Uncoded, go do your own arithmetic and post the results.

I found an arithmetic error in your calculations, too.
>
> >Basing conclusions on the 10 months of data following the
restructuring
> >is, by definition, more accurate and correct than basing them on the
9
> >months of data following the restructuring.
>
> No sh*t?

Why the vulgarity, Len?

>Is that from the "highly educated" school or something?

I've been to a couple of schools and got some diplomas. Is that a bad
thing?
>
> >> What about the two years PRIOR to restructuring?
> >
> >Different ballgame. Different license structure, different test
> >requirements, different dynamics. And the FCC was renewing Tech
Pluses
> >as Tech Pluses back then.
>
> No sh*t?

No reason for that, Len.

> In the period before restructuring too place, was there an
> increase in the code-tested license numbers and a decrease in the
> non-code-tested license numbers ???

Who said that? Not me. All I wrote is the FACT that the whole situation
changed with the restructuring.
>
> >Which tells us that most new hams start out with the Technician
> >license - as I have written many times. Upgrades are not shown as new
> >licenses in the Speroni data. Upgrades are not shown separately in
the
> >Speroni data, either.
>
> I don't think downgrades are shown either...but they exist in the
> FCC database files.

There is a difference between a database error and a change in license
class that is part of the regs.

> As I have suggested before, go download
> your own database files and do searching for whatever data you
> want to "prove" something. They are ASCII files and searchable
> with a text-based search program.

I'm not trying to "prove" anything, Len. Just pointing out some
avoidable errors in your posts. Is that wrong?

>
> >And the restructuring DID have an effect. Once the NPRM was
announced,
> >hams and prospective hams who kept up with the news knew that changes
> >were probably coming. Some of them would act accordingly, perhaps
> >delaying upgrading until the new license structure was known. After
the
> >late December 1999 R&O, those thinking about getting licenses or
> >upgrading knew what was on the way and acted accordingly. The exact
> >effects can only be guessed at, but there WERE effects.
> >
> >What do you think the above data says in terms of trends, beyond the
> >fact that most new hams today start out as Technicians?
>
> The above "data" paragraph is your own reporter-voice
description. :-)

I have no idea what that is suppoosed to mean.
>
> Not all new hams start out as Technicians.

No, but most do.

> In the 27 months
> between start of 1998 and end of March 2000 there were
> 1900 New Novice class licenses granted, 3,504 New Tech-Plus
> licenses granted, 459 New Generals, 78 New Advanced, and 68
> New Extra.

And your point is?

> Yes, Jim, "MOST" new hams probably DO start out
> as Technician class licensees (they aren't all job technicians,
> some may be engineers, housewives, plumbers, etc.). :-)

I have no idea what that is supposed to mean. What is a "job
technician"?
>
> >"And it is to be expected that the easiest-to-get US amateur radio
> >license will have large numbers of licensees."
> >
> >That's better. I apologize for being vague in that statement the
first
> >time.
>
> Are you absolutely SURE of the first sentence above?

As sure as I am of anything related to the subject.

> After all,
> the FCC is renewing Tech-Plusses who don't re-test on renewal
> as Technicians,

That's correct. Read the regs and look at the Speroni data. Ask any Tech Plus who renewed after April 15, 2000.

> and "many" of the existing Techs will drop out,

That's not what I wrote. 5% per year is not "many" - it's one in 20.

> and aliens might invade the earth to be repulsed by morse code.

Never claimed that at all. What IS your problem with Morse code, Len?

> Or at least repulsed by long-time morsemen who will fight
> change (of any kind) to a moral, mortal end. :-)

I have no idea what that is supposed to mean.

The whole code-test thing is a dead issue. FCC reduced the code test for a US ham license to the absolute bare minimum under the treaty back in April. Their comments, and their actions for the past 20+ years make it clear that the treaty is the only reason they kept 5 wpm testing. Unless FCC decides to ignore the treaty, no more reduction will occur until the treaty changes.

Sure I'm "pro-code". I like the mode - for me and many other hams, it's lots of fun, efficient, effective, and has lots of good features. Is there something wrong with that?

N2EY
FISTS #4360
BIT #0001

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

3133. Re: Morse Code replacement? Bigtime flame war article!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 04:38:49 UTC
From: kelly@dvol
Message-ID: <3a861468.186914703@news2.dvol.com>
Source record: 3482

On Sun, 11 Feb 2001 00:51:39 GMT, Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
wrote:

>> >"When you've worked over a FIST, you've worked over a friend!"
>> >
>> Squiggy doesn't qualify as either.
>
>Why not?
>
Squiggy doesn't have a fist, he couldn't communicate with dots &
dashes if his life or anybody else's life depended on that ability, he
advocates elimination of all subands, he advocates the use or wideband
digital modes on the HF ham bands and he goes off on anti-cw rants at
neighborhood ham club meetings (draws snores and doesn't go back). The
only time I'd do dinner with him would be if he was the guest of honor
and showed up on the platter with an apple stuffed in his mouth.
>
Get it yet?
>
>Sent via Deja.com
>http://www.deja.com/
>
w3rv

3134. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 04:41:23 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net>
Message-ID: <3A8617F3.C050F612@ovis.net>
Source record: 3484

Brian wrote:
>
> In article <3A84C85A.F68FD2DA@ovis.net>,
> Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net> wrote:
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > In article <3A83F6F1.FFE2535@ovis.net>,
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net> wrote:
> > >
> > > I'd
> > > > describe your perception of amateur radio reality with a term from
> > > > ionospheric propagation: skewed path.
> > > >
> > > > Dave K8MN
> > >
> > > Likewise, you seem to hang with what I consider some of the wrong
> > > elements in amateur radio. You follow the ground wave.
> > >
> > > Sent via Deja.com
> > > http://www.deja.com/
> >
> > I'm proud to "hang" with the element I'm associated with. They are
> good
> > ops and active ones. I've been walking the walk and, as far as I can
> > tell, you pretty much just talk the talk. That you consider some of
> my
> > friends "the wrong elements" speaks volumes.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> Then you are in complete disagreement with some of your other ground
> wavers, except in one respect: you are all arrogant. Good Ops or not,
> you're rather shitty to other hams on here.

What defines "arrogance", Brian. In what way do you perceive me as
arrogant? Is it because I don't share your beliefs or have disagreed
with you?

You've left out an important word prior to the words "other hams". The
word is "some". I give as I get generally. I think most people do.
I'm certain that you do not like or get along with everyone you meet in
life. Why should amateur radio be any different? I get along with most
people and like many people. I avoid some people and simply detest
others. Is it somehow different with you?

>
> Jim Kelley thinks I have nothing to say, you say I speak "volumes." Why
> don't you two huddle, then get back to me. I'm almost curious which way
> you'll decide.

If you have anything important to say, I don't think you've yet said it. I'm not Jim Kelley so you'll have wait for his reaction. My own opinion is that the chip I told you that you have on your shoulder has once again made an appearance. If you feel like the bastard child at the family reunion, do some self examination.

Dave K8MN

3135. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 05:33:18 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010211003318.10105.00001491@nso-bh.aol.com>
Source record: 3485

In article <8qq98tk287cm7ophn4v7mu6gjfpremimc1@4ax.com>, Aaron Jones
<nomail@nomail.com> writes:

>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>>it was not nearly so easy to listen to hams on SSB with the SWL sets of
>>the time as it was to listen to hams using AM.
>
>If an SWL couldn't figure out how to use a BFO to listen to SSB I
>doubt that he would make it as a ham back then...

I couldn't figure it out, but I "made it as a ham" in 1967.
>
>>It was $112 bucks or so for the rig itself,
>>then another $30-40 for the power supply.
>
>I didn't get the power supply. I made one from old TV set parts. It
>sported a couple of 5U4s. Great regulation... :-)

Yup.
>
>>And what you got was an SSB-only monoband rig
>
>I bought some parts (crystals and coils) from Heathkit that were
>designed for the 80 and 20 meter models. I used a few switches and
>presto it was a tri-band rig: 80, 40 and 20 meters...

That idea was made into an aftermarket kit by another company. Funny that Heath
didn't pick up on it and sell a triband HW-?2
>
>>that needed a 1:1 SWR (or close to it) to work.
>
>That was easily solved by putting a broadcast receiver type 360
>micky-mike (remember that word?) variable cap across the output which
>made it into a pi net, and then it would load almost anything...

It WAS a pinet - a fixed one.
>
>>On the other hand, a Novice could add a modulator to his MOPA CW rig and go
>on
>>AM easily and cheaply.
>
>I'll agree that AM was cheaper (using used old used gear). I was just
>saying that SSB didn't have to be all that expensive...

Sure - if you knew what you were doing and were willing to go whole-hog. But
one of the real virtues of the old technologies and license structure was the

incremental approach.

First, a prospective ham got a shortwave receiver and strung up some sort of antenna. Using that setup, the newcomer learned the code and got a feel for amateur procedures, propagation, and stuff like that. If the receiver was homemade or converted surplus, the newcomer learned some theory and practical skills in the process of building/converting it.

Once the new ham passed the Novice exam, it was time to set up a transmitter and T/R system, as well as an antenna that could transmit if that hadn't been doen already. There was a wait of many weeks between passing the tests and getting the license, too. The transmitter was usually quite simple because the Novice privileges were so limited.

When the Novice upgraded, he/she could take advantage of the new privileges by adding a VFO and possibly a modulator to the transmitter.

Improvements could be done incrementally at any time - better receiver, more powerful transmitter, etc. Sure, the gear was big and clunky and basic, but the new ham had a chance of understanding how it worked and in many cases had built or converted all or much of it, learning a lot in the process.

The SSB transceiver era changed all that.
>
>>Some folks used cathode or screen modulation, which
>>could be added for almost nothing. Sure, the efficiency was awful, but it
>got
>
>Remember the old Heathkit DX35 and it's "controlled carrier" (screen)
>modulation? I think it measured in the neighborhood of 25 watts AM.
>That really didn't cut it...

Actually it was more on the order of 10-15 watts carrier output on a good day. The DX-40 and DX-60 used the same system. I had a DX-20 for a time, then a Viking Adventurer, plus various homebrew and surplus rigs. Learned a lot from each one. Knew every wire and component in them by the time I sold or traded them away.
>
>>$4 was not a small fee in 1963. Many newcomers were teenagers, and the
>minimum
>>wage was maybe $1. So we're talking 4-5 hours minimum wage to take the test,
>>pass or fail. What's 4-5 hours of minimum wage today? More than $20.
>
>Do you really think that $20 would stop a teenager today from becoming
>a ham if that's what he wanted?

It would slow some of them down, particularly if the price was formerly $0. And if the test was not passed, it was "come back in 31 days and try again. Bring another $4, too."

>Have you priced some of the teenage toys these days...

I'm not there yet...
>
>BTW I was making $88.25 a week at Motorola in 1963 with a wife and
>soon to be kid. That $112 for the SSB rig was hard to cough up, but
>heck what's more important anyway... :-)

There ya go. You paid 127% of a week's wages for that thing. How much would
that be in today's money?
>
>>how many hams do you think went to Woodstock?
>
>Dunno. But I think the Woodstock populace might be an improvement over
>some of the characters I see at the ham swapmeets here... :-)

I'm not sure what you mean. One thing I know about the hamfest crowds - they
are NOT necessarily a cross-section of th ham population. Many of us have other
obligations on a Sunday morning.

Most of the reasons I cited were not of my own creation. They came from a 1963
QST editorial.
>
>>Some folks moaned back then that "ham radio was dying" because
>>there were only 250,000 hams and they were all getting older. And the new
>gear
>>was too complex, the tests were too hard, the ARRL was ruining everything,
>>etc., etc. Sound familiar?
>
> Yeah, but it's all true now,
> (except for the tests being hard)... :-)
>
I got my Extra in 1970 because I wanted all privileges and I figured that the
tests would not get easier. Ah, the folly of youth.....

73 de Jim, N2EY

3136. How do I cancel my League membership?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 06:16:51 UTC
From: bummer-radio@licensing.org
Message-ID: <goodbye@goodbye>
Source record: 3486
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

I find I can no longer support the ARRL by being a member. What's the best way to cancel a membership?

TNX 73 de Smiley

3137. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 06:23:24 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <48bc8tsvp94f20mba0ee781scads5lof5g@4ax.com>
Source record: 3487

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>You paid 127% of a week's wages for that thing [Heathkit SSB rig].

That SSB rig was cheaper than most of the available
new AM gear of the day...

>How much would that be in today's money?

It certainly points up the fact that ham rigs (in real dollars) are
much less expensive today...

>Most of the reasons I cited were not of my own creation.
>They came from a 1963 QST editorial.

A little late for the credits... :-)

>I got my Extra in 1970 because I wanted all privileges and I figured that the
>tests would not get easier. Ah, the folly of youth.....

I'm still waiting. At the present rate of change I should have my
privileges back in a few years free gratis... :-)

3138. Re: How do I cancel my League membership?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 06:33:08 UTC
From: Buzzsaw <"Catch Me."@edu.com>
Message-ID: <965bke$ko7$0@dosa.alt.net>
Source record: 3488
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Buy a CB....

"smiley o'riley" <bummer-radio@licensing.org> wrote in message
news:goodbye@goodbye...
>
> I find I can no longer support the ARRL by being a member. What's the
best
> way to cancel a membership?
>
> TNX 73 de Smiley

3139. Re: How do I cancel my League membership?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 06:56:27 UTC
From: "M. Schneider" <markinokla@juno.com>
Message-ID: <UPqh6.44$sp6.208@newsfeed.slurp.net>
Source record: 3489
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Try writing them a nice letter stating, due to diminished mental ability resulting in your involuntary commitment to a state mental hospital, that you are no longer able to function as a reasoning amateur radio operator, so would they please cancel your membership and return any refund so you can pay for the electro-shock treatments. I'm sure the League will be very understanding.

73,
Mark

"smiley o'riley" <bummer-radio@licensing.org> wrote in message news:goodbye@goodbye...
>
> I find I can no longer support the ARRL by being a member. What's the best
> way to cancel a membership?
>
> TNX 73 de Smiley

3140. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 07:52:08 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <965gb8$2j1$0@208.207.71.162>
Source record: 3490

Brian wrote:
>
> I
> Jim Kelley thinks I have nothing to say, you say I speak "volumes." Why
> don't you two huddle, then get back to me. I'm almost curious which way
> you'll decide.

Well? When someone speaks volumes and still says nothing.....

3141. Re: I heard a CB'er on 20 meters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 08:05:52 UTC
From: jeffreyh@Hawaii.Edu
Message-ID: <965h50hou1@news.hawaii.edu>
Source record: 3492
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner

In article <t896923k2b7a9f@corp.supernews.com>, h <not@aol.com> wrote:
>Lucky for me I grew up in a country where BRAVE MEN decided to break some
>laws in the year 1776!

Well, Ken, some time ago on rec.radio.cb, someone was encouraging the "gang" to use a particular group of HF frequencies for their free-banding. I thought the list of frequencies looked familiar, then it struck me that he had listed the trans-Pacific and trans-Atlantic HF air-to-ground channels that Aeronautical Radio, Inc., uses to track long-range commercial airline passenger flights. When I pointed that out to him, explaining that he could possibly be endangering lives by encouraging HF free-banders to utilize those frequencies, I was flamed to a crisp.

Break whatever laws you desire, but in doing so, don't infringe upon other people's welfare and well-being.

Jeff KH6O

3142. Re: How do I cancel my League membership?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 08:14:18 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010211031418.21689.00000459@ng-cr1.aol.com>
Source record: 3491

>From: bummer-radio@licensing.org (smiley o'riley)

>I find I can no longer support the ARRL by being a member. What's the best
>way to cancel a membership?

Contact the Circulation Department at ARRL HQ.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3143. Re: How do I cancel my League membership?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 08:18:20 UTC
From: jeffreyh@Hawaii.Edu
Message-ID: <965hscicd1@news.hawaii.edu>
Source record: 3496
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

smiley o'riley <bummer-radio@licensing.org> wrote:
>I find I can no longer support the ARRL by being a member. What's the best
>way to cancel a membership?
>TNX 73 de Smiley

0 2 4 6 8 10
/
/
/
/
/
/
/
/
TROLL-O-METER
(courtesy K0HB)

Jeff KH6O

3144. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 08:20:49 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010211032049.21689.00000461@ng-cr1.aol.com>
Source record: 3493

>From: Aaron Jones nomail@nomail.com

>I said that I think that most hams of the *50's* could fix their own
>gear. Things had somewhat changed by the 80's.

Okay, as long as we agree that we are discussing a 20-year old "problem."

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3145. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 08:21:32 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010211032132.21689.00000462@ng-cr1.aol.com>
Source record: 3494

>From: Aaron Jones nomail@nomail.com

>Am I the average ham...

No one knows for sure. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3146. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 08:28:27 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010211032827.21689.00000463@ng-cr1.aol.com>
Source record: 3495

>From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

>????? Wake up, Ed. He compared a 5 watt CW signal with a KW SSB.

If the only way he can make his point is by using a technically unfair
comparison, I don't believe he has made it very well.

>That means that CW is the less robust mode? When you can clearly copy a
>CW signal at levels where SSB voice is totally unintelligible?

Then why the objection to sharing spectrum space with SSB signals?

>Fellow, you're beginning to sound like this is getting to you, you're
>losing your technical edge. Why?

I believe that OOK CW is more "robust" than SSB, but was noting that saying
that a CW signal cannot be copied in the presence of an SSB signal is saying
that it is not. I don;t know why some feel they need to tear down the value of
CW in
order to "save" it.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3147. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 08:36:49 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010211033649.21689.00000464@ng-cr1.aol.com>
Source record: 3497

>From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

> It really in thoughtful of manufacturers to see to it that CW mode is preserved
> on all these newly manufactured rigs, though,

I sure hope they continue.

>they must know what Real Hams like.

"Real hams" don't need to use the term "Real Hams." They understand that the term is insultive and not in the spirit of ham radio. I know you know this.

73,
Ed Ha

3148. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 08:54:26 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <965k02chh0@208.207.71.162>
Source record: 3498

W1RFI wrote:
>
> >From: Aaron Jones nomail@nomail.com
>
> >I said that I think that most hams of the *50's* could fix their own
> >gear. Things had somewhat changed by the 80's.
>
> Okay, as long as we agree that we are discussing a 20-year old "problem."

Yep, the Question Pools are pushin' 20....

3149. Re: How do I cancel my League membership?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 11:43:28 UTC
From: SkyKing <gyewug@egfurg.com>
Message-ID: <kluc8t8bjda7bhpitj6pshordjdhghdla6@4ax.com>
Source record: 3499

On 11 Feb 2001 08:14:18 GMT, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:

>>From: bummer-radio@licensing.org (smiley o'riley)
>
>>I find I can no longer support the ARRL by being a member. What's the best
>>way to cancel a membership?

Send them more money...
In fact, sign up for a lifetime membership...
That'll show'em!

3150. Re: Morse Code replacement? Bigtime flame war article!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 12:01:57 UTC
From: tlbryant@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <965uvl01g4e@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 3354

In article <3a861468.186914703@news2.dvol.com>, kelly@dvol says...

>Squiggy doesn't have a fist, he couldn't communicate with dots &
>dashes if his life or anybody else's life depended on that ability, he
>advocates elimination of all subands, he advocates the use or wideband
>digital modes on the HF ham bands and he goes off on anti-cw rants at
>neighborhood ham club meetings (draws snores and doesn't go back). The
>only time I'd do dinner with him would be if he was the guest of honor
>and showed up on the platter with an apple stuffed in his mouth.
>>
>Get it yet?

Served with some fava beans and a nice chinanti?

3151. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 12:11:01 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <965vgk$rs6$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 3351

In article <3A8617F3.C050F612@ovis.net>,
Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net> wrote:
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > In article <3A84C85A.F68FD2DA@ovis.net>,
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net> wrote:
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > In article <3A83F6F1.FFE2535@ovis.net>,
> > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net> wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > I'd
> > > > > describe your perception of amateur radio reality with a term
from
> > > > > ionospheric propagation: skewed path.
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave K8MN
> > > > >
> > > > > Likewise, you seem to hang with what I consider some of the
wrong
> > > > > elements in amateur radio. You follow the ground wave.
> > > > >
> > > > > Sent via Deja.com
> > > > > http://www.deja.com/
> > > >
> > > > I'm proud to "hang" with the element I'm associated with. They
are
> > good
> > > > ops and active ones. I've been walking the walk and, as far as I
can
> > > > tell, you pretty much just talk the talk. That you consider some
of
> > my
> > > > friends "the wrong elements" speaks volumes.
> > > >
> > > > Dave K8MN
> > >
> > > Then you are in complete disagreement with some of your other ground
> > > wavers, except in one respect: you are all arrogant. Good Ops or
not,
> > > you're rather shitty to other hams on here.
>
> What defines "arrogance", Brian. In what way do you perceive me as
> arrogant? Is it because I don't share your beliefs or have disagreed

> with you?

You cannot accept that another persopn has an opinion, even if you disagree with it. You must pronounce it wrong. That is my perception of your arrogance. No need to tell me I'm wrong...

> You've left out an important word prior to the words "other hams". The
> word is "some".

I stand corrected. Good Ops or not, you're rather shitty to SOME other hams on here. So are SOME of your Good Op friends.

> I give as I get generally. I think most people do.

Count me in. Now think about that.

> I'm certain that you do not like or get along with everyone you meet in
> life. Why should amateur radio be any different? I get along with most
> people and like many people. I avoid some people and simply detest
> others. Is it somehow different with you?
>
> >
> > Jim Kelley thinks I have nothing to say, you say I speak "volumes." Why
> > don't you two huddle, then get back to me. I'm almost curious which way
> > you'll decide.
>
> If you have anything important to say, I don't think you've yet said it.

Then engage me only when you think it important.

> I'm not Jim Kelley so you'll have wait for his reaction.

Yet you jumped in to this thread in response for Jim Kelley.

> My own opinion
> is that the chip I told you that you have on your shoulder

Well, Dick Carol says the same thing. Great minds think alike.

has once
> again made an appearance. If you feel like the bastard child at the
> family reunion, do some self examination.

Thank you Dave, I will. A few weeks ago I spent about 3 or 4 days acting exactly like Dick Carrol. Everybody hated it. Now I'm back to me, and only SOME people hate it.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

3152. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 12:14:55 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <965vntrsu1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 3500

In article <965gb8$2j1$0@208.207.71.162>,
Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>
>
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > I
> > Jim Kelley thinks I have nothing to say, you say I speak "volumes."
Why
> > don't you two huddle, then get back to me. I'm almost curious which
way
> > you'll decide.
>
> Well? When someone speaks volumes and still says nothing.......

You were saying....?

Dick, you've got to get over thinking that you are the El Supremo
Commandant of the ARS. You are but one licensee. Go enjoy that license
before it expires.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

3153. Re: Morse Code replacement? Bigtime flame war article!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 12:24:06 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <966093$s8m$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 3352

In article <so1c8tgpiccr6j8i0oqf078cscthc2b9gu@4ax.com>,
Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com> wrote:
> Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com> wrote:
> >Apparently, according to Hans, FISTS members work you once, get your
> >number, and are more than happy to send you on your way.
>
> While I am not a contester or DXer, I see no harm in collecting
> numbers. What harm is there in giving someone a number if that's all
> that he wants?

Nor do I. I was pefectly willing to give him my number again on the 3rd
QSO, but he didn't want it.

> >Can it be than idiots can pick up a paddle?
>
> I think that there are likely just as many idiot hams on CW as there
> are on phone. Thankfully the mode makes it difficult to act like one
> when your using it... :-)

Now you'll have all the "heavy hitters" on here wailing and moaning
about CW.

;)

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

3154. Re: Morse Code replacement? Bigtime flame war article!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 12:29:59 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <9660k5sih1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 3353

In article <3a861468.186914703@news2.dvol.com>,
kelly@dvol (Brian Kelly, w3rv) wrote:
> On Sun, 11 Feb 2001 00:51:39 GMT, Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
> wrote:
>
> >> >"When you've worked over a FIST, you've worked over a friend!"
> >> >
> >> Squiggy doesn't qualify as either.
> >
> >Why not?
> >
> Squiggy doesn't have a fist, he couldn't communicate with dots &
> dashes if his life or anybody else's life depended on that ability, he
> advocates elimination of all subands, he advocates the use or wideband
> digital modes on the HF ham bands and he goes off on anti-cw rants at
> neighborhood ham club meetings (draws snores and doesn't go back). The
> only time I'd do dinner with him would be if he was the guest of honor
> and showed up on the platter with an apple stuffed in his mouth.
> >
> Get it yet?
> >
> >Sent via Deja.com
> >http://www.deja.com/
> >
> w3rv

Does Squiggy have a name, or is it that you find it easier to imagine
him dead if he had a cartoon name and an apple in his mouth?

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

3155. Re: Engineers, Technicians, and Appliance Operators

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 12:52:08 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <9661totbi1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 3355

In article <3A853556.A24CFED6@ovis.net>,
Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net> wrote:

> Len, you've turned into an aging cyber stalker. Why the peculiar
> fixation on Steve's personal life? I find it rather peculiar.
>
> Dave K8MN

Dave, you'll notice that "Good Op" and friend, Hans Brakob, K0HB, did three minutes of -sleuthing- and came up with Steve's employment information.

Is Hans also an aging cyber-stalker?

What's peculiar is your fixation with the imagined transgressions of only certain (as in SOME) members of this group, and the others (as in SOME) receive a free pass.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

3156. Re: Morse Code replacement? Bigtime flame war article!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 13:27:57 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010211082757.16173.00000424@ng-cu1.aol.com>
Source record: 3356

In article <3a861468.186914703@news2.dvol.com>, kelly@dvol says...

>Squiggy doesn't have a fist, he couldn't communicate with dots &
>dashes if his life or anybody else's life depended on that ability

Actually, at one point, Carl was approaching 20 wpm. He could certainly manage a code QSO today, though he has not accepted my invite to do so.

Maybe I will have to be him a lobster dinner that he can't. :-)

>he advocates elimination of all subands,

The US is one of few countries that has actual sub-band allocations; they sort themselves out by band plan. His basic recommendation is that the rules say "these are your bands; stay within them." Unfortunately, what works in some countries would possibly not work in the US. On 160 M, for example, the band plan for CW operation is regularly stomped on by phone operators, some who know better; some who do not. I think the same mentality that drives the Know Code = no Ham spams would show up with a small, but very noisy, group, who could make it rapidly unworkable. Why, even our Cecil wanted to engage someone in a 5 wpm QSO in the DX windows, just because he can.

>he advocates the use or wideband
>digital modes on the HF ham bands

I think that some FHSS needs to be permitted on HF. He wants to give it carte blanche, however. Is there room for it on 80 M? How about 160M? How about 30M, where some commercial stations could be already using it? How about 10 M?

>and he goes off on anti-cw rants at
>neighborhood ham club meetings

He has said here a number of times that he doesn't believe that CW use should be abolished at all. Does he say different things at club meetings? He may be swept up in the easy trap of having to tear something down completely in order to justify change. There are some here who say some pretty bad things about CW to justify keeping it.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3157. Re: ARRL HQ "Attitude" (Was: Re: Pride)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 13:33:19 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010211083319.16173.00000425@ng-cu1.aol.com>
Source record: 3357

>From: Rick Tannehill rickw7rt@firstinter.net

>But..but what about the Wouf Hong? Has it been retired?

It is in a case, inside a glass cabinet, in the Hallowed Hall (there is only one hall that is Hallowed, contrary to rumor) on the first floor of ARRL HQ.

I will confess to you privately (don't tell anyone) that over the years, the method of its application has become lost to us. Many visitors have offered suggestions -- hitting over the head, as Larry suggested, cracking of the knuckles between the two sections, and a few suggestions a bit more colorful.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3158. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 13:37:54 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010211083754.16173.00000426@ng-cu1.aol.com>
Source record: 3358

>From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

>It has never been different except that once it was much easier for an
>ordinary individual to learn to be a communications (radio) engineer.

Dick, there are tools that are readily available today that let ordinary individuals do things that engineers of old found difficult. I can predict quite accurately the performance of a multi-element Yagi antenna with a few minutes programming. I can optimize that antenna in another few minutes for maximum forward gain, F/B, feed-point Z or any combination thereof. I can predict the propagation between W1 and central India using another free software program, or can design an amplifier using free design software.

I disagree that it was much easier to do these things in 1963.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3159. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 13:42:01 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010211084201.16173.00000427@ng-cu1.aol.com>
Source record: 3359

>From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

>> I subscribe to the concept that more hams need to learn the fundamentals of
>> modern radio technology.

>As you well know by now, so do I -

I am glad to hear you say that. I was hard too see from your choice of words like "boring," "rammed down my throat" and "Agenda."

> If one wished to maintain the communications mode which would be
>likely to be useable under the widest range of situations and
>conditions, would he not decide to keep the most universally available,
>easily implemented mode, at least as a reserve? Why is that so obscure a
>point ot view to so many techies?

It is not an obscure point of view to me, Dick. I believe that Morse code CW use should be permitted on the ham bands. I believ that the "most universally available, easily implemented mode" will continue to be a valuable asset to Amateur Radio, irrespective of whether it it tested. I think it illogical to assume that the "most valuable" of all modes will not be used by hams unless they are required to learn it to get a license.

>Agenda time again?

Oops, now I am confused again. There is that "Agenda" thing.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3160. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 13:53:00 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010211085300.16173.00000428@ng-cu1.aol.com>
Source record: 3360

>From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

>> I am quite aware of the present technical status of hams, Dick; I spend
>> about 2 or 3 hours a day on the phone, answering their questions.
>> Most of them don't share your "can't do" viewpoint.

>I sereiously doubt it. You meet and converse with seek out your
>services and those of ARRL.

Are you really offering that those that call me on the phone do so because they believe they "can't do" whatever it is they are asking me about? I fail to understand that logic, Dick.

Secondly, please forgive me for not also explaining that my contact with hams also includes a lot of travel to conventions, and local club meetings. During that travel, I not only talk to a lot of hams, but I wander around a bit and look at what is going on. I do not see evidence of "they won't learn anything more than what is on the test" as you describe. That is "can't do" and what I see is people doing the doing.

When I go to a local club meeting, generally only the club program director has sought me out. The other 30 people are just there. In what way do you think they are different than the hams that you know? How could I possibly see so much hope and enthusiasm in hams, yet you see none?

> For every one you contact there are many thousands you never know
> about. No one I know personally has had contact with you.

Of the 50 or so people that show up regularly here, about 5 have had personal dealings with me.

But you may be right. Tell me about the personal contact you have had with the many thousands that I have not met. It is quite coincidental that you have met all those many thousands of people, yet have not met the smaller number of people that I have used as my sample size.

> ARRL memebeship amounts to less than 25% of US hams. I don't
> think you know that much about the majority of them.

Obviously you do. Please tell us how many hams you have met and why you think they are different than the hams I have met.

If your contention is that I can only discuss issues if I have met all 650,000+ hams, then I would offer that no one here can discuss issues; we need to shut down the newsgroup.

However, if it is important to you, I would guess that I have interacted with over 5000 hams over the years. Out of those, I do not see more than a handful

that I believe are the way you have offered that most new hams must be. Please tell us about the much larger group you have interacted with and why they are so very different from the hams I have met.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3161. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 13:57:06 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010211085706.16173.00000430@ng-cu1.aol.com>
Source record: 3361

>From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)

>>The Technician with HF endorsement
>>is now the entry-level HF license -- how much harder is is than the Novice
>>used to be?

>It's easier than the Novice used to be.

Not the Novice I took. I studied 4 pages and passed easily.

>Well, I agree with you, Ed. Learning is a Basis and Purpose of the ARS, I
>think.

>The big question is whether the learning needs to be heavily "incentivized"
>by the license tests, or not.

IMHO, the tests should contain some of the fundamentals, but it is not only not necessary to test detailed knowledge of these subjects, it is simply not practical. Unlike ILP, I don't think that testing is the golden road to learning. I think it is much more important, and much more effective, to have hams learn those areas of technology that interest them; that is going to result in more and better learning, and a lot more enthusiasm for it when all is said and done.

I believe that this applies to Morse-code, too.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI
>>
>73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>
>
>
>
>
>

3162. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 14:25:51 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010211092551.16173.00000433@ng-cu1.aol.com>
Source record: 3362

>From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

>Ed Hare, W1RFI" wrote:

>> I have said often that I believe that amateurs need to learn more about
>> modern radio technology; you have disagreed with me. Just what basket are
>> you saying I am in?

> No I have NOT disagreed with you, rather I have agreed with you.

Thanks for the clarification. It was hard to tell when you told me that stating my belief is "harranguing" or "yelling."

> But I gotta tell you-- If ARRL(or anyone else) wants any serious numbers of
>hams to learn the advanced techniques it will take more than just
>haranguing and a few references in the Handbook to do it.

Yes, it will take much more than that. Maybe ARRL needs to put some of this material up on a Web page. Perhaps TAPR should be asked to do the same.

A minute spent on Yahoo's search engine gave me the following (among many others -- perhaps what is needed is a tutorial on the fact that search engines exist):

Spread Spectrum Tutorial:
http://www.tapr.org/tapr/html/ssf.html (TAPR, a reprint from a QEX article)

DSP:
http://www.arrl.org/tis/info/dsp.html

Software defined radio: (This one needs more work, but it is a start.)
http://www.arrl.org/tis/info/sdr.html

> I'd suggest the BOD start a true basic level educational initiative to do
just
> that.

Although they have not yet delved into technical subjects, the ARRL education and certification program is intended to do just that. The ground level of this program started with a discussion board in which ARRL members told the program manager what they wanted to see. Did you get any reaction to your comments when you posted them to that discussion board?

http://www.arrl.org/cce/

> Start by cocmparing the basic level differences with a a conventional
> superhet then a ground-up model of a DSP radio transciever, on the
> most basic operational level that will function, then publissh the whole
thing

> in a series of magazine articles- and NOT in QEX.

Maybe ARRL should publish them in QST, then make them available for download on its web pages. :-)

> A book wouldn't hurt a thing.

Maybe ARRL should put a chapter in the Handbook on DSP techniques and publish a book on spread spectrum.

http://www.arrl.org/catalog/?category=Digital+Communications&words=spread+spectrum or go to http://www.arrl.org/catalog and type spread spectrum in the search box.

> With all the yelling at us that goes on here SURELY there are plenty
> of experts that could handle this in stride - aren't there?????

Yelling? Do you really think that someone saying that he believes that more hams need to learn the fundamentals about modern communications techniques is "yelling?" That sort of reaction is why I believed that you were in disagreement with what I said.

> Bottom line, all this noise is just that so long as it isn't followed
>by actual movement to accomplish.

I agree. If there were more of me to go around, and I were more of an expert, I would be able to do more. Fortunately, there is a lot that has already been done.
> It really becomes mundane, all the "we
gotta modernize" stuff with nothing
> to back it up.

You are being somewhat critical of this information, at least I get the impression you feel it is not adequate to teach the fundamentals. Can you be specific about what about each of the links and books is not adequate and offer any suggestions as to how they can be improved? I am curious, did you read this material when it first came out, or just before you made your post?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3163. Re: Engineers, Technicians, and Appliance Operators

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 14:27:29 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010211092729.16173.00000434@ng-cu1.aol.com>
Source record: 3363

>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)

>My only dispute is with some of the ARRL's policy decisions.

I, too, have disagreed with some of ARRL's policy decisions. I have not even disagreed with much of what you have offered. You only seem to get a bit far afield when you use capitalization and religious terms in your posts. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3164. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 14:34:19 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010211093419.16173.00000436@ng-cu1.aol.com>
Source record: 3364

>From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

>I would have been quite willing to change that
>structure in accordance with my proposed structure stated in my
>comments to the FCC on the Restructuring NPRM:

Unfortunately, your "willingness" was not the one that counted. :-) Neither was mine.

> eliminate the Novice class, alter the written tests slightly, and give 100%
>of HF voice privileges to the 12/13 WPM Advanced class
>license, leaving the CW DX windows and the 1x2 and 2x1 callsigns
>as the only remaining incentives with a 20 WPM code test
>attached to them.

Not tremendously different than ARRL's proposal and comments, at least as compared to the final FCC result.

>>>My question for you is -- what do you have against striving to
>>>achieve a lofty goal?

>>Do you see everything through the filter of striving, or a lack thereof?

>An even better question would be why do you see nothing through
>such a "filter?"

Although I see some people within the Amateur Radio Service who do not want to learn, it is my experience that the vast majority of hams became hams because they thought it would be a beneficial and learning experience. Admittedly, I don't qualify my beliefs with a caveat that they don't apply to a minority of hams. I do not think it is necessary to do so, but your misunderstanding of that does disprove the rule. I thought that common sense would have told anyone that I was speaking from my oveall experience.

> What in the bloody blue blazes is wrong with
>establishing and maintaining a set of reasonable requirements,
>geared toward obtaining practical communications skills, to be
>achieved in order to attain valuable operating privileges?

Nothing. IMHO, the standards are higher than they were when I became a ham.

> Do you really think the clients of the Welfare State will flock to the ARRL
>en masse once the bar is dropped to the ground?

The biggest welfare state I see here, Larry, comes from you. You believe that Morse code requires an affirmative action to continue to survive. I believe it can stand on its own.

Do you really think that my personal views are formulated to get the most number of ARRL members?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3165. Re: Engineers, Technicians, and Appliance Operators

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 14:46:36 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <9668kb$20b$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 3366

In article <20010211092729.16173.00000434@ng-cu1.aol.com>,
w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:
> >From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>
> >My only dispute is with some of the ARRL's policy decisions.
>
> I, too, have disagreed with some of ARRL's policy decisions. I have
not even
> disagreed with much of what you have offered. You only seem to get a
bit far
> afield when you use capitalization and religious terms in your posts.
:-)
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

Hello Ed. I've notice that Steve uses a lot of CAPITALIZATION in his
posts. Do you have any thoughts on that? Thanks, Brian

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

3166. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 14:49:32 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010211094932.16173.00000438@ng-cu1.aol.com>
Source record: 3365

>From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

>And the output of the Kachina is undistinguishable from a non-DSP rig.
>You say we must do it because someone can.

The Kachina is a good example of a software-controlled radio. Its DSP implementation is the start of what constitutes a software-defined radio.

As DSP technology improves, and right now, it is good to at least 10 MHz, we are literally going to see software-to-antenna radios. They will be readily programmable to be any mode radio that we want. To make design changes, one will download new code. The FM, SSB, SS, data, digital voice or CW signals will be encoded and decoded right in software.

In the long run, these radio techniques will increase flexibility and interoperability of radios. The FCC may very well make changes in the way that it allocates spectrum and operating authority as a result.

Spread Spectrum is at least as revolutionary a change as was AM-SSB; the former was, at least initially, accomplished by taking an AM signal and running it through a filter. SS and digital voice are more different than SSB and FM than was AM/SSB. Using SS, and/or trunking techniques, the very way spectrum is used in the Amateur Radio Service could be changed. Instead of allocating frequency pairs that are unused most of the time, that block of spectrum could be accessed by multiple users, each with their own spreading codes, thus limiting the use of the "repeater" bands not by the number of potential users, but by the number of actual users. No more "no pairs available" and coordination difficulties. Not as sweeping a change as AM to SSB?

>No one **EVER** suggested that hams should refrain from learning about
>new technolies ...

> WE DO RESIST the continued assertion that we must "modernize" by
> dumnping everything that interests us just because it might have been
> around longer than the latest digital dream.

I will speak only for myself, Dick; I have never suggested that you need to dump anything that interests you. I sure don't intend to stop using OOK CW. If you feel that I have suggested that you need to stop using CW, or even that you personally "must" learn new things, you should read my words more carefully. I have faith that hams will learn this technology if they are given some of the reasons why it is important that they do and given the resources to do so. Very few have taken this as "yelling" or as my telling that that they must dump what they are doing. Very, very few.

>We've listed dozens of other objects which are
>also obsolete, and are still in universal use today, but that makes no

>difference.

Yes, they are in universal use today. How many of them are a mandatory part of testing for any priveleges, amateur or otherwise?

>It is clear that the entire movement to "modernize" is nothing more
>than another push to get rid of the code.

Is that what you think that retired Dale Hatfield from the FCC was seeking to do?

>And we refuse to be intimidated or browbeat
>by those who want their agenda to prevail.

There's that "agenda" thing again. Do you really think that the only reason I say that I believe more hams should learn the fundamentals of modern communications technology is to "get rid of the code?" No offense, Dick, but that's pretty lame, too.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3167. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 15:13:52 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <966a7g$qj2$0@208.206.142.85>
Source record: 3367

W1RFI wrote:
>
> >From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
>
> >It has never been different except that once it was much easier for an
> >ordinary individual to learn to be a communications (radio) engineer.
>
> Dick, there are tools that are readily available today that let ordinary
> individuals do things that engineers of old found difficult. I can predict
> quite accurately the performance of a multi-element Yagi antenna with a few
> minutes programming. I can optimize that antenna in another few minutes for
> maximum forward gain, F/B, feed-point Z or any combination thereof. I can
> predict the propagation between W1 and central India using another free
> software program, or can design an amplifier using free design software.
>

I know. Just like it is easy to pass the written amateur exams today
because of the existance of a public pool with all the test questions
and their exact answers.
Just because you have access to software that will allow you to bypass
knowledge doesn't mean you have that knowledge.

> I disagree that it was much easier to do these things in 1963.

And I said nothing whatever about 1963. The selftrained radio engineers
came considerably earlier in most cases, the people who were the
creators of much of what we know as "radio". Many, even most had no
engineering training at all.

3168. Re: Calling the "Roll"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 15:25:00 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <B6AC18FA.19ED%stewartx@sccoast.net>
Source record: 3368

Brian Kelly, w3rv wrote:

> "Kim" <w8ing2001@yahoo.com> wrote:
>>
>> Happy New Year, Everyone (No, I'm not back)..
>>
> Whew: Thought for a minute that you might be back.

Kim, W5TIT, is the only person I know of who could, with all seriousness, actually post a note in a newsgroup stating that she's not back in the newsgroup. See, Kim didn't actually post that message - her other self (W5ASS) did it for her. ;-)

Not only that, but she doesn't seem to know that it's February (not January 1st). Or, perhaps she is still celebrating, which might also explain why she didn't know she was in this newsgroup.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net

3169. Re: Morse Code replacement? Bigtime flame war article!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 15:37:42 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <966bk6$43g$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 3369

In article <20010211082757.16173.00000424@ng-cu1.aol.com>,
w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:
> In article <3a861468.186914703@news2.dvol.com>, kelly@dvol says...
>
> >Squiggy doesn't have a fist, he couldn't communicate with dots &
> >dashes if his life or anybody else's life depended on that ability
>
> Actually, at one point, Carl was approaching 20 wpm. He could
certainly manage
> a code QSO today, though he has not accepted my invite to do so.

Perhaps Jim needs to talk to the USCG about people's lives depending on one's ability to send/receive dots and dashes. Once he clears that little hurdle, perhaps he can convince the FCC to restructure yet again, and ingnore the upcoming WRC-2003. Kick the requirement back up to 20wpm AND mandate 20hrs of CW use per month to keep your skills current.

That will ensure that the ARS will be prepared to be the life saving service that all of the other professional life saving services aren't.

Furthermore, I don't think that whatever Jim had in mind that would prevent Carl from making it back ("Don't bring that sumbitch to Bookbinders for the RV/EY lobsterfest, he'll never make it back to Allentown") is appropriate behavior between hams whether on the air or here!

You, Dave, and other "Good Ops" -always- pass on critiquing such inappropriate threats. Why? I find it totally unacceptable.

> Maybe I will have to be him a lobster dinner that he can't. :-)

Excellent bait. I've never understood using perfectly good shrimp or delicious squid to catch a fish, but lobster to catch a "squiggy?" Thats probably about right.

> >he advocates elimination of all subands,
>
> The US is one of few countries that has actual sub-band allocations;
they sort
> themselves out by band plan. His basic recommendation is that the
rules say
> "these are your bands; stay within them." Unfortunately, what works
in some
> countries would possibly not work in the US. On 160 M, for example,
the band

> plan for CW operation is regularly stomped on by phone operators, some
who know
> better; some who do not. I think the same mentality that drives the
Know Code =
> no Ham spams would show up with a small, but very noisy, group, who
could make
> it rapidly unworkable.

I think we're about there. But it isn't just the code issue, its the "I've been a ham for X years, and I own the ARS" mentality that we encounter form supposedly "Good Ops" right here on rrap.

> Why, even our Cecil wanted to engage someone in a 5 wpm
> QSO in the DX windows, just because he can.

Is it inconceivable that the DX station is only good to 5wpm? Certainly if a station from North Korea came up at 5wpm, you would engage in a 5wpm QSO in the DX window - just because you can. Or would you send at 35wpm - just because you can?

Now that 5wpm has become the standard for testing in America, there should be no problem trying to cantact even a DX station who is sending at 20wpm. If the DX is a good enough op, he'll match the speed for the qso. Or should he ignore the 5wpm station? Is this a fraternity, or only a clique.

> >he advocates the use or wideband
> >digital modes on the HF ham bands
>
> I think that some FHSS needs to be permitted on HF. He wants to give
it carte
> blanche, however. Is there room for it on 80 M? How about 160M? How
about
> 30M, where some commercial stations could be already using it? How
about 10 M?
>
> >and he goes off on anti-cw rants at
> >neighborhood ham club meetings
>
> He has said here a number of times that he doesn't believe that CW use
should
> be abolished at all. Does he say different things at club meetings?
He may be
> swept up in the easy trap of having to tear something down completely
in order
> to justify change. There are some here who say some pretty bad things
about CW
> to justify keeping it.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

I haven't called any names, cussed at anyone, or presented anything improbable. Now watch as these "Good Ops" assasinate my character and try to put me out of business.

73, Brian/N0iMD

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

3170. Re: Morse Code replacement? Bigtime flame war article!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 16:04:06 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <966d5j$53g$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 3370

In article <20010210145350.01651.00001391@nso-fp.aol.com>,
lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
> In article <20010210003936.13655.00003462@nso-mq.aol.com>,
yodoc@aol.comnospam
> (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:
>
> >Ah, yes, the 10-10 club. You just ran into the very attitude which
> >has made me an avid "no-phoner" ever since! The Ten-Ten
organization,
> >and all of its drooling, toothless, slack-jawed, knuckle-dragging,
> >mouth-breathing, bottom-feeding members are, collectively, proof
> >that any idiot can pick up a microphone and talk -- and most
> >idiots do!
>
> ...and some folks wonder why tRoll was beaten with a stick!
>
> :-)
>
> didit

With a Ham Stick or a Terlin Sick (the one with the flailing "wander
leads")?

;)

Len, better lighten up before the all the "Good Ops" start threatening
to do you bodily harm.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

3171. Re: Morse Code replacement? Bigtime flame war article!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 16:07:26 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <966dbr$5d7$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 3373

In article <964nr8$vm5$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com> wrote:
> In article <963n8d$e9v$1@208.206.142.95>,
> Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
> >
> >
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > "When you've worked over a FIST, you've worked over a friend!"
> >
> > So when did you OR Carl ever work a FIST?
>
> Did you get your bills in the mail on time or are you still making
late
> payments?

Sorry, inappropriate reply.

I don't know that I've ever worked a FIST. They don't usually volunteer
their FIST number while on phone, do they? Maybe they should.

I'm certain that I've never "worked over" a FIST.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

3172. Re: Morse Code replacement? Bigtime flame war article!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 16:08:04 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <966dd2$5dm$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 3372

In article <964nr8$vm5$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com> wrote:
> In article <963n8d$e9v$1@208.206.142.95>,
> Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
> >
> >
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > "When you've worked over a FIST, you've worked over a friend!"
> >
> > So when did you OR Carl ever work a FIST?
>
> Did you get your bills in the mail on time or are you still making
late
> payments?

Sorry, inappropriate reply.

I don't know that I've ever worked a FIST. They don't usually volunteer
their FIST number while on phone, do they? Maybe they should.

I'm certain that I've never "worked over" a FIST.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

3173. Re: Calling the "Roll"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 16:17:55 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010211111755.16594.00006371@nso-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 3371

In article <aLfh6.6131$ZJ5.537204@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "Kim"
<w8ing2001@yahoo.com> writes:

>
>Ya left two out...
>
>Happy New Year, Everyone (No, I'm not back)...I needed to see if I could
>find Phil Kane's email address.
>
>--
>73 de W5TIT - Kim

Happy New Year to you, Kim -- now, don't let the door hit you in
the ass on your way out!

73 de Larry, K3LT

3174. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 16:21:28 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <966e68$8sv$0@208.206.142.85>
Source record: 3374

W1RFI wrote:
>
> >From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
>
> >> I subscribe to the concept that more hams need to learn the fundamentals of
> >> modern radio technology.
>
> >As you well know by now, so do I -
>
> I am glad to hear you say that. I was hard too see from your choice of words
> like "boring," "rammed down my throat" and "Agenda."

That is basically because you say something then explain it in terms
that change the meaning of the original statement (not just you, all the
"we gotta modernize the ARS" mavens). You say that, then next it's "Hams
can learn the bsics of .....". Which is it? Tell us again just how
it is that ham radio is NOT today modernized. Because we don't use (and
have absolutely no need to use) spread specgtrum?Because SSB and CW and
a few digital modes most of which have been around awhile seem to serve
the ARS's neds quite nicely? All this "we gotta modernize" talk appears
to be mostly lip service to some Technology God who will surely smite us
all if we don't submit to The Agenda.Sorry. It just doesn't compute.
Cecil is dead wrong when he says that DSP is the SSB of the 50's. It
just isn't so. There WAS a desperate needd in the 50's and 60's to
relieve the congestion caused by the predominance of AM stations on the
ham HF bands, and that was clear to anyone who ever tuned across one.
The heterodynes were inescapable and a low powered AM station didn't
stand a chance againse them. SSB eliminated the heterodynes and allowed
much more simultaneous voice activity without the constant interference
and the need to run high power to suceed.
But to insist that SSB be abaindoned in favor of digitized voice on
HF-whatever the mode, just becase it is technically possible, is
ludicrous and most hams know it, if they know anything technical. And
there is some question that the fact that so many do not is one avenue
of success by digital proponents. When people know little about the
subject it's much easier to convince them that "change" is really
necessary when it truly is not.
All the "modernization" talk is centered on modes alone, and totally
ignores the vast technical advancments we use daily. There is simply NO
comparison between the rig I use now and the simple transmitter that I
put on the air in late winter of early 1957. That simple two tube
homemade transmitter was really labor-intensive in operation compared to
the one I use today, where I touch one button to select the band, touch
it again to select one of three stored frequencies in that band - with

the mode for that segment already stored- and since I have the
"autotune" button already selected, I don't need to either tune the rig
nor even tune the antenna! Simplicity and modernity personified! It IS
almost boring!
And the differences in the receivers is beyond comment. The surplus
single-band WW2 bomber receiver I had to start out was close to the bare
minimum, but its wide bandpass tought me operating skills that probalby
wouldn't have been learned any other way, in digging a single signal
from out of the bedlam- with the filter between the ears. instead of in
the rig. These are skills most new operators never develop.
No wonder so many of us also keep some old stuff around and also
homebrew "Hollow State" ham gear. Sorta makes one feel like a REAL ham
radio operator for a change. Yeah, things change, and for the better.
But not always!

> > If one wished to maintain the communications mode which would be
> >likely to be useable under the widest range of situations and
> >conditions, would he not decide to keep the most universally available,
> >easily implemented mode, at least as a reserve? Why is that so obscure a
> >point ot view to so many techies?
>
> It is not an obscure point of view to me, Dick. I believe that Morse code CW
> use should be permitted on the ham bands. I believ that the "most universally
> available, easily implemented mode" will continue to be a valuable asset to
> Amateur Radio, irrespective of whether it it tested. I think it illogical to
> assume that the "most valuable" of all modes will not be used by hams unless
> they are required to learn it to get a license.

IF there was any way to impress upon beginners that fact without them
learning for themselves about radiotelegraphy, you would be correct.
Unfortunately that is not the natural progression.Few who haven't
experienced it can personally realize how "valuable" Morse is as a low
tech, purely useful method of simple basic communications in a high tech
world.
Virtually no beginner starts out eagerly volunteering to learn Morse
code
just so that he has it at his disposal. It is almost universal that it
is
learned for the purposes of qualifying for the ticket and enroute learn
its true charactersitics. When that goes away, the mode goes away.
That is wrong from any perspective except that of the Carl Stevensons
of the world. You can believe that he got "close to 20wpm" if youwish,
just because
he says it doesn't make it so. I seriously doubt he could recovnize his
own callsign. It is perfectly clear from his ravings what his real
intent is. And it isn't "live and let live".

3175. Code Requirement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 17:30:47 UTC
From: Jim Wayda <jwayda@killspam.home.com>
Message-ID: <b%zh6.68852$Ti5.1068775@news1.alsv1.occa.home.com>
Source record: 3375
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Ham Radio and Code.

Has the archaic code requirement been removed from Ham Radio testing yet?

-jim

3176. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 17:33:15 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010211123315.22631.00002029@nso-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 3376

In article <ol4c8tc4s9mfoffc7p05co38dvrh07029m@4ax.com>, Aaron Jones
<nomail@nomail.com> writes:

>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>>The AR-3 had a "reflex" BFO - the first audio stage was made to oscillate.
>>The results were far from optimum.
>
>SWLs could listen to ham SSB on one if they wanted...

Agreed! But not nearly so easily as they could listen to AM.
>
>>the unskilled SWL probably didn't know to turn on the BFO,
>>turn down the RF gain, turn up the AF gain and tune very
>>slowly.
>
>I think that you underrate SWLs who spend hours at
> their receivers and know them well, perhaps even
> better than a (gasp) ham... :-)

I didn't mean to underestimate anybody. Only point is that there was a lot less
serendipitous discovery of ham radio once SSB began to seriously displace AM.
>
>>Eventually home computers and internet connections
>>will be as common as TV, if not more so.
>
>Eventually TV and the Internet will be the same thing...

You got THAT right! In fact, some radio stations and networks simulcast on
their websites. TV tuners for a PC have long been available. Between cable TV
and highspeed 'net connections, how long before more people are "watching TV"
on their computer monitors than on their "TV sets"? How long before the RF
connection disappears entirely for most people? Not long in most urban/suburban
areas.

At my old house, I could see the "Roxborough antenna farm" from my second-floor
bathroom window. True line-of-sight! Most of my neighbors had similar paths to
the TV broadcasters. I could get no less than a dozen TV stations using rabbit
ears - yet almost the entire neighborhood was on cable. At my new house, the
reception is almost as good with the rabbit ears, but I'm the only one without
cable. That may change soon, because the township meetings are on cable.
>
Next step is to replace the cable with fiber. TV broadcasting? Practically
obsolete.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3177. Re: How do I cancel my League membership?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 17:37:45 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010211123745.16594.00006418@nso-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 3378

In article <goodbye@goodbye>, bummer-radio@licensing.org (smiley o'riley) writes:

>
>I find I can no longer support the ARRL by being a member. What's the best
>way to cancel a membership?

1. Write a letter to ARRL HQ indicating your desire to cancel your membership.

2. Don't let the door hit you in the ass on your way out!

BTW -- can we get a Troll-O-Meter reading and a show of scorecards from the Armenian Judges on this post?

73 de Larry, K3LT

3178. Re: ARRL HQ "Attitude" (Was: Re: Pride)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 17:37:45 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010211123745.16594.00006419@nso-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 3380

In article <963b5b12dgu@enews4.newsguy.com>, tlbryant@my-deja.com (T. L. Bryant) writes:

>>Cecil:
>>
>>That's where you'd be wrong, again! You're pretty annoying at times,
>>but you've never hit me with a stick! Where did this stick-hitting
>>requirement for annoyance come from, anyway? You don' need no
>>steenking sticks in order to be annoying!
>>
>>73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>
>So now you're saying that K1ZZ hit you with a stick at Dayton?

No, Cecil -- now stop trying to be annoying!

73 de Larry, K3LT

3179. Re: ARRL HQ "Attitude" (Was: Re: Pride)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 17:37:46 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010211123746.16594.00006420@nso-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 3384

In article <3A856E9B.ECA0DA50@IEEE.org>, Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>> That's where you'd be wrong, again! You're pretty annoying at times,
>> but you've never hit me with a stick! Where did this stick-hitting
>> requirement for annoyance come from, anyway? You don' need no
>> steenking sticks in order to be annoying!
>
>Just shows how little you know about human psychology, Larry.
>Anyone who gets annoyed on a news group is choosing to be
>annoyed. The basic question is: Why do you choose to allow
>people to annoy you on a news group?

Cecil:

I'm ass-u-&-me-ing that you're sitting down while you're reading this;
but in case you type your newsgripe postings from a standing
position, please sit down before you read this:

You don't annoy me. Nobody in this newsgroup annoys me. Even
Kim didn't annoy me. This is just a bunch of people typing on a
computer screen -- nothing to be annoyed about! And you are the
leader of the group that couldn't possibly annoy me no mater what
you said! Sorry for the disillusionment.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3180. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 17:37:47 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010211123747.16594.00006421@nso-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 3381

In article <20010210080316.23230.00000028@ng-fm1.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>
>I don't know, Larry. I was a ham (off and on) for about 20 years before I
>joined ARRL. Maybe that gives me a different perspective on new hams'
>joining
>and supporting organizations.
>
>Is whether they are League members really more important to you than the fact
>that there are 37,980 new hams?

Ed:

No, it means nothing to me, actually. However, it had damn well
better mean something to you! I'm not the one who makes his living
working at ARRL HQ -- you are!

73 de Larry, K3LT

3181. Re: Morse Code replacement? Bigtime flame war article!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 17:37:47 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010211123747.16594.00006422@nso-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 3382

In article <9631qu$ni5$1@nnrp1.deja.com>, Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
writes:

>> Brian:
>>
>> Ah, yes, the 10-10 club. You just ran into the very attitude which
>> has made me an avid "no-phoner" ever since! The Ten-Ten organization,
>> and all of its drooling, toothless, slack-jawed, knuckle-dragging,
>> mouth-breathing, bottom-feeding members are, collectively, proof
>> that any idiot can pick up a microphone and talk -- and most
>> idiots do!
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>Apparently, according to Hans, FISTS members work you once, get your
>number, and are more than happy to send you on your way. Can it be than
> idiots can pick up a paddle?

Brian:

I'm not aware of any such limitation in the FISTS organization. I've
worked numerous FISTS members numerous times, and usually
enjoyed each QSO. What the heck are you talking about, anyway?

73 de Larry, K3LT

3182. Re: Morse Code replacement? Bigtime flame war article!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 17:37:48 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010211123748.16594.00006423@nso-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 3383

In article <963b1c02dgu@enews4.newsguy.com>, tlbryant@my-deja.com (T. L. Bryant) writes:

>>Brian:
>>
>>Ah, yes, the 10-10 club. You just ran into the very attitude which
>>has made me an avid "no-phoner" ever since! The Ten-Ten organization,
>>and all of its drooling, toothless, slack-jawed, knuckle-dragging,
>>mouth-breathing, bottom-feeding members are, collectively, proof
>>that any idiot can pick up a microphone and talk -- and most
>>idiots do!
>>
>>73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>
>I didn't realize exchanging 10-10 numbers was restricted to phone. Must be
>something in 10-10 International's charter that I missed.

T. L.:

I've never encountered a 10-10 member on 10-meter CW; however, if
I did, and I wasn't able to give him my number, I'm sure I'd receive the
same kind of disparagement as I received during my very last 10-meter
phone QSO with a 10-10 member!

73 de Larry, K3LT

3183. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 17:37:49 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010211123749.16594.00006425@nso-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 3377

In article <20010210074801.23230.00000022@ng-fm1.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>
>>In any scenario where CW subbands are shared with phone
>>signals, CW will tend to lose out. Its only natural.
>
>Then you believe that CW is the less-robust mode.

Ed:

No, I believe you're a wanker if you can't understand a simple statement like the one I made above!

73 de Larry, K3LT

3184. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 17:37:49 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010211123749.16594.00006424@nso-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 3385

In article <20010211093419.16173.00000436@ng-cu1.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>The biggest welfare state I see here, Larry, comes from you. You believe >that Morse code requires an affirmative action to continue to survive. I believe
>it can stand on its own.

Ed:

Well, you're entitled to your own opinion. I, however, am a realist when it comes to human nature, and I believe the only thing that would keep CW going is a code testing requirement attached to progressively higher HF operating privileges on all modes. I've never said anything else. I've never stated that "Morse code can stand on its own." I don't believe that it can, or ever did. And I don't recall ever saying so.

>Do you really think that my personal views are formulated to get the most >number of ARRL members?

I think that if I were your boss at the ARRL, I'd be monitoring every byte you post here and anywhere else, and if I ever caught a whiff of anything that wasn't clearly geared toward forwarding the business goals of the organization, I'd fire your funky ass out the door with a cannon! I don't think you'd dare post anything that was even one degree out of phase with ARRL organizational policy. As the old saying goes, "We live in a democracy, but we don't work in one." That applies to you just as much as anyone else. To me, you are nothing more and nothing less than a fully in-the-tank ARRL spokesman and cheerleader when you post in this newsgripe. And if you're not, and you value your job, you're a fool!

73 de Larry, K3LT

3185. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 17:37:50 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010211123750.16594.00006426@nso-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 3379

In article <20010210074908.23230.00000023@ng-fm1.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>
>>From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
>
>>I believe the FCC should always make liberal use of grandfathering
>>of privileges, just so hams like myself, who don't have a problem
>>accepting a challenge, don't have to be bothered to listen to the
>>whining!
>
>Would it also put an end to your whining about whining?
>
>73,
>Ed Hare, W1RFI

Gee, Ed, that sounded like a whine to me! Individuals who reside in vitreous abodes should refrain from hurling aggregate projectiles!

73 de Larry, K3LT

3186. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 17:37:51 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010211123751.16594.00006428@nso-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 3387

In article <963bjq22dgu@enews4.newsguy.com>, tlbryant@my-deja.com (T. L. Bryant) writes:

>
>>I believe the FCC should always make liberal use of grandfathering
>>of privileges, just so hams like myself, who don't have a problem
>>accepting a challenge, don't have to be bothered to listen to the
>>whining!
>>
>>73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>AH Yes! The old "You don't post a callsign, so you must not have passed"
>reponse.

T. L.:

I could care less whether or not you post a callsign; and for the record, I could care less if you are an "Pre-Resturcturing" Extra or a newly-licensed Technician. You identify your posts with your name, for this or any newsgroup, that is sufficient. At least you are not hiding behind some fictious "screen name," or so it seems -- but I'm inclined to give the benefit of the doubt when I see a "real" looking name. However, in these dumbed-down days of ham radio, any idiot can get a license and a call sign, so I have no need to see yours. Never think you need to post it for my benefit.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3187. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 17:37:51 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010211123751.16594.00006427@nso-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 3388

In article <20010210075913.23230.00000027@ng-fm1.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>What year do you estimate that the last Morse code QSO will take place on
>Amateur Radio, Larry? Can you explain why you believe that year will be the
>one?

Ed:

I'm not sure that there will EVER be a 100% elimination of Morse code use on the ham bands. I even think its possible that in a total no-code testing requirement licensing system, there may even be a few hams that learn the code out of their own curiosity, interest and initiative. The numbers of active CW users will certainly decline in the absence of the testing requirement, but there will always be a few CW users hanging in there.

>>> Do you feel that the mode has so little value to ham radio that no one
>>> will learn it and use it unless it is tested?

Like I said, a few will -- but the numbers will be a tiny fraction of what we would get if the requirement remained. This has nothing to do with the value of the mode -- it has to do with the fact that learning the code requires an unusually higher level of dedicated effort. Everyone knows how to talk, and typing is a more common skill than Morse code proficiency. Therefore, you need to compare apples to apples, and stop hauling out your oranges when apples are being discussed.

>>Asked and answered, many times.
>
>Yes, you have; you do not believe that Morse code can survive without
>government support and welfare through an affirmative-action testing program.

And I think you and I don't have a common understanding of the meaning of the words "government support," "welfare," and "affirmative action." Please give up the Cecil Moore impersonation, Ed, it doesn't become you.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3188. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 17:37:52 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010211123752.16594.00006429@nso-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 3389

In article <3A85712F.B4500C74@IEEE.org>, Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>The great majority of people who don't know Morse code don't consider
>it to be universal or easily implemented. If you want to use Morse code
>for emergencies, Dick, by all means do it. Most of the rest of the world
>has given up on Morse code for emergency use.

Cecil:

That's true -- and the reason is that it requires an operator to learn and gain useful proficiency in the skill of sending and receiving Morse code! Now, when you're talking about commercial or military utility communications applications, this means the expense of training, paying, and providing benefits for flesh-and-blood radio operators. If I owned a shipping line, I would probably want to eliminate that particular part of my overhead, just as much as anyone else. Therefore, ships at sea and land-based communications facilities depend on expensive, computerized communications systems instead of human radio operators.

Amateur radio does not have these economic considerations, but we still have to deal with the fact that learning and gaining useful proficiency in Morse code still requires a considerable amount of dedicated effort on the part of the operators who wish to use it. In the past, this effort was motivated and incentivized by the promise of increased operating privileges; now that that incentive has been removed, there will, for sure, be far fewer people even bothering to learn and gain useful proficiency in Morse code.

The Morse/CW mode continued to survive and flourish only due to the code testing requirement. In the absence of the requirement, the numbers of Morse/CW mode users will most likely shrink to a small fraction of their present numbers, at least in the United States. European/Asian/African operators don't seem to have as much of a laziness problem as we Americans do.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3189. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 17:37:53 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010211123753.16594.00006430@nso-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 3386

In article <3A856CB6.DA7C20E4@IEEE.org>, Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>> And none of these other modes require the physical development of
>> an operating skill which requires a great deal of personal motivation,
>> dedication, and perseverence to master.
>
>So you are saying the value of the return on investment for Morse code
>is too low for the cost/effort involved. You might be right, Larry, but
>Ed and I disagree with you. Only time will tell.

Cecil:

No, I didn't say that -- you did! Your feeble attempts to put words into
my fingertips isn't working. If you can't come up with a sound agrument
against the things I post here, you should really considering keeping
your own counsel -- otherwise, as you just did in the above quote, you
only serve to make yourself look foolish.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3190. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 17:40:01 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <966iphjod0@208.206.142.85>
Source record: 3390

W1RFI wrote:
>
> >From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
>
> >> I am quite aware of the present technical status of hams, Dick; I spend
> >> about 2 or 3 hours a day on the phone, answering their questions.
> >> Most of them don't share your "can't do" viewpoint.
>
> >I seriously doubt it. You meet and converse with seek out your
> >services and those of ARRL.
>
> Are you really offering that those that call me on the phone do so because they
> believe they "can't do" whatever it is they are asking me about? I fail to
> understand that logic, Dick.

If you spent a half hour per telephone contact, 8 hours per day, 5 days
per week for 52 weeks per year, you'd talk to 830 hams.

>
> Secondly, please forgive me for not also explaining that my contact with hams
> also includes a lot of travel to conventions, and local club meetings. During
> that travel, I not only talk to a lot of hams, but I wander around a bit and
> look at what is going on. I do not see evidence of "they won't learn anything
> more than what is on the test" as you describe. That is "can't do" and what I
> see is people doing the doing.
>
> When I go to a local club meeting, generally only the club program director has
> sought me out. The other 30 people are just there. In what way do you think
> they are different than the hams that you know?

If you attended a hamfest or club meeting every week for 52 weeks and
talked to 30 persons per meeting you;d talk to 1,560 hams in a year.
All in all, not any overpowering percentage of licensed hams.

> How could I possibly see so
> much hope and enthusiasm in hams, yet you see none?
>

Once again, you misstate my position. That is not at all what I said.
I said that you don't see all the hams out there who just want to be
hams, and don't have the training nor the refined technical skills to
get involved in your mission of "high tech for the masses", nor will
they ever get very deeply involved in it for that very reason. It is NOT
a simple matter and everyone except the promoters of the Agenda know it.

Oh, the Agenda is not a formal document nor even a clearly stated position, it is just an attitude. It basically says, but certainly is not limited to, "get the ARS away from CW specifically, and into the world of high tech, never mind anything else". It ignores completely the practical aspects that characterize almost every ordinary ham. He wants to use ham radio as he recognizes it, which is to say that it IS an evolving and improving entity, and he intends to be a part of that evolution and improvement. He does NOT believe that just because inventors working for the telephone company have found that spread spectrum techniques find favor in use as cordless telephones that he must line up and follow suit. He sees that is pure techie nonsense, and recoginzes it as what it is - an attempt by a few hams and others whose interests are in little except development to trump his own desires and best interests. Cecil Moore said yesterday that his interest is in experimenting and he rarely gets on the air. That's fine, but it also shows that his interest is driven by something other than that of the average ham.

Of course hams need to learn more about advancing technology. It won't happen effectively until people who develop these systems who are able to explain them in terms understandable to the average ham who knows little or nothing about those techniques and little about technology at all.

THAT is the challenge. I and othes have raised it several times here in recent years, to do it, and explain what you're doing, or get off the soapbox. So far I've seen nothing that I would call progress. A single text explaining in simnple detail, it that is possible, the basics of the new technologis would go far toward educating the masses of hams. Most I know would spring a few bucks for such a boot. If they could find it. Instead all they get is criticism.

> > For every one you contact there are many thousands you never know
> > about. No one I know personally has had contact with you.
>
> Of the 50 or so people that show up regularly here, about 5 have had personal
> dealings with me.
>
I would guess that I have interacted with
> over 5000 hams over the years. Out of those, I do not see more than a handful
> that I believe are the way you have offered that most new hams must be.

Of course not. You see those basically who want to see you and hear what you have to say. Others are busily doing other things that interest them. I will say, you are probably the biggest crowd draw that Newington has to offer. When a crowd of hundreds or more producesd an audience of 50 for your presentation that means that you won't be exposed to the attitudes of aa pretty large majority.

Please
> tell us about the much larger group you have interacted with and why they are
> so very different from the hams I have met.

Ed, I live out here among them, talk to hams almost daily, have hundreds of friends and contacts that have persisted for many years, and spend a LOT of time on the air, mostly listening to others. You on the other hand spend your time in the ivory towers of Newington. I can easily see that you inhabit the ground floor, as you are in fact one of the most practically minded ihabitants. But the fact remains.

Surely you understand that the people that gravitate to your presentations at hamfests are the subset of the much larger crowd attending the event,those who happen to know you, or of you, and are particularily interested in what you have to say,but they represent a small percentage of the attendance. Far more wouldn't know you from Adam, I'm sorry to say. Atg that, you're probabaly the best known Newingtonite.
If I attend a hamfest where you appear I'll be in the group you address. A great majority of ordinary hams will not. Some will be interested in your RFI work. Some will skip because you are a part of the movement to "modernize" ham radio away from their interests, and they don't support that. Not many hams believe it is in their best interests to cause the ARS to implement such modes as spread spectrum nor univesal digitized voice especially on HF, since the bands are not unduly congested and the "cure" is just as likely to be much worse than any perceived ailment.

Many of these same hams believe it is a travesty to allow radiotelegraphy to atrophy to the point of uselessness just to allow easy entry into ham radio, and believe that this is a part of the movement to force ham radio into accepting modes that are commercially invaluable but which have little or nothing to offer to hams in practical application. Not much is known about their actual effects on the HF ham bands. Many hans just don't buy the assertion of many in your movement that ham radio must abandon our older but very reliable and utilitarian modes for no reason other than the fact that commercial engineeers must constantly come up with "new and improved" versions of everything, else they find themselves unemployed. Yes, we heard, "no one is
insisting that we abandon anything...". Just what does "modernize" mean as used in all the rhetoric, then? That, to them, is the thrust of the urge to "modernize". What else could it mean? That just because there is utility in using spread spectrum techniques in many communications venues that we actually need it in ham radio? I don't think so, and neither do they.

3191. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 17:45:39 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010211124539.20170.00000387@ng-fc1.aol.com>
Source record: 3391

>From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

>And I think you and I don't have a common understanding of the meaning
>of the words "government support," "welfare," and "affirmative action."

Clearly not. You think those terms apply to things you oppose, but do not
apply to things you support.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3192. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 17:47:04 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010211124704.20170.00000388@ng-fc1.aol.com>
Source record: 3392

>From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

>No, I didn't say that -- you did! Your feeble attempts to put words into
>my fingertips isn't working. If you can't come up with a sound agrument
>against the things I post here, you should really considering keeping
>your own counsel -- otherwise, as you just did in the above quote, you
>only serve to make yourself look foolish.

Maybe he is doing an Ed Hare imitiation.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3193. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 17:52:34 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010211125234.20170.00000389@ng-fc1.aol.com>
Source record: 3393

>From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

>To me, you are nothing more and nothing less than
>a fully in-the-tank ARRL spokesman and cheerleader when you post in
>this newsgripe. And if you're not, and you value your job, you're a fool!

ARRL recently affirmed that it is not seeking to change its policy wrt the US code testing requirements. Do you believe from my posts here that my personal view and that policy are identical?
You can rest assured that, as an ARRL employee, I will not take one single step with the FCC in contrast to the ARRL policy position, but as a free individual, I see no conflict in posting my personal views, the reasons for them and discussing those views with my fellow amateurs, just like you do.

Do you really believe that ARRL employees should not enjoy the same free-speech rights as other US citizens? Otherwise, you seem patriotic; why the difference for me?

I have posted quite a bit on this subject in the past, in a way that I thought said pretty clearly to what extent I feel what I say is shaped by my employment. Did you not read them, or think I was lying?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3194. Re: Code Requirement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 17:58:32 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <966js5ael1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 3394
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.policy
Body handling: HTML body converted to readable text

In article ,
"Jim Wayda" wrote:
> Ham Radio and Code.
>
> Has the archaic code requirement been removed from Ham Radio testing
yet?
>
> -jim

Hello Jim, I'm not familiar with archaic code, but the Morse code is
still a requirement in the USA and Canada. Go ahead and learn it
because you now get some ROI, but don't plan on using it at 5wpm.
That's frowned on.

73, Brian/N0iMD

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

3195. Re: Calling the "Roll"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 18:00:36 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <966k01agq1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 3395

In article <20010211111755.16594.00006371@nso-cg.aol.com>,
yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote:
> In article <aLfh6.6131$ZJ5.537204@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>,
"Kim"
> <w8ing2001@yahoo.com> writes:
>
> >
> >Ya left two out...
> >
> >Happy New Year, Everyone (No, I'm not back)...I needed to see if I
could
> >find Phil Kane's email address.
> >
> >--
> >73 de W5TIT - Kim
>
> Happy New Year to you, Kim -- now, don't let the door hit you in
> the ass on your way out!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Larry, you never disappoint me. You're as predictable as Rush Limbo.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

3196. Re: ARRL code test resolution

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 18:14:36 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <966kq7$b24$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 3397

In article <94a98tgo2ho2ab97ujrnvik9h1qmvnqrp0@news.mindspring.com>,
Xara Thustra <sparks@bigfoot.com> wrote:
> On Sun, 28 Jan 2001 21:00:52 GMT, "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nospam.spam>
> wrote:
>
> >On 28 Jan 2001 13:31:30 GMT, W1RFI wrote:
> >
> >>>From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
> >>
> >>>QFU isn't on my Q-signal list. I've never heard it on the air.
> >>
> >>I have heard it on the air and I didn't need a list to know exactly
what it
> >>meant.
> >
> > QFU is in the series assigned to the Aeronautical Services -
> > that series does not appear in the ITU Radio Regs so I don't
> > know its exact (legal) meaning. The "de facto" meaning is
> > obvious.....
> >
> > Anyone have access to the ICAO Regs?
>
> I was a maritime shipboard radio officer many years ago, and can't
> resist passing on to the more recent folks, a couple of Q signals
> that also were not in the books, but were quite commonly encountered:
>
> QWC - "Water Closet" the British equivalent of toilet; in other words,
> I will be away from the key for a moment or so......
>
> QLF - Please send with your left foot; your right foot sounds tired.
>
> Paul Martin W4SXD

Paul, have you ever worked WD4GDH? He was a shipboard radio officer
till he jumped ship on Guam to work for the one of the USN's big
transmitter sites. We did JOTA for the Scouts in 91.

73, Brian/N0iMD

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

3197. Re: Code Requirement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 18:16:17 UTC
From: BD <bodu@pobox.com>
Message-ID: <qGAh6.214$vb4.29561@nnrp2.sbc.net>
Source record: 3396
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Not able to master it, huh, smarty-jim?...

"Jim Wayda" <jwayda@home.com> wrote in message
news:b%zh6.68852$Ti5.1068775@news1.alsv1.occa.home.com...
> Ham Radio and Code.
>
> Has the archaic code requirement been removed from Ham Radio testing yet?

3198. Re: Code Quick RULEZ!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 18:23:48 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <966lbebgs1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 3398
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

In article <95clakcjr1@agate.berkeley.edu>,
David Snyder Hale <david@isi9.mtwilson.edu> wrote:
> In rec.radio.amateur.misc Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com> wrote:
>
> > Sounds useful and has come up here before. I should try it. Does
it
> > cost more than a pizza? More than a lobster dinner?
>
> hum, I think closer to lobster than pizza; I think I paid around $35 a
> little over a year ago.
>
> --
> Dave * N3WTK (DM04xf) * http://isi.mtwilson.edu * n3wtk@arrl.net

OK, but my kids will be pissed about getting Code Quick for dinner
this Friday night. Maybe if I put cheese on it. Sounds like I need to
support the hobby to the tune of another 35 sheckles (as Dick calls em).
Maybe I'll have that QSO with N2EY before 2027AD when I retire.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

3199. Re: Code Quick RULEZ!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 18:32:56 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <966lsobva1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 3399

In article <95n8ut031ba@enews1.newsguy.com>,
tlbryant@my-deja.com (T. L. Bryant) wrote:
> In article <u29s7tsndq6lu5r4gf5grfq9do9g4211n7@4ax.com>,
nomail@nomail.com
> says...
>
> >>it offers the proverbial
> >>free lunch -- and therefore, gets a strong following from the
> >>clients of the ham radio Welfare State.
> >
> >This is the *real reason* you don't like Code Quick. People who have
> >no intention of ever using the code on the air have found success in
> >using Code Quick to quickly pass the code test. But then I suppose
> >that's similar to people who have no intention of learning
electronics
> >using memorization to quickly pass the written test...
>
> Larry will never change. Technology has advanced in the area of
superior modes,
> but his proselytizing is akin to having to demonstrate how to start a
car with
> a hand crank in order to recieve your driver's license.

TL, while its fun to drive an antique car, I don't think it should be a requirement to be licensesd drive a modern automobile. Manual choke and dwell can would leave most modern motorists stranded by the side of the road.

Even Cecil's website shows him (and daughters) dressed up in period Cowboy (and cowgirl) garb. I imagine that it was a lot of fun. Ditto Morse code. Probably a blast if you're any good at it, probably sends rivers of sweat if you're not.

But to require it to operate any other mode on HF???

73, Brian/N0iMD

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

3200. Re: Code Quick RULEZ!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 18:44:29 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <966miccea1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 3400

In article <95n5f8$i20$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
K0HB <K0HB@arrl.org> wrote:
> In article <20010204104711.03780.00001058@nso-ch.aol.com>,
> yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote:
>
> > No, thank God, I don't! Oh, speaking of God, that's another problem
> > I have with Code Quick. It indulges in religious proselytizing
right
> in
> > the middle of the tape. Specifically, fundamentalist Christian
> > proselytizing. Why is religion brought into the program? What
about
> > potential customers who are Catholic, Jewish, Muslim, or any other
> > non-fundamentalist Christian religion? If the guy wants to sell
> > religious tapes, he should do so within the confines of that market
--
> > and not include HIS specific religious beliefs in a program marketed
> > to people from all walks of life who are interested in ham radio
>
> Really? If I were God, I wouldn't want to be on a code tape!
> If I were God, I'd get together with all my other God friends
> and have a big party. We'd all get drunk and create unliftable
> rocks, then try to lift them. It would be loads of fun! Then I'd
> probably just destroy the rocks with a lightning bolt. Then I'd
> probably pass out. :^)
>
> 73, Hans, K0HB

I can buy the passing out part. Go easy on the Guiness and Mead.

BTW, who are the other "Gods" you're getting drunk with? Do they fit
Dave's definition of "Good Ops?"

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

3201. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 19:00:20 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010211140020.24870.00000412@ng-mb1.aol.com>
Source record: 3501

>From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

>>>I believe the FCC should always make liberal use of grandfathering
>>>of privileges, just so hams like myself, who don't have a problem
>>>accepting a challenge, don't have to be bothered to listen to the
>>>whining!

>>Would it also put an end to your whining about whining?

>Gee, Ed, that sounded like a whine to me! Individuals who reside in
>vitreous abodes should refrain from hurling aggregate projectiles!

This could go on forever. Rather than whining about your whining about my whining about your whining about their whining, I will let you have the last word about whining.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

>
>
>
>
>
>
>

3202. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 19:04:43 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010211140443.24870.00000414@ng-mb1.aol.com>
Source record: 3502

>From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

>>Is whether they are League members really more important to you than the
>fact
>>that there are 37,980 new hams?

>No, it means nothing to me, actually. However, it had damn well
>better mean something to you! I'm not the one who makes his living
>working at ARRL HQ -- you are!

Okay, so you were worried about me. Thanks, but I really can fend for myself. My salary is not tied in to the number of members ARRL has. Whether I have a job or not might be, but I don't think I would be the first to go. Any concerns I have about ARRL membership are tied in to the things that ARRL would have to stop doing if the membership base were to decrease significantly. Every year, there are things that I would like to see funded that cannot be funded. Those members would go a long way to making that happen. But over and above that, I think that the health of the Amateur Radio Service depends on more than the health of the ARRL, don't you?

But to reassure you, if I were to lose my job because too few hams chose to be ARRL members, I would be okay; I am reasonably sure I could secure employment elsewhere.

But thanks for thinking of me.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3203. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 19:05:09 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A86E265.E414650A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3505

W1RFI wrote:
> Do you really believe that ARRL employees should not enjoy the same free-speech
> rights as other US citizens?

Nocoders have no code experience so their opinions about Morse code don't matter. Non-Extras are not fast enough at Morse code to have a valid opinion. Post April 15 Extras didn't prove their Morse code skill so they also have no right to post their personal opinions. Members of NCI shouldn't post their personal opinions. ARRL employees shouldn't post their personal opinions. See the pattern? Anyone who disagrees with Larry on the subject of Morse code testing should not post their personal opinions. :-)
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

3204. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 19:06:45 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010211140645.24870.00000417@ng-mb1.aol.com>
Source record: 3503

>From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

>>>In any scenario where CW subbands are shared with phone
>>>signals, CW will tend to lose out. Its only natural.

>>Then you believe that CW is the less-robust mode.

>No, I believe you're a wanker if you can't understand a simple statement
>like the one I made above!

I understood what you said, I just couldn't make any sense out of it. How can a mode be "more robust" than another, but lose out when it goes head to head with the other mode in shared spectrum?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3205. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 19:08:41 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A86E339.CC4BB223@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3508

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> Please give up the Cecil Moore impersonation, Ed, it doesn't become you.

I don't recall ever calling the mandatory Morse code testing program an
"affirmative action" program, Larry. But if mandatory Morse code testing
is not an affirmative program for Morse code, exactly what is it?
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

3206. Re: Calling the "Roll"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 19:12:06 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010211141206.24870.00000419@ng-mb1.aol.com>
Source record: 3504

>From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

>>Happy New Year, Everyone (No, I'm not back)...I needed to see if I could
>>find Phil Kane's email address.

>Happy New Year to you, Kim -- now, don't let the door hit you in
>the ass on your way out!

Thanks for the blast from the past. I think the last time I heard that one for real was junior high school.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3207. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 19:14:12 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A86E484.482163C5@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3510

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> >So you are saying the value of the return on investment for Morse code
> >is too low for the cost/effort involved?

> No, I didn't say that -- you did!

Sure seems to me that is what you are saying when you say CW cannot
succeed by standing on its own merits without an affirmative action
program. Either the ROI is there or it's not. If the ROI is there,
we don't need an affirmative action program. If the ROI is not there,
it doesn't deserve an affirmative action program.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

3208. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 19:15:41 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010211141541.24870.00000420@ng-mb1.aol.com>
Source record: 3506

>From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

>And I said nothing whatever about 1963. The selftrained radio engineers
>came considerably earlier in most cases, the people who were the
>creators of much of what we know as "radio". Many, even most had no
>engineering training at all.

So Amateur Radio has been "ruined" for over 40 years now? I am curious, Dick;
how long has ham radio been down the tubes?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3209. Re: Engineers, Technicians, and Appliance Operators

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 19:18:20 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010211141820.24870.00000421@ng-mb1.aol.com>
Source record: 3507

>From: Brian brianburke@my-deja.com

>Hello Ed. I've notice that Steve uses a lot of CAPITALIZATION in his
>posts. Do you have any thoughts on that? Thanks, Brian

I would imagine that most people who use all caps do so to emphasize.

I think that those who use a capitilization only on the first character of a word do so to give it an Importance that it wouldn't otherwise have.

If you want to know the real reason that Steve uses capitalization, you could ask him. His email address is k4yz@aol.com. His answer would be more accurate than my speculation.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3210. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 19:22:00 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010211142200.24827.00000451@ng-mb1.aol.com>
Source record: 3509

>From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

>> >> I subscribe to the concept that more hams need to learn the fundamentals
>of
>> >> modern radio technology.

>"Hams
>can learn the bsics of ....". Which is it?

I do admit that I don't repeat it word for word every time, but let me try it
again:

I believe that amateurs should learn the basic principles of modern
communications technlogy.

I will save this in a file so that the next time you ask me to repeat it, I
will do word for word to prevent you from continuing to be confused by it.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3211. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 19:23:37 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010211142337.24827.00000453@ng-mb1.aol.com>
Source record: 3511

>From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

> But to insist that SSB be abaindoned in favor of digitized voice on
>HF-whatever the mode, just becase it is technically possible, is
>ludicrous and most hams know it

Yes, it it ludicrous, Dick; that is why I never said it.

It is very difficult to converse with you when you make up things then take
issue with me for saying them.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3212. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 19:29:11 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A86E807.F9C6141@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3512

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> The Morse/CW mode continued to survive and flourish only due to
> the code testing requirement.

I disagree and you cannot possibly know that for certain. I learned Morse code in Cub Scouts because it was fun. It has been fun for me for 52 years. I have never used CW or needed to use CW for an emergency. I seriously doubt that I will ever use CW for an emergency. Why don't you stop telling everyone what a pain in the arse it was for you to learn Morse code and promote the fun aspect of the mode with a little positive thinking?
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

3213. New Zealand protest to FCC - Code Discriminates

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 19:33:55 UTC
From: K0HB <k0hb@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <966pf4emm1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 3513

Just re-read Fred W5YI's CQ article about "code is discriminatory",
based on comments to the FCC from NCI enthusiasts in New Zealand.

And now r.r.a.p. and NCI present a special documentary on the ZL
training effort for the upcoming $alt Lake City Olympic$.

We see a training field with various athletes engaged in various
physical

routines. Standing before camera is REPORTER.

R: Good afternoon. The activities which you see behind me are the
training exploits of the cr&#65533;me de la cr&#65533;me of the New Zealand Olympic
aspirants. These fine young physical specimens have inspired the
confidence of the masses for the upcoming Games. However, this silver
cloud has a dark lining. There has recently been a great
deal of controversy over the nature of the ZL Olympic team, and
allegations have arisen that physically handicapped people are
being seriously underrepresented in the upcoming Games. Charges
of discrimination are being pressed upon the ZL Olympic
Advisory Committee.

Camera changes to INTERVIEWEE 1, speaking into visible mike.
Subtitles flash "Arthur Chesterton, Kiwi Society for the Prevention
of Human Discrimination." I1 wears a sand-colored coat and a porkpie
hat.

I1: It's blatant discrimination, that's what it is! The Olympic Games
and Morse Code tests are unfair to athletes who have any physical
handicap, or don't want to learn Morse.

R: But there are those who have competed successfully even with
physical handicaps.

I1: Yes, but they weren't blind, or on crutches, or confined to a
wheelchair.

R: But don't the nature of the games preclude the participation
of anyone who falls into one of those categories?

I1: That's what I mean! It's blatant favoritism and unfair attitudes
toward those who don't meet the standards.

R: But is there any need for those who don't fit the standards to
compete in the games in the first place?

I1: Well, there's pride! Besides, if the games are unfair to handicapped people, perhaps they should be altered so that handicapped people would be able to participate.

R: But some say that the spirit of competition would be weakened by removing the stringent standards which have been set.

I1: Spirit of competition my eye! It's all commercialism and political hype, anyhow -- who would notice a few more players on the field? Er, so to speak.

Camera changes to INTERVIEWEE 2, also speaking into mike. Subtitles flash "Stanley Greenburt -- New Zealand Olympic Advisory Board." I2 wears a typical business suit.

I2: The entire situation is ludicrous.

R: How so?

I2: Well, the spirit of the Games is being undermined by people who are obviously envious of those who are better gifted. Handicapped people have no place on the playing field. The Olympic Games represent the peak of physical perfection: tall, handsome, muscular athletes, their auburn hair waving in the breeze... their bare tanned arms glistening in the sun... their flimsy shorts delicately fluttering over their tight buttocks... Scene changes back to R at training field.

R: The controversy still rages, but already handicapped people have in fact begun training for the Olympic Games.

Camera shows person in a wheelchair rolling along a high-diving board, teetering at the edge, falling into the swimming pool, and failing to resurface. Bubbles rise. Switch to a blind person hurling a discus which sails into a nearby garbage can. Another blind person hurls a javelin which hits a passing person in the chest. Camera switches to deaf runners at a starting line. The gun goes off, but nobody moves. Switch to another person in a wheelchair holding a shotput, leaning back to throw it, being caught off-balance, and falling over backwards. Judges measure the distance the shotput rolls.

VOICE-OVER: Already have handicapped athletes begun the long and torturous task of training for the Olympic Games. The trainees shown here only represent a small fraction of the total number of the eager, gutsy individuals who have the courage to grasp for their wildest goals. Of these, perhaps a lucky few will go on to the actual Olympic Games. Hopes are high, as are spirits. This is indeed a chronicle of sheer heroism, a shining example to the youth of our nation. Truly shall this be a great legacy of pride.

Scene changes to R at ski slopes of Salt Lake City Utah.

R: At this time a blind ski team has entered the Winter Olympics in Salt Lake City, Utah. In order to illustrate their fine, nay, artistic, performing abilities, we now show you a film of their achievements, played to the music of Johann Strauss' "Blue Danube Waltz."

Roll clip with "Blue Danube" background music. Ski team, with dark glasses and white canes, performs all sorts of humorous stunts and ends up with a variety of fates, e.g. sailing off edge of cliff, running into trees or boulders, crashing into each other, plowing into crowds of people, smashing into judges' stand [7.8, 8.1, 7.4], and so on.

Total run time about 35 seconds.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

3214. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 19:36:55 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A86E9D7.58DF787@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3514

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Cecil is dead wrong when he says that DSP is the SSB of the 50's. It
> just isn't so.
> But to insist that SSB be abaindoned in favor of digitized voice on
> HF-whatever the mode, just becase it is technically possible, is
> ludicrous ...

Uhhhhhhhhh Dick, DSP handles SSB just fine. DSP doesn't mean the end
of SSB - it means enhanced SSB.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

3215. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 19:48:32 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A86EC90.D6DB2B30@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3518

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> In article <20010210074801.23230.00000022@ng-fm1.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com
> (W1RFI) writes:
>
> >
> >>In any scenario where CW subbands are shared with phone
> >>signals, CW will tend to lose out. Its only natural.
> >
> >Then you believe that CW is the less-robust mode.
>
> No, I believe you're a wanker if you can't understand a simple statement
> like the one I made above!

Well, I don't believe your statement is true, Larry. I hear hams
checking into SSB nets when they cannot be heard on SSB. The CW
signal stands out from the SSB signals plus noise. After all, CW
has a double digit dB S/N advantage over SSB. A five watt CW
signal is like a 150+ watt SSB signal.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

3216. Re: Engineers, Technicians, and Appliance Operators

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 19:52:12 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010211145212.16762.00001696@nso-mp.aol.com>
Source record: 3516

In article <964v3s$57i$1@nnrp1.deja.com>, Steven J Robeson, K4YZ <k4yz@my-deja.com> writes:

> Again, like your "views" of Ham Radio, you look from the outside >in and make poorly substantiated judgements on that. Oh well. Nothing >we haven't become accustomed to.

The "we-we" is being shaken again...

"Looking from the outside in" is what about 300 million Americans do towards US amateur radio. Using such a phrase implies some secrecy in US amateur radio. Unfortunately, for you or your "we," amateur radio is not secret, nor exclusive, nor mystical, nor religious. It is one of the most transparent of all hobbies, clear to anyone with a receiver within range of amateur transmissions.

That "outsiders" are somehow ignorant of activities, interests, or technology is itself an ignorant statement...or it presupposes a false and misleading sense of "royalty" by those licensed in the amateur radio service. Activities, interests, technology, and even individuals are well documented in publications of the ARRL, CQ Communications, and 73 magazine in addition to other newstand publications. All US amateur transmission modes must be "in clear" (without encryption or intent to deceive) by law.

Radio itself is a known technology, merely 105 years in existance since the first two radio communications done in 1896. The public is aware that radio in many forms exists, everything from two-way vehicular business radios to satellite relay communications. There is nothing exclusive to modes, methods, standards, in amateur radio that has not already been done in other radio services. Perhaps only the jargon and terminology pertinent to amateur radio's evolution is exclusive. Certainly the Belief Systems at work in amateur radio is exclusive. The Urban Myths propagated by certain self-centered amateurs as generalities of activity, basis, or purpose are all most exclusive and only self-serving, self-prideful.

One of the most damning of all implications is that no one else "knows anything about amateur radio" until one is licensed in that radio service. The only federal agency that regulates and licenses radio amateurs in the United States does NOT require any staff or Commissioners to hold amateur radio licenses. The FCC sets regulations, again by law, but they are not required to be a part of amateur radio. Why is there an assumption or implication that "outsiders know nothing at all," therefore they

cannot be a part of any rule, regulation, or policy establishment?

Another misstatement is that amateur radio is a "service" to the nation. Throughout Title 47 the word "service" is a regulatory term refering to the type and kind of radio in various Parts of all US civil radio regulations. While amateur radio MAY provide an actual service during civil emergencies, US amateur radio is not defined with a specific purpose of providing emergency communications. In actual emergencies, all citizens, amateur radio licensees or not, are expected to come to the aid of their community or the nation as a whole Amateur radio in the US is stated to be an activity of and about communications for personal interest without monetary compensation. In a short form, it is a hobby.

Some individuals become so wrapped up in a hobby that it becomes a lifestyle, even a reason for existance. That is not a requirement for all, indeed most amateur radio enthusiasts view amateur radio as just a secondary activity for fun and relaxation. Why then should a hobby be structured in regulation as if it were a guild, trade, or even military service? The "incentive plan" structure of US amateur radio licensing was a rather thinly disguised aprenticeship-journeyman-master guild structure having no less than five "ranks" complete with "privileges" in the EM spectrum and with modes of operation. The names even carried emotional overtones of the supposed skill of the licensee, no doubt pleasing to those of "higher" rank who could look down on "lesser" classes.

It is false and misleading to say that anyone not licensed in the US amateur radio service "knows nothing" about amateur radio...until they are "properly" licensed. That is the statement of mysticsm, of religious fervor in a quasi-religious belief, of exclusivity and elitism that is self-serving, pompous, and arrogant on the part of the claimant. It is both emotional and puerile. It is not a statement of pride but rather denial or possibly insecurity.

> I already DO have "bragging rights", Lennie. In more than one
>field of endeavour.

This is yet another statement of puerile pomposity. If the only purpose of US amateur radio licensing is to establish "bragging rights" or "superiority" then it has obviously succeeded for some. Neither bragging rights nor superiority is part of the Basis and Purpose stated in Part 97...yet it is stated often by those who feel threatened by loss of rank, status, and privileges due to regulation changes. To those who prize rank, status, and privilege above all else in US amateur radio, who revere tradition with an almost fedayin fervor, newcomers or "ordinary" hobbyists are forgotten as "unimportant" or "lesser beings." In the whole of national regulation necessary in all of civil radio, that is a

narrowminded selfish viewpoint which does not logically apply to regulations.

> G'night, Lennie. Mrs A has your dose of Geritol ready.

Again, typical of Robeson's remarks, a personal negative comment having nothing to do with the subject thread. It is an emotional outburst of someone who cannot control himself nor has the stamina or courage to argue a subject on the subject's merits or demerits. If that is the majority opinion of already-licensed US radio amateurs, then there is little hope for the survival of US amateur radio. Indeed, such a majority opinion does not belong in a civilized society. It belongs in barbarian cultures whose democratic principles are settled in school-yard fighting, only the physically-strongest surviving. Proponents do not understand that they may survive to be older and targets of the same taunts they now champion. They gain nothing.

didit

3217. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 19:52:13 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010211145213.16762.00001697@nso-mp.aol.com>
Source record: 3517

In article <3A8611A9.F6CCB653@ovis.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net> writes:

>That's a real knee slapper, Len! Keep the yuks coming. Have any
>amateur radio related material?

Just the material that started this thread...newcomers to US
amateur radio who were either code-tested or not code-tested.
An Extra (N2EY) already commented on the subject...without
making a bunch of nonsense about who started it.

What amateur radio related material do you have? More
insults and deprecations of those who might be interested
in US amateur radio?

Or are you going into some diatribe of those who do not
believe in the US ARS policies as you do? Or are you simply
an unpleasant person towards those who might be interested
in a newer, more modern policy about and for the US ARS?

didit

3218. Re: How do I cancel my League membership?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 19:52:46 UTC
From: QSB@QRM-QRN.net
Message-ID: <slrn98drcd.6ov.QSB@animas.frontier.net>
Source record: 3515
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

```
On Sun, 11 Feb 2001 06:16:51 GMT, smiley o'riley scribbled:
>
>I find I can no longer support the ARRL by being a member. What's the best
>way to cancel a membership?

Start by trolling in rec.radio.amateur.policy *only*.
rec.radio.amateur.antenna doesn't need this banality.
(It has enough of its own -- regrettably.)

Jonesy
--
| Marvin L Jones | jonz | W3DHJ | OS/2
| Gunnison, Colorado | @ | Jonesy | linux __
| 7,703' -- 2,345m | frontier.net | DM68mn SK
```

3219. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 19:55:28 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A86EE30.380FD7AD@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3520

W1RFI wrote:
> >And we refuse to be intimidated or browbeat
> >by those who want their agenda to prevail.
>
> There's that "agenda" thing again. Do you really think that the only reason I
> say that I believe more hams should learn the fundamentals of modern
> communications technology is to "get rid of the code?" No offense, Dick, but
> that's pretty lame, too.

It's just a thinly veiled attempt to demonize you, me, and others who
disagree with his head-in-the-sand agenda-from-hell. :-)
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

3220. Re: Morse Code replacement? Bigtime flame war article!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 20:02:54 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A86EFEE.94C17072@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3521

W1RFI wrote:
> Why, even our Cecil wanted to engage someone in a 5 wpm
> QSO in the DX windows, just because he can.

You must've missed the smiley face, Ed.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

3221. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 20:04:58 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <3A86F06A.14C7B866@arrl.org>
Source record: 3519

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> THAT is the challenge. I and othes have raised it several times here
> in recent years, to do it, and explain what you're doing, or get off the
> soapbox. So far I've seen nothing that I would call progress. A single
> text explaining in simnple detail, it that is possible, the basics of
> the new technologis would go far toward educating the masses of hams.

Such texts exist, but one does have to read them. Have you? If not,
you're being disingenuous when you say that nothing has been done. If
you have read them and found them wanting, some direct, specific
feedback to the publisher or authors would be a positive contribution --
certainly more positive than disparaging the efforts of those who are
trying to educate hams about current technology.

> Most I know would spring a few bucks for such a boot. If they could find
> it.

Spread Spectrum fundamentals:
http://www.arrl.org/catalog/?item=3177

There have been several treatments of DSP techniques. See:
http://www.arrl.org/tis/info/dsp.html#signals
and the ARRL Handbook.

Yes, more is needed, and more will be forthcoming.

> Instead all they get is criticism.

The only ones who get criticism are those who repeatedly disparage the
efforts of the folks who are promoting new techniques by claiming that
those folks have an "Agenda" that simply doesn't exist.

> Please
> > tell us about the much larger group you have interacted with and why they are
> > so very different from the hams I have met.

Because, Dick, you tend to meet prinicipally those hams who are
interested in the same things you are since you meet them in the course
of doing what interests you. That gives you a biased view of what hams
think, just as those who stay away from the things that interest you
tend to have opposite biases.

> Ed, I live out here among them, talk to hams almost daily, have
> hundreds of friends and contacts that have persisted for many years, and
> spend a LOT of time on the air, mostly listening to others. You on the
> other hand spend your time in the ivory towers of Newington.

I'm curious: How do you know how Ed spends his time?

Why don't you simply accept that reasonable people can evaluate similar information and reach different conclusions? It seems clear to me that you think there is an agenda to eliminate CW as a mode within ham radio by eliminating Morse testing, thus drying up the pool of CW operators. (Please correct me if I'm misstating your views.) Ed, on the other hand, has said that he thinks that the pool of operators will NOT dry up because of the inherent qualities of CW. (He'll correct me if I'm wrong about his opinions, I'm sure.) If Ed believes that, clearly he's not promoting any such agenda as you are claiming. Now, he may be wrong in what be thinks will happen, but if he is it's still an honestly held belief that CW will persist, not be eliminated.

> Surely you understand that the people that gravitate to your
> presentations at hamfests are the subset of the much larger crowd
> attending the event,those who happen to know you, or of you, and are
> particularily interested in what you have to say,but they represent a
> small percentage of the attendance.

If that were the only contact HQ staff has with hams your point would be valid. But it's not. Even at hamfests and conventions, there is actually much more individual contact than that -- on the floor of the hamfest, in the hallways, at lunches and dinners, etc. I don't get out to hamfests nearly as much as Ed does (or nearly as much as I used to), but I doubt I was ever at a hamfest that I didn't talk individually (not in a prepared speech) to at least 50 hams, and at the larger hamfests far more. And that's just the hamfests. Factor in the phone calls, emails and HQ visitors and the number is much larger. Plus, aside from his professional duties, Ed is quite active on the air, just like you, and thus has access to the same basic information source.

> Far more wouldn't know you from
> Adam, I'm sorry to say. Atg that, you're probabaly the best known
> Newingtonite.

If you're talking about rrap or RFI forums, true. But go to a DX forum and ask who at ARRL HQ they know best. Go to an emergency communications forum and ask who they know best. Go to an educational forum and ask who they know best. In none of those cases will Ed's name even come up. This is an example, Dick, of your misplaced belief that your own experience extrapolates neatly to ham radio as a whole. You fail to fully recognize that the experiences of others may be markedly different from your own and may lead to their holding different opinions. And that even those with similar experiences may come to different conclusions, all without having "Agendas" other than to enjoy and contribute to ham radio.

> Many hans just don't buy the assertion of many in your
> movement that ham radio must abandon our older but very reliable and
> utilitarian modes for no reason other than the fact that commercial
> engineeers must constantly come up with "new and improved" versions of
> everything, else they find themselves unemployed. Yes, we heard, "no one
> is

> insisting that we abandon anything...".

Then why not simply believe that?

> Just what does "modernize" mean
> as used in all the rhetoric, then?

Adding modern techniques to our amateur toolbox without abandoning old ones that we still find useful -- or even just enjoyable.

> That, to them, is the thrust of the
> urge to "modernize". What else could it mean? That just because there is
> utility in using spread spectrum techniques in many communications
> venues that we actually need it in ham radio? I don't think so, and
> neither do they.

Dick, why don't you just stick to telling us what you believe? You have no justification for attempting to speak for the rest of ham radio. Trying to strengthen your argument by claiming that unnamed masses agree with you is a weak rhetorical device.

Jon

3222. Re: Calling the "Roll"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 20:13:12 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <3A86F258.6DA5CA87@arrl.org>
Source record: 3522

W1RFI wrote:
>
> >From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
> >
> >Happy New Year to you, Kim -- now, don't let the door hit you in
> >the ass on your way out!
>
> Thanks for the blast from the past. I think the last time I heard that one for
> real was junior high school.

They had doors way back then? :-)

Jon

3223. Re: Code Requirement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 20:14:36 UTC
From: ben@url.com
Message-ID: <3a86f295.2844352@news.accessnv.com>
Source record: 3523
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.policy

It's only 5 wpm so any lazy ass ought to be able to pass it.

On Sun, 11 Feb 2001 17:30:47 GMT, "Jim Wayda"
<jwayda@killspam.home.com> wrote:

>Ham Radio and Code.
>
>Has the archaic code requirement been removed from Ham Radio testing yet?
>
>-jim
>
>
>
>

3224. Re: Code Requirement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 20:16:30 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <3A86F31E.7AFB1F92@arrl.org>
Source record: 3524

ben wrote:
>
> It's only 5 wpm so any lazy ass ought to be able to pass it.

"Lazy ass?" Hmmm, should we replace QLF with QLC(heek)?

Jon

3225. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 21:02:11 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010211160211.17176.00001628@nso-ba.aol.com>
Source record: 3526

In article <20010211140020.24870.00000412@ng-mb1.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>This could go on forever. Rather than whining about your whining about my >whining about your whining about their whining, I will let you have the last >word about whining.

...serve no whine before its time... :-)

didit

3226. Re: Engineers, Technicians, and Appliance Operators

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 21:02:11 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010211160211.17176.00001627@nso-ba.aol.com>
Source record: 3529

In article <20010211092729.16173.00000434@ng-cu1.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>
>>My only dispute is with some of the ARRL's policy decisions.
>
>I, too, have disagreed with some of ARRL's policy decisions. I have not even
>disagreed with much of what you have offered. You only seem to get a bit far
>afield when you use capitalization and religious terms in your posts. :-)

"ARRL" is all capitals. :-)

I don't think I'm far afield on some who have quasi-religious thoughts on US amateur radio. I used to call them "ama-baptists" for their proselyting but others got confused and thought I was berating the AMA. :-)

While some folks use Yaesu and Kenwood radios, I'll swear that they are using Icons. :-)

[sorry, I shouldn't swear, Jim N2EY doesn't like it... :-)]

"Code" is a four-letter word.

Watch how many will think the above sentence is swearing or a "denunciation" of morse code! :-)

didit

3227. Re: Morse Code replacement? Bigtime flame war article!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 21:02:12 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010211160212.17176.00001629@nso-ba.aol.com>
Source record: 3528

In article <966d5j$53g$1@nnrp1.deja.com>, Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
writes:

>In article <20010210145350.01651.00001391@nso-fp.aol.com>,
> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
>> In article <20010210003936.13655.00003462@nso-mq.aol.com>,
>yodoc@aol.comnospam
>> (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:
>>
>> >Ah, yes, the 10-10 club. You just ran into the very attitude which
>> >has made me an avid "no-phoner" ever since! The Ten-Ten
>organization,
>> >and all of its drooling, toothless, slack-jawed, knuckle-dragging,
>> >mouth-breathing, bottom-feeding members are, collectively, proof
>> >that any idiot can pick up a microphone and talk -- and most
>> >idiots do!
>>
>> ...and some folks wonder why tRoll was beaten with a stick!
>>
>> :-)
>>
>> didit
>
>With a Ham Stick or a Terlin Sick (the one with the flailing "wander
>leads")?
>
>;)
>
>Len, better lighten up before the all the "Good Ops" start threatening
>to do you bodily harm.

Too late...they've already tried. One even threated to "remove my
ego" forcibly from the newsgroup according to private mail. :-)

didit

3228. Re: Morse Code replacement? Bigtime flame war article!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 21:02:13 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010211160213.17176.00001630@nso-ba.aol.com>
Source record: 3527

In article <3a861468.186914703@news2.dvol.com>, kelly@dvol (Brian Kelly, w3rv) writes:

>Squiggy doesn't have a fist, he couldn't communicate with dots &
>dashes if his life or anybody else's life depended on that ability, he
>advocates elimination of all subands, he advocates the use or wideband
>digital modes on the HF ham bands and he goes off on anti-cw rants at
>neighborhood ham club meetings (draws snores and doesn't go back). The
>only time I'd do dinner with him would be if he was the guest of honor
>and showed up on the platter with an apple stuffed in his mouth.
>>
>Get it yet?

Please, quit holding back and tell us how you REALLY feel... :-)

didit

3229. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 21:03:42 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <966unejce0@208.206.142.83>
Source record: 3525

W1RFI wrote:
>
> >From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
>
> >And the output of the Kachina is undistinguishable from a non-DSP rig.
> >You say we must do it because someone can.
>
> The Kachina is a good example of a software-controlled radio. Its DSP
> implementation is the start of what constitutes a software-defined radio.
>
> As DSP technology improves, and right now, it is good to at least 10 MHz, we
> are literally going to see software-to-antenna radios. They will be readily
> programmable to be any mode radio that we want. To make design changes, one
> will download new code. The FM, SSB, SS, data, digital voice or CW signals
> will be encoded and decoded right in software.
>
> In the long run, these radio techniques will increase flexibility and
> interoperability of radios. The FCC may very well make changes in the way that
> it allocates spectrum and operating authority as a result.
>
> Spread Spectrum is at least as revolutionary a change as was AM-SSB; the former
> was, at least initially, accomplished by taking an AM signal and running it
> through a filter. SS and digital voice are more different than SSB and FM than
> was AM/SSB. Using SS, and/or trunking techniques, the very way spectrum is
> used in the Amateur Radio Service could be changed. Instead of allocating
> frequency pairs that are unused most of the time, that block of spectrum could
> be accessed by multiple users, each with their own spreading codes, thus
> limiting the use of the "repeater" bands not by the number of potential users,
> but by the number of actual users. No more "no pairs available" and
> coordination difficulties. Not as sweeping a change as AM to SSB?

I can see some applications on VHF/UHF where SS could solve a few
problems that have been politically knotty, and thus avoided by both FCC
and ARRL. The repeater situation should have never been allowed to
degenerate into the sort of situation where all pairs are tied up while
there is mostly silence on those bands, and much of the activity one
does hear makes you want to turn off your HT.
But of course your discussion above addresses VHF/UHF, and not HF where
there is simply no reason to even consider such a change-unless it is
considered to be necessary just because the modes in use on HF must be
considered old and obsolete, thus unusable. That's an attitude
attributable mostly to people who spend most of their time trying to
change things whether or not they need changing instead of using HF ham
radio.

> >No one **EVER** suggested that hams should refrain from learning about
> >new technolies ...
>
> > WE DO RESIST the continued assertion that we must "modernize" by
> > dumnping everything that interests us just because it might have been
> > around longer than the latest digital dream.
>
> I will speak only for myself, Dick; I have never suggested that you need to
> dump anything that interests you. I sure don't intend to stop using OOK CW.
> If you feel that I have suggested that you need to stop using CW, or even that
> you personally "must" learn new things, you should read my words more
> carefully. I have faith that hams will learn this technology if they are given
> some of the reasons why it is important that they do and given the resources to
> do so. Very few have taken this as "yelling" or as my telling that that they
> must dump what they are doing. Very, very few.

This little scrap has been ongoing far longer than I've been on usenet.
I don't mean to attribute any particular part of it to you personally,
just that you have shown that you agree with the thrust, that ham radio
is derelict in having not widely adopted all those new modes which have
done so well in commercial and government use. Overlooked is the widely
diverging orientation between ham radio, especially HF, and those other
services which have largely abandoned HF.
I believe the main reason for that is there is largely no need felt by
most hams for ir, particularily on HF. And most of the spectral problems
on VHF/UHF are because of outdated schemes and regulations instead of
modal shortcomings. That doesn't mean that there is no benefit at all to
making wholesale changes, just that there is no demonstraded need. The
"installed base" principle DOES apply.
The political problems on VHF/UHF might be releived by changing to SS
but look at the huge cost involved for the small benefit, and I really
don't think most hams would benefit at all. I see it as merely "change
for the sake of change". With the serious decline in use of much of the
present repeater system having occurred I doubt if much activty would
survive. Would I buy a completely new VHF rig to replace the FM rig that
I rarely use now? I seriously doubt it, unless some new factor became
involved. Replacing all the FM gear now in use is a huge project that I
just don't see happening at all, wsithout some more compelling reason
than just updating the technology. Just as it has not happened in most
commercial and governmental organizations. I know that most Public
Safety organizations have not changed to more modern modes and still use
point to point FM and repeaters. Some of those that have have moved to
trunked systems have had reason to regret it, at least at times.
The idea that a hugely complex system can be made to be so reliable that
it won't fail is still a concept not yet realized.

> >We've listed dozens of other objects which are
> >also obsolete, and are still in universal use today, but that makes no
> >difference.
>
> Yes, they are in universal use today. How many of them are a mandatory part of
> testing for any priveleges, amateur or otherwise?

How many match the unique attributes of radiotelegraphy?

> >It is clear that the entire movement to "modernize" is nothing more
> >than another push to get rid of the code.
>
> Is that what you think that retired Dale Hatfield from the FCC was seeking to
> do?

Of course not. I see that my wording was a bit overly strong. On the
other hand, I sure do believe that he has been greatly influenced by the
stridency of people like Carl Stevenson. Don't you? After we've been
flatly told that "a few people can change the world and just did"? After
FCC near-totally ignored the ARRL BOD in the restructuring decision and
gave NCI almost everything they
whined for and some they didn't?

> >And we refuse to be intimidated or browbeat
> >by those who want their agenda to prevail.
>
> There's that "agenda" thing again. Do you really think that the only reason I
> say that I believe more hams should learn the fundamentals of modern
> communications technology is to "get rid of the code?"

No, Ed, you're not nearly the main part of the problem. You're only a
side feature of it, in that you have decided to agree to cave in to the
shrillness that is total opposition to ANY Morse code operational test
requirement. Evidently the entire ARRL heirachy has. The rest of it I
see as being used mainly for justification.
Three or four years ago, not long after I first landed on this NG I
said something about "Where's the beef? Why isn't there any gear
available to actually use if these glitzy new modes are so great? When
are some of the strident advocates going to put their expertise where
their mouths are?"

If they are in fact all that beneficial and applicable to ham radio why
are there NO renditions available today on the market, even as kits?

I looked over the TAPR website you gave, and yes indeed, I believe it
is proper to add a few questions on that material to the question pools.
But the tests, instead of being reduced in scope and number of
questions, would be better expanded when including new material,
otherwise they actually are being reduced in scope of coverage.

3230. Re: Morse Code replacement? Bigtime flame war article!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 21:08:18 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <spvd8t0clpc5ucijje459bbhivkslk97r6@4ax.com>
Source record: 3532

w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:
>On 160 M, for example, the band plan for CW operation is regularly
>stomped on by phone operators...

CW ops can go anywhere on most bands for a QSO. Yet they usually stick to the agreed upon CW areas of the bands. Do you have such a low opinion of phone ops that you don't think that they can abide by a gentleman's agreement to do likewise? I'll bet 95% of them can. They could and did when they voluntarily divided up the phone bands between AM and SSB during the transition. Maybe a concerted education effort by ARRL on your 160 meter problem would help. Better than more government regulation to solve a ham problem, don't you think...

>Cecil wanted to engage someone in a 5 wpm
>QSO in the DX windows, just because he can.

I think Cecil wanted to make a point. And perhaps get a goat. But I doubt that he really intends to violate the gentleman's agreement of chatting in the DX area. But then you knew that didn't you. You were also trying to make a point and perhaps get a goat... :-)

3231. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 21:08:19 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <7pvd8tkkkpnnlv3qkvu0ntifmvjei93ec4@4ax.com>
Source record: 3530

w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:

>>From: Aaron Jones nomail@nomail.com
>
>>I said that I think that most hams of the *50's* could fix their own
>>gear. Things had somewhat changed by the 80's.
>
>Okay, as long as we agree that we are discussing a 20-year old "problem."

I'm not sure that it is a "problem". I think that it is unrealistic to
believe that modern hams (of all walks of life) should be able to fix
their modern gear...

3232. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 21:08:21 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <vovd8t025nfae8gdu50u3k9n785pane1g6@4ax.com>
Source record: 3531

w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:
>I think it illogical to assume that the "most valuable" of all
> modes will not be used by hams unless
>they are required to learn it to get a license.

I think it is quite logical that if applicants are not required to learn the code before becoming a ham, then there will be far fewer who will take up CW afterwards. To think otherwise flies in the face of basic advertising theory.

Just think if one of QST's advertisers could force all hams to try his rig before getting a license. Sure many would hate it at first, but after awhile some would find that they actually did like it. Sales would go up and the rig would find increased use on the bands. Then after some years the forced rig use requirement goes away. Of course sales and rig use among new hams will go down. It's a slam dunk... :-)

However, will the elimination/reduction of forced code testing be bad or good for the hobby as a whole, not just CW, is really the important point...

3233. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 21:08:22 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <8nvd8ts0lsk5j540gt19k0du0v9tsppckl@4ax.com>
Source record: 3533

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>I could get no less than a dozen TV stations using rabbit ears

Phoenix has always been a good rabbit ears town. Course we put our TV
towers up on the mountain...

>yet almost the entire neighborhood was on cable.

Same here. The good stuff is on cable...

Well actually satellite is better, but the hassle of local programming
and feeding multiple TV sets makes it difficult...

>TV broadcasting? Practically obsolete.

Not for a few years yet. They gotta pay for those new HDTV
transmitters...

3234. Re: Code Requirement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 21:16:51 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <966vg3$ku0$0@208.206.142.83>
Source record: 3534
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Jim Wayda wrote:
>
> Ham Radio and Code.
>
> Has the archaic code requirement been removed from Ham Radio testing yet?

Have you removed that archaic gasoline engine from your car yet?

3235. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 21:33:48 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010211163348.01651.00001425@nso-fp.aol.com>
Source record: 3536

In article <48bc8tsvp94f20mba0ee781scads5lof5g@4ax.com>, Aaron Jones
<nomail@nomail.com> writes:

>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>>You paid 127% of a week's wages for that thing [Heathkit SSB rig].
>
>That SSB rig was cheaper than most of the available
> *new* AM gear of the day...

Yup. That's what really caused the move from AM to SSB - it became cheaper to run SSB than AM at the power levels hams wanted to use.

AM gear is cheaper and simpler than SSB at low power levels. But once you have an SSB signal generated, building up the power level is cheaper than with AM. The development of the amateur HF heterodyne transceiver (which uses the same frequency-determining parts for both T and R) nailed it for SSB.

Oddly enough, the first true HF amateur heterodyne transceiver design I have been able to dig up is a CW transceiver.
>
>>How much would that be in today's money?
>
>It certainly points up the fact that ham rigs (in real dollars) are
>much less expensive today...

Yep - and kits are back.
>
>>Most of the reasons I cited were not of my own creation.
>>They came from a 1963 QST editorial.
>
>A little late for the credits... :-)

Never said they were my original ideas. It's interesting that nobody else recognized the source.
>
>>I got my Extra in 1970 because I wanted all privileges and I figured that
>the
>>tests would not get easier. Ah, the folly of youth.....
>
>I'm still waiting. At the present rate of change I should have my
>privileges back in a few years free gratis... :-)

You are probably not far wrong. QCWA asked for just that.

Funny thing is, the 1968-1969 changes radically decreased the amount of phone spectrum available to Generals in the ham bands from 80 thru 15 meters. Then, about 1972, the FCC began widening the 'phone bands, so that over time allmost

all of the "lost" phone spectrum was regained by Generals.
>
73 de Jim, N2EY

3236. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 21:33:49 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010211163349.01651.00001426@nso-fp.aol.com>
Source record: 3535

In article <3a5f9c59.1525595@news.mindspring.com>, billsohl@mindspring.com (Bill Sohl) writes:

>The question for you Vince then is twofold:
>Is publishing questions from PAST tests illegal when
>done by those college prep course publishers?

Let me have a go at this one.

It's not illegal for at least two reasons:

1) The published tests are intentionally released by the testing agency for publication.
2) The published tests are no longer used - they really are past tests, not current ones.

>If the answer to the first question is NO, then why
>should Bash be held to a different standard of law?

Because Bash violated both of the above conditions. The tests he published were not intentionally released for publication by the FCC, and they were not questions which had been removed from use in testing.

Let me ask this, Bill: If a college prep course publisher somehow got hold of current test questions, and published them, would that be OK?
>
>If the Q&A was (by some miracle) made secret again,
>would you complain when people publised the questions
>they remembered from PAST tests on a centralized web site?

I would, if the intent of making them secret was to keep the exact Q&A secret.

What Bash really did was to expose the fact that the FCC did not have an enormous stack of different tests in use. Prosecuting him would have publicized that fact and probably greatly increased sales.

All academic now. Bash's actions are ancient history. No way is the FCC going to get involved in ham testing in the foreseeable future other than retesting as part of enforcement actions.
>
73 de Jim, N2EY

3237. Re: How do I cancel my League membership?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 21:41:58 UTC
From: etagg <etagg@twcny.rr.com>
Message-ID: <GGDh6.120121$o91.12287832@typhoon.nyroc.rr.com>
Source record: 3537
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

```
just stop
"smiley o'riley" <bummer-radio@licensing.org> wrote in message
news:goodbye@goodbye...
>
> I find I can no longer support the ARRL by being a member. What's the
best
> way to cancel a membership?
>
> TNX 73 de Smiley
```

3238. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 21:44:25 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <96713ppfc0@208.206.142.83>
Source record: 3538

W1RFI wrote:
>
> >From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
>
> >>>In any scenario where CW subbands are shared with phone
> >>>signals, CW will tend to lose out. Its only natural.
>
> >>Then you believe that CW is the less-robust mode.
>
> >No, I believe you're a wanker if you can't understand a simple statement
> >like the one I made above!
>
> I understood what you said, I just couldn't make any sense out of it. How can
> a mode be "more robust" than another, but lose out when it goes head to head
> with the other mode in shared spectrum?

I would think that a 23db power advantage to the other mode might do
it.
(5 watts vs 1500)

3239. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 21:49:37 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9671dhqeo0@208.206.142.83>
Source record: 3539

W1RFI wrote:
>
> >From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
>
> >And I said nothing whatever about 1963. The selftrained radio engineers
> >came considerably earlier in most cases, the people who were the
> >creators of much of what we know as "radio". Many, even most had no
> >engineering training at all.
>
> So Amateur Radio has been "ruined" for over 40 years now? I am curious, Dick;
> how long has ham radio been down the tubes?

??? Well, when you finally get the answer let me know. I said nothing
about any such thing. I said that once it was much easier for a ham to
become a radio engineer since the technology was easier to learn.

3240. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 21:50:29 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9671f5qeo1@208.206.142.83>
Source record: 3540

"T. L. Bryant" wrote:
>
> In article <961tnb$g11$1@208.206.142.81>, dixie@townsqr.com says...
> >
> >
> >
> >Cecil wrote:
> >>
> >
> >> The great majority of hams are stuck in the 60s, Dick. We are already
> >> stagnating 40 years behind the state of the art in RF communications.
> >>
> >
> >That is pure unadulturated bullcrap.
>
> You're absolutely right, Dick. He should have that most hams are stuck in the
> 50s.

If you believe that is shows that you know nothing about the 50's

3241. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 21:52:52 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9671jkqeo2@208.206.142.83>
Source record: 3541

Brian wrote:
>
> Dick, you've got to get over thinking that you are the El Supremo
> Commandant of the ARS.

Gee, Brian, I'm impressed that you think that. I had no idea.

3242. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 21:57:38 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9671siqeo3@208.206.142.83>
Source record: 3542

Cecil wrote:
>
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > The Morse/CW mode continued to survive and flourish only due to
> > the code testing requirement.
>
> I disagree and you cannot possibly know that for certain. I learned
> Morse code in Cub Scouts because it was fun. It has been fun for
> me for 52 years. I have never used CW or needed to use CW for an
> emergency. I seriously doubt that I will ever use CW for an
> emergency. Why don't you stop telling everyone what a pain in the
> arse it was for you to learn Morse code and promote the fun aspect
> of the mode with a little positive thinking?
>

Yeah, Larry. Go ahead and "positively think" radiotelegraphy out of
existance.

3243. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 22:10:49 UTC
From: tlbryant@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <9672l9020mj@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 3543

In article <966a7g$qj2$0@208.206.142.85>, dixie@townsqr.com says...
>
>
>
>W1RFI wrote:
>>
>> >From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
>>
>> >It has never been different except that once it was much easier for an
>> >ordinary individual to learn to be a communications (radio) engineer.
>>
>> Dick, there are tools that are readily available today that let ordinary
>> individuals do things that engineers of old found difficult. I can predict
>> quite accurately the performance of a multi-element Yagi antenna with a few
>> minutes programming. I can optimize that antenna in another few minutes for
>> maximum forward gain, F/B, feed-point Z or any combination thereof. I can
>> predict the propagation between W1 and central India using another free
>> software program, or can design an amplifier using free design software.
>>
>
>
> I know. Just like it is easy to pass the written amateur exams today
>because of the existance of a public pool with all the test questions
>and their exact answers.
> Just because you have access to software that will allow you to bypass
>knowledge doesn't mean you have that knowledge.

Using tools to make tasks a bit easier is not the same as bypassing knowlege.
You'd still have to know something about propogation or antenna specs in order
to use the software Ed is talking about. The tediousness of hand calculations,
which are more subject to human error, is what's eliminated.

3244. Re: Code Requirement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 22:25:48 UTC
From: tlbryant@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <9673hc120mj@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 3544
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.policy
Body handling: HTML body converted to readable text

In article ,
jwayda@killspam.home.com says...
>
>Ham Radio and Code.
>
>Has the archaic code requirement been removed from Ham Radio testing yet?
>
>-jim

It's getting there. There's only one code test now, and that's 5 WPM for the class of licenses that require it.

3245. Re: ARRL HQ "Attitude" (Was: Re: Pride)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 22:30:21 UTC
From: tlbryant@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <9673pt220mj@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 3545

In article <20010211123745.16594.00006419@nso-cg.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam says...
>
>In article <963b5b12dgu@enews4.newsguy.com>, tlbryant@my-deja.com (T. L. >Bryant) writes:
>
>>>Cecil:
>>>
>>>That's where you'd be wrong, again! You're pretty annoying at times, >>>but you've never hit me with a stick! Where did this stick-hitting >>>requirement for annoyance come from, anyway? You don' need no >>>steenking sticks in order to be annoying!
>>>
>>>73 de Larry, K3LT
>>
>>
>>So now you're saying that K1ZZ hit you with a stick at Dayton?
>
>No, Cecil -- now stop trying to be annoying!
>
>73 de Larry, K3LT

Cecil didn't write it. Try reading the e-mail address of the poster once and awhile.

3246. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 22:33:02 UTC
From: tlbryant@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <9673uu320mj@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 3546

In article <20010211123747.16594.00006421@nso-cg.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam says...
>
>In article <20010210080316.23230.00000028@ng-fm1.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com
>(W1RFI) writes:
>
>>
>>I don't know, Larry. I was a ham (off and on) for about 20 years before I
>>joined ARRL. Maybe that gives me a different perspective on new hams'
>>joining
>>and supporting organizations.
>>
>>Is whether they are League members really more important to you than the fact
>>that there are 37,980 new hams?
>
>Ed:
>
>No, it means nothing to me, actually. However, it had damn well
>better mean something to you! I'm not the one who makes his living
>working at ARRL HQ -- you are!
>
>73 de Larry, K3LT

If it means nothing to you, why are you showing such concern for his welfare by bringing it up?

3247. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 23:17:21 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <9676hr$p8b$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 3548

In article <9671jkqeo2@208.206.142.83>,
Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>
>
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dick, you've got to get over thinking that you are the El Supremo
> > Commandant of the ARS.
>
> Gee, Brian, I'm impressed that you think that. I had no idea.

Then you're easily impressed, Dick.

But your biggest problem is having no idea.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

3248. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 23:24:31 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <9676v8pka1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 3549

In article <20010211145213.16762.00001697@nso-mp.aol.com>,
lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
> In article <3A8611A9.F6CCB653@ovis.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net>
writes:
>
> >That's a real knee slapper, Len! Keep the yuks coming. Have any
> >amateur radio related material?
>
> Just the material that started this thread...newcomers to US
> amateur radio who were either code-tested or not code-tested.
> An Extra (N2EY) already commented on the subject...without
> making a bunch of nonsense about who started it.
>
> What amateur radio related material do you have? More
> insults and deprecations of those who might be interested
> in US amateur radio?
>
> Or are you going into some diatribe of those who do not
> believe in the US ARS policies as you do? Or are you simply
> an unpleasant person towards those who might be interested
> in a newer, more modern policy about and for the US ARS?
>
> didit

I'm interested in a newer, more modern policy about and for the US ARS.
Where can I read more?

Hey, I just read where Canada needs an NCI rep.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

3249. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 23:27:42 UTC
From: billsohl@mindspring.com
Message-ID: <3a871fa8.2231356@news.mindspring.com>
Source record: 3547

On 11 Feb 2001 21:49:37 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

>W1RFI wrote:
>>
>> >From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
>>
>> >And I said nothing whatever about 1963. The selftrained radio engineers
>> >came considerably earlier in most cases, the people who were the
>> >creators of much of what we know as "radio". Many, even most had no
>> >engineering training at all.
>>
>> So Amateur Radio has been "ruined" for over 40 years now? I am curious, Dick;
>> how long has ham radio been down the tubes?
>
>??? Well, when you finally get the answer let me know. I said nothing
>about any such thing.

OK, then let's take you at your literal comment...

> I said that once it was much easier for a ham to
>become a radio engineer since the technology was easier to learn.

SO... when did that end and WHY did that end?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3250. Re: ARRL HQ "Attitude" (Was: Re: Pride)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 23:30:01 UTC
From: tlbryant@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <96779p02b27@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 3411

In article <20010211123746.16594.00006420@nso-cg.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam says...
>I'm ass-u-&-me-ing that you're sitting down while you're reading this;
>but in case you type your newsgripe postings from a standing
>position, please sit down before you read this:
>
>You don't annoy me. Nobody in this newsgroup annoys me. Even
>Kim didn't annoy me. This is just a bunch of people typing on a
>computer screen -- nothing to be annoyed about! And you are the
>leader of the group that couldn't possibly annoy me no mater what
>you said! Sorry for the disillusionment.
>
>73 de Larry, K3LT

If you're not annoyed, you certainly have a funny way showing it.

3251. Re: Code Requirement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 23:38:16 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <9677p8$q6l$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 3402

In article <3A86F31E.7AFB1F92@arrl.org>,
Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote:
> ben wrote:
> >
> > It's only 5 wpm so any lazy ass ought to be able to pass it.
>
> "Lazy ass?" Hmmm, should we replace QLF with QLC(heek)?
>
> Jon

We already had a "piece" on here about a year ago conserning squeezing a
paddle with ones cheeks. It was a messy thread. ;)

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

3252. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 23:39:15 UTC
From: billsohl@mindspring.com
Message-ID: <3a8720c9.2520361@news.mindspring.com>
Source record: 3550

On 11 Feb 2001 17:37:52 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>In article <3A85712F.B4500C74@IEEE.org>, Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>>The great majority of people who don't know Morse code don't consider
>>it to be universal or easily implemented. If you want to use Morse code
>>for emergencies, Dick, by all means do it. Most of the rest of the world
>>has given up on Morse code for emergency use.
>
>That's true -- and the reason is that it requires an operator to learn
>and gain useful proficiency in the skill of sending and receiving Morse
>code! Now, when you're talking about commercial or military utility
>communications applications, this means the expense of training,
>paying, and providing benefits for flesh-and-blood radio operators. If
>I owned a shipping line, I would probably want to eliminate that
>particular part of my overhead, just as much as anyone else. Therefore,
>ships at sea and land-based communications facilities depend on
>expensive, computerized communications systems instead of
>human radio operators.

Exactly. I agree completely with that statement. The bottom line
is that the cost benefit no longer justifies the need for trained
CW ops in military and commercial.

>Amateur radio does not have these economic considerations,

WRONG!!!

My personal time is absolutly under the same rules as
commercial/military indetermining what I do.

>but
>we still have to deal with the fact that learning and gaining useful
>proficiency in Morse code still requires a considerable amount of
>dedicated effort on the part of the operators who wish to use it.

Ageed.

>In
>the past, this effort was motivated and incentivized by the promise
>of increased operating privileges; now that that incentive has been
>removed, there will, for sure, be far fewer people even bothering to
>learn and gain useful proficiency in Morse code.

Probably true, but that is simply the FCC recognition that there
is NO justifiable reason to warrant having all new HF hams
learn CW to the degree warranted in the past. To wit...the FCC

acknowledges the cost to the individual can not be justified
by any rational to sustain the old requirements for CW ability
at 13 or 20 wpm.

>The Morse/CW mode continued to survive and flourish only due to
>the code testing requirement.

Which states volumes as to the true worth of the mode. It seems
you had to mandate code learning by all to obtain a small subset
of proponents. That's truly a waste of a great many people's time.

> In the absence of the requirement,
>the numbers of Morse/CW mode users will most likely shrink to a
>small fraction of their present numbers, at least in the United States.

That is then your own problem (if you see it as a
problem at all).

>European/Asian/African operators don't seem to have as much of a
>laziness problem as we Americans do.

So why is it that so many countries are now moving to end all
but a 5 wpm test?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3253. Re: Code Requirement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 23:40:11 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <9677srqfm1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 3401
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <966vg3$ku0$0@208.206.142.83>,
Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>
>
> Jim Wayda wrote:
> >
> > Ham Radio and Code.
> >
> > Has the archaic code requirement been removed from Ham Radio testing
yet?
>
> Have you removed that archaic gasoline engine from your car yet?

Damned Liberals. Are you with Algore on that one, too?

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

3254. Re: Morse Code replacement? Bigtime flame war article!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 23:41:39 UTC
From: tlbryant@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <9677vj12b27@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 3408

In article <20010211123748.16594.00006423@nso-cg.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam says...
>
>I've never encountered a 10-10 member on 10-meter CW; however, if

That doesn't mean that they don't exist.

>I did, and I wasn't able to give him my number, I'm sure I'd receive the
>same kind of disparagement as I received during my very last 10-meter
>phone QSO with a 10-10 member!
>
>73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Seems to me that's a little premature in judgement. Maybe if you'd worked the ten required stations and applied for a membership, you wouldn't feel so negative about it.

3255. Re: Morse Code replacement? Bigtime flame war article!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 23:51:00 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <9678h2$qv0$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 3404

In article <20010211123747.16594.00006422@nso-cg.aol.com>,
yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote:
> In article <9631qu$ni5$1@nnrp1.deja.com>, Brian
<brianburke@my-deja.com>
> writes:
>
> >> Brian:
> >>
> >> Ah, yes, the 10-10 club. You just ran into the very attitude which
> >> has made me an avid "no-phoner" ever since! The Ten-Ten
organization,
> >> and all of its drooling, toothless, slack-jawed, knuckle-dragging,
> >> mouth-breathing, bottom-feeding members are, collectively, proof
> >> that any idiot can pick up a microphone and talk -- and most
> >> idiots do!
> >>
> >> 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >
> >Apparently, according to Hans, FISTS members work you once, get your
> >number, and are more than happy to send you on your way. Can it be
than
> > idiots can pick up a paddle?
>
> Brian:
>
> I'm not aware of any such limitation in the FISTS organization. I've
> worked numerous FISTS members numerous times, and usually
> enjoyed each QSO. What the heck are you talking about, anyway?
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Hey, don't ask me. Take it up with your "Good Op" Hans. Here's what HE
said:

"I like all those ideas, Jim, except the one about publicizing the Fists
freqs. I've abandoned any operations anywhere near xx.058, because once
a Fists member "collects your number", the contact usually comes to a
quick conclusion.

73, Hans, K0HB
Fists # 7419 (I think)"

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

3256. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 23:54:50 UTC
From: tlbryant@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <9678oa22b27@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 3418

In article <20010211123751.16594.00006428@nso-cg.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam says...
>T. L.:
>
>I could care less whether or not you post a callsign; and for the record,
>I could care less if you are an "Pre-Resturcturing" Extra or a newly-
>licensed Technician. You identify your posts with your name, for this
>or any newsgroup, that is sufficient. At least you are not hiding behind
>some fictious "screen name," or so it seems -- but I'm inclined to give
>the benefit of the doubt when I see a "real" looking name. However,
>in these dumbed-down days of ham radio, any idiot can get a license
>and a call sign, so I have no need to see yours. Never think you need
>to post it for my benefit.
>
>73 de Larry, K3LT

For someone who claims not to be concerned with things, you certainly contradict yourself in your responses. I really don't think you remember what you write from one day to the next. I guess it figures that you wouldn't remember me from when I posted several months ago, and at that time, posted my callsign. (Remember the little exchange we had about your complaining about Kim's "vulger" callsign, and then your using the "F" word in a posting? Do a deja.com archive search, if you like)

So how many more contradictions can we expect to see from you?

3257. Re: Morse Code replacement? Bigtime flame war article!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-11 23:56:12 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <9678qq$r2p$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 3410

In article <20010211160212.17176.00001629@nso-ba.aol.com>,
lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
> In article <966d5j$53g$1@nnrp1.deja.com>, Brian
<brianburke@my-deja.com>
> writes:
>
> >In article <20010210145350.01651.00001391@nso-fp.aol.com>,
> > lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
> >> In article <20010210003936.13655.00003462@nso-mq.aol.com>,
> >yodoc@aol.comnospam
> >> (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:
> >>
> >> >Ah, yes, the 10-10 club. You just ran into the very attitude
which
> >> >has made me an avid "no-phoner" ever since! The Ten-Ten
> >organization,
> >> >and all of its drooling, toothless, slack-jawed, knuckle-dragging,
> >> >mouth-breathing, bottom-feeding members are, collectively, proof
> >> >that any idiot can pick up a microphone and talk -- and most
> >> >idiots do!
> >>
> >> ...and some folks wonder why tRoll was beaten with a stick!
> >>
> >> :-)
> >>
> >> didit
> >
> >With a Ham Stick or a Terlin Sick (the one with the flailing "wander
> >leads")?
> >
> >;)
> >
> >Len, better lighten up before the all the "Good Ops" start
threatening
> >to do you bodily harm.
>
> Too late...they've already tried. One even threated to "remove my
> ego" forcibly from the newsgroup according to private mail. :-)
>
> didit

Lots of junk yard dogs in ham radio, it would appear. Perhaps the chest
pounders can get a gig on the WWF. Maybe they'll go back to brass
pounding.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

3258. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-12 00:01:42 UTC
From: billsohl@mindspring.com
Message-ID: <3a872411.3360313@news.mindspring.com>
Source record: 3403

On 11 Feb 2001 17:40:01 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

>W1RFI wrote:
>>
>> >From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
>> >> I am quite aware of the present technical status of hams, Dick; I spend
>> >> about 2 or 3 hours a day on the phone, answering their questions.
>> >> Most of them don't share your "can't do" viewpoint.
>>
>> >I seriously doubt it. You meet and converse with seek out your
>> >services and those of ARRL.
>>
>> Are you really offering that those that call me on the phone do so because they
>> believe they "can't do" whatever it is they are asking me about? I fail to
>> understand that logic, Dick.
>
>
> If you spent a half hour per telephone contact, 8 hours per day, 5 days
>per week for 52 weeks per year, you'd talk to 830 hams.

Hey, any time I've called Ed on the phone he has never given me
1/2 hour of histime. Am I not getting my monies worth from my
ARRL membership? :-)

>> Secondly, please forgive me for not also explaining that my contact with hams
>> also includes a lot of travel to conventions, and local club meetings. During
>> that travel, I not only talk to a lot of hams, but I wander around a bit and
>> look at what is going on. I do not see evidence of "they won't learn anything
>> more than what is on the test" as you describe. That is "can't do" and what I
>> see is people doing the doing.
>>
>> When I go to a local club meeting, generally only the club program director has
>> sought me out. The other 30 people are just there. In what way do you think
>> they are different than the hams that you know?
>
> If you attended a hamfest or club meeting every week for 52 weeks and
>talked to 30 persons per meeting you;d talk to 1,560 hams in a year.
>All in all, not any overpowering percentage of licensed hams.

I've seen Ed talk to hundreds at a hamfest. To suggest that
someone like Ed would only talk to so few people in a hamfest
setting is a joke.

>> How could I possibly see so
>> much hope and enthusiasm in hams, yet you see none?
>

> Once again, you misstate my position. That is not at all what I said.
>I said that you don't see all the hams out there who just want to be
>hams, and don't have the training nor the refined technical skills to
>get involved in your mission of "high tech for the masses", nor will
>they ever get very deeply involved in it for that very reason. It is NOT
>a simple matter and everyone except the promoters of the Agenda know it.

Dick must have some special dailog with all those "other"
folks that Ed and the rest of us never meet.

And...there's that "agenda" silliness once again.
What agenda Dick?

> Oh, the Agenda is not a formal document nor even a clearly stated
>position, it is just an attitude. It basically says, but certainly is
>not limited to, "get the ARS away from CW specifically, and into the
>world of high tech, never mind anything else".

Gee Dick, I must have skipped that chapter in my ARRL
manual and the FCC part 97.

>It ignores completely the
>practical aspects that characterize almost every ordinary ham. He wants
>to use ham radio as he recognizes it, which is to say that it IS an
>evolving and improving entity, and he intends to be a part of that
>evolution and improvement. He does NOT believe that just because
>inventors working for the telephone company have found that spread
>spectrum techniques find favor in use as cordless telephones that he
>must line up and follow suit. He sees that is pure techie nonsense, and
>recoginzes it as what it is - an attempt by a few hams and others whose
>interests are in little except development to trump his own desires and
>best interests. Cecil Moore said yesterday that his interest is in
>experimenting and he rarely gets on the air. That's fine, but it also
>shows that his interest is driven by something other than that of the
>average ham.
>
> Of course hams need to learn more about advancing technology. It won't
>happen effectively until people who develop these systems who are able
>to explain them in terms understandable to the average ham who knows
>little or nothing about those techniques and little about technology at
>all.

Spread spectrum was invented by a layman with NO
engineering background.

> THAT is the challenge. I and othes have raised it several times here
>in recent years, to do it, and explain what you're doing, or get off the
>soapbox. So far I've seen nothing that I would call progress. A single
>text explaining in simnple detail, it that is possible, the basics of
>the new technologis would go far toward educating the masses of hams.
>Most I know would spring a few bucks for such a boot. If they could find
>it. Instead all they get is criticism.

I see such articles in QST all the time. Do you read them
Dick?

>> > For every one you contact there are many thousands you never know
>> > about. No one I know personally has had contact with you.
>>
>> Of the 50 or so people that show up regularly here, about 5 have had personal
>> dealings with me.
>>
>I would guess that I have interacted with
>> over 5000 hams over the years. Out of those, I do not see more than a handful
>> that I believe are the way you have offered that most new hams must be.
>
> Of course not. You see those basically who want to see you and hear
>what you have to say. Others are busily doing other things that interest
>them. I will say, you are probably the biggest crowd draw that Newington
>has to offer. When a crowd of hundreds or more producesd an audience of
>50 for your presentation that means that you won't be exposed to the
>attitudes of aa pretty large majority.

Well Ed...I guess if you don't have an SRO crowd then
you aren't doing a good job for us. All those others that
don't sign up to hear your talk just have no need for
it because they march to the sound of a differnet drum...which
only Dick knows about.

> Please
>> tell us about the much larger group you have interacted with and why they are
>> so very different from the hams I have met.
>
> Ed, I live out here among them, talk to hams almost daily, have
>hundreds of friends and contacts that have persisted for many years, and
>spend a LOT of time on the air, mostly listening to others. You on the
>other hand spend your time in the ivory towers of Newington.

Hey Ed, you guys didn't show me those ivory towers
when I went for the ARRL tour a few years back.

>I can
>easily see that you inhabit the ground floor, as you are in fact one of
>the most practically minded ihabitants. But the fact remains.
>
> Surely you understand that the people that gravitate to your
>presentations at hamfests are the subset of the much larger crowd
>attending the event,those who happen to know you, or of you, and are
>particularily interested in what you have to say,but they represent a
>small percentage of the attendance. Far more wouldn't know you from
>Adam, I'm sorry to say. Atg that, you're probabaly the best known
>Newingtonite.
> If I attend a hamfest where you appear I'll be in the group you
>address. A great majority of ordinary hams will not. Some will be
>interested in your RFI work. Some will skip because you are a part of
>the movement to "modernize" ham radio away from their interests, and

>they don't support that. Not many hams believe it is in their best
>interests to cause the ARS to implement such modes as spread spectrum
>nor univesal digitized voice especially on HF, since the bands are not
>unduly congested and the "cure" is just as likely to be much worse than
>any perceived ailment.
>
> Many of these same hams believe it is a travesty to allow
>radiotelegraphy to atrophy to the point of uselessness just to allow
>easy entry into ham radio, and believe that this is a part of the
>movement to force ham radio into accepting modes that are commercially
>invaluable but which have little or nothing to offer to hams in
>practical application. Not much is known about their actual effects on
>the HF ham bands. Many hans just don't buy the assertion of many in your
>movement that ham radio must abandon our older but very reliable and
>utilitarian modes for no reason other than the fact that commercial
>engineeers must constantly come up with "new and improved" versions of
>everything, else they find themselves unemployed. Yes, we heard, "no one
>is
>insisting that we abandon anything...". Just what does "modernize" mean
>as used in all the rhetoric, then? That, to them, is the thrust of the
>urge to "modernize". What else could it mean? That just because there is
>utility in using spread spectrum techniques in many communications
>venues that we actually need it in ham radio? I don't think so, and
>neither do they.

Dick... modernize is eactly what hams have been doing
for decades. The fact that some wish to still use (and enjoy using)
older technology is their personal choice. The problem for hams
as a large group would be if hams as a majority took such
old technology approaches. It's that simple. Many hams
migrate to new technology as the new equipment finds its
way to commercial availability. That too is nothing
new.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3259. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-12 00:02:31 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010211190231.17629.00000392@ng-da1.aol.com>
Source record: 3405

>From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)

>All academic now. Bash's actions are ancient history. No way is the FCC going
>to get involved in ham testing in the foreseeable future other than retesting
>as part of enforcement actions.

Even then it is likely that the FCC will ask that the applicant be retested by
a VEC, either by specifying the VEC or by making a stipulation that it be a
different VEC than coordinated a questionable test session.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3260. Re: Engineers, Technicians, and Appliance Operators

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-12 00:04:51 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010211190451.17629.00000394@ng-da1.aol.com>
Source record: 3406

>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)

>"Code" is a four-letter word.

>Watch how many will think the above sentence is swearing
>or a "denunciation" of morse code! :-)

None, now that you pointed it out. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3261. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-12 00:08:48 UTC
From: tlbryant@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <9679ig32b27@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 3420

In article <20010211123752.16594.00006429@nso-cg.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam says...

>That's true -- and the reason is that it requires an operator to learn
>and gain useful proficiency in the skill of sending and receiving Morse
>code! Now, when you're talking about commercial or military utility
>communications applications, this means the expense of training,
>paying, and providing benefits for flesh-and-blood radio operators. If
>I owned a shipping line, I would probably want to eliminate that
>particular part of my overhead, just as much as anyone else. Therefore,
>ships at sea and land-based communications facilities depend on
>expensive, computerized communications systems instead of
>human radio operators.
>
>Amateur radio does not have these economic considerations, but

The ARRL doesn't think so.

>we still have to deal with the fact that learning and gaining useful
>proficiency in Morse code still requires a considerable amount of
>dedicated effort on the part of the operators who wish to use it. In
>the past, this effort was motivated and incentivized by the promise
>of increased operating privileges; now that that incentive has been
>removed, there will, for sure, be far fewer people even bothering to
>learn and gain useful proficiency in Morse code.

I wonder when the 20-13-5 WPM test was in place, how many hams learned just enough to pass the test and then abandoned the mode? It would seem that the number of proficient operators would have declined in spite of the mandatory high-speed testing.

>The Morse/CW mode continued to survive and flourish only due to
>the code testing requirement. In the absence of the requirement,
>the numbers of Morse/CW mode users will most likely shrink to a
>small fraction of their present numbers, at least in the United States.
>European/Asian/African operators don't seem to have as much of a
>laziness problem as we Americans do.
>
>73 de Larry, K3LT

That's probably because the European/Asian/African operators want to get all of those American 10-10 numbers that you find so despicable. That's *their* incentive.

3262. Re: Engineers, Technicians, and Appliance Operators

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-12 00:09:00 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <9679inrje1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 3407

In article <20010211141820.24870.00000421@ng-mb1.aol.com>,
w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:
> >From: Brian brianburke@my-deja.com
>
> >Hello Ed. I've notice that Steve uses a lot of CAPITALIZATION in his
> >posts. Do you have any thoughts on that? Thanks, Brian
>
> I would imagine that most people who use all caps do so to emphasize.
>
> I think that those who use a capitilization only on the first
character of a
> word do so to give it an Importance that it wouldn't otherwise have.
>
> If you want to know the real reason that Steve uses capitalization,
you could
> ask him. His email address is k4yz@aol.com. His answer would be more
accurate
> than my speculation.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

Now come on Ed. You speculate that Len gets "far afield" when he uses caps, but cannot speculate why Steve uses caps? And I thought you might be a little more fair handed than some of the other "Good Ops" on here.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

3263. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-12 00:11:35 UTC
From: billsohl@mindspring.com
Message-ID: <3a8729be.4813655@news.mindspring.com>
Source record: 3412

On 11 Feb 2001 21:33:49 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:

>In article <3a5f9c59.1525595@news.mindspring.com>, billsohl@mindspring.com
>(Bill Sohl) writes:
>
>>The question for you Vince then is twofold:
>>Is publishing questions from PAST tests illegal when
>>done by those college prep course publishers?
>
>Let me have a go at this one.
>
>It's not illegal for at least two reasons:
>
>1) The published tests are intentionally released by the testing agency for
>publication.
>2) The published tests are no longer used - they really are past tests, not
>current ones.
>
>>If the answer to the first question is NO, then why
>>should Bash be held to a different standard of law?
>
>Because Bash violated both of the above conditions. The tests he published were
>not intentionally released for publication by the FCC, and they were not
>questions which had been removed from use in testing.
>
>Let me ask this, Bill: If a college prep course publisher somehow got hold of
>current test questions, and published them, would that be OK?

It already is.

>>If the Q&A was (by some miracle) made secret again,
>>would you complain when people publised the questions
>>they remembered from PAST tests on a centralized web site?
>
>I would, if the intent of making them secret was to keep the exact Q&A secret.

Then you'd be very frustrated.

>What Bash really did was to expose the fact that the FCC did not have an
>enormous stack of different tests in use. Prosecuting him would have publicized
>that fact and probably greatly increased sales.

And I stick to my contention that had the FCC gone
against Bash he never would have been convicted.

>All academic now. Bash's actions are ancient history. No way is the FCC going
>to get involved in ham testing in the foreseeable future other than retesting
>as part of enforcement actions.

Agreed.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3264. Re: Engineers, Technicians, and Appliance Operators

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-12 00:12:13 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <9679oo$rt8$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 3409

In article <20010211160211.17176.00001627@nso-ba.aol.com>,
lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
> In article <20010211092729.16173.00000434@ng-cu1.aol.com>,
w1rfi@aol.com
> (W1RFI) writes:
>
> >>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
> > >
> > >>My only dispute is with some of the ARRL's policy decisions.
> > >
> > >I, too, have disagreed with some of ARRL's policy decisions. I have
not even
> > >disagreed with much of what you have offered. You only seem to get a
bit far
> > >afield when you use capitalization and religious terms in your posts.
:-)
>
> "ARRL" is all capitals. :-)
>
> I don't think I'm far afield on some who have quasi-religious
> thoughts on US amateur radio. I used to call them
> "ama-baptists" for their proselyting but others got confused
> and thought I was berating the AMA. :-)
>
> While some folks use Yaesu and Kenwood radios, I'll swear
> that they are using Icons. :-)
>
> [sorry, I shouldn't swear, Jim N2EY doesn't like it... :-)]
>
> "Code" is a four-letter word.
>
> Watch how many will think the above sentence is swearing
> or a "denunciation" of morse code! :-)
>
> didit

Salmon Rushdie would be proud. You spead enough smileys across the
screen to prevent a holy jihad (maybe).

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

3265. Re: Calling the "Roll"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-12 00:17:08 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <967a1u$s0t$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 3413

In article <20010211141206.24870.00000419@ng-mb1.aol.com>,
w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:
> >From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
>
> >>Happy New Year, Everyone (No, I'm not back)...I needed to see if I
could
> >>find Phil Kane's email address.
>
> >Happy New Year to you, Kim -- now, don't let the door hit you in
> >the ass on your way out!
>
> Thanks for the blast from the past. I think the last time I heard
that one for
> real was junior high school.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

Now come on Ed. That has been a tRoll trademark on here for years.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

3266. Re: Code Requirement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-12 00:18:46 UTC
From: tlbryant@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <967a5642b27@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 3417
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <966vg3$ku0$0@208.206.142.83>, dixie@townsqr.com says...
>
>
>
>Jim Wayda wrote:
>>
>> Ham Radio and Code.
>>
>> Has the archaic code requirement been removed from Ham Radio testing yet?
>
>
> Have you removed that archaic gasoline engine from your car yet?

No, but we've removed archaic, horse-drawn carriages and I, for one, will
remove my gasoline engine when I see that hydrogen fuel cells have been
perfected.

3267. Re: Morse Code replacement? Bigtime flame war article!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-12 00:27:32 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <967ald$sg6$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 3414

In article <20010211123748.16594.00006423@nso-cg.aol.com>,
yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote:
> In article <963b1c02dgu@enews4.newsguy.com>, tlbryant@my-deja.com (T.
L.
> Bryant) writes:
>
> >>Brian:
> >>
> >>Ah, yes, the 10-10 club. You just ran into the very attitude which
> >>has made me an avid "no-phoner" ever since! The Ten-Ten
organization,
> >>and all of its drooling, toothless, slack-jawed, knuckle-dragging,
> >>mouth-breathing, bottom-feeding members are, collectively, proof
> >>that any idiot can pick up a microphone and talk -- and most
> >>idiots do!
> >>
> >>73 de Larry, K3LT
> >>
> >>
> >I didn't realize exchanging 10-10 numbers was restricted to phone.
Must be
> >something in 10-10 International's charter that I missed.
>
> T. L.:
>
> I've never encountered a 10-10 member on 10-meter CW; however, if
> I did, and I wasn't able to give him my number, I'm sure I'd receive
the
> same kind of disparagement as I received during my very last 10-meter
> phone QSO with a 10-10 member!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Larry, you do seem to have a lot of trouble getting quality QSO's on the
radio. I recall you're impromtu SET. Perhaps if you weren't so
offensive...

Tell you what, I'm going to hook you up with the Spring 10X CW Contest.
Here's the info:

SPRING CW Contest: May 5-6, 2001

Logs due by: May 21, 2001

Logs to: Linda C. Kelchner, KC4SWY
Possum Trot Chapter

9946 Rockfish Road
Raeford, NC 28376-7036

Be sure to use a dupe sheet, and don't send QFU to anyone.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

3268. Re: Morse Code replacement? Bigtime flame war article!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-12 00:29:19 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <967aop$sh7$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 3415

In article <3A86EFEE.94C17072@IEEE.org>,
Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> W1RFI wrote:
> > Why, even our Cecil wanted to engage someone in a 5 wpm
> > QSO in the DX windows, just because he can.
>
> You must've missed the smiley face, Ed.

A 5wpm QSO would have put a smiley on my face 13 years ago.

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

3269. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-12 00:51:47 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010211195147.17629.00000401@ng-da1.aol.com>
Source record: 3416

>From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

> I can see some applications on VHF/UHF where SS could solve a few
>problems that have been politically knotty, and thus avoided by both FCC
>and ARRL. The repeater situation should have never been allowed to
>degenerate into the sort of situation where all pairs are tied up while
>there is mostly silence on those bands, and much of the activity one
>does hear makes you want to turn off your HT.

The problem is not even one of certain repeaters being off the air completely, but the pair not relinquished (although that does happen). What about the repeater that really is used once a month for an on-the-air club meeting, and a few minutes here and there. That can be an important use of a repeater, and I think that it is apporopriate to accomodate it. THe problem could be that there are more people who want to do that than available pairs, so some cannot get access to repeater spectrum at all.

> But of course your discussion above addresses VHF/UHF, and not HF where
>there is simply no reason to even consider such a change-unless it is
>considered to be necessary just because the modes in use on HF must be
>considered old and obsolete, thus unusable.

The modes on HF may be old, but I do not consider them to be unusable at all. IMHO, the strength in amateur radio is in our diverisity and although I believe it is important to add new modes to amateur radio as they become available in the "real" radio world, I believe that it is important to consider their compatibility with existing useage and modes and add them in a way that minimizes the impact. But adding them is important because I believe that Amateur Radio will improve upon their implementation -- the technical part of the value of Amateur Radio to the world at large.

> That's an attitude attributable mostly to people who spend most of their
> time trying to change things whether or not they need changing instead
> of using HF ham radio.

I am sure that most of those who want change can give you more reasons that change for the sake of change. I have given my principle reasons above. And I am fairly active on HF CW, near the QRP frequencies.

>> I will speak only for myself, Dick; I have never suggested that you need to
>> dump anything that interests you.

> This little scrap has been ongoing far longer than I've been on usenet.
>I don't mean to attribute any particular part of it to you personally,
>just that you have shown that you agree with the thrust, that ham radio
>is derelict in having not widely adopted all those new modes which have
>done so well in commercial and government use.

Sure I have, but that does not mean that I am forcing you to dump what you are doing. I do not want to dump what I am doing; I am just making an observation.

> Overlooked is the widely diverging orientation between ham radio,
> especially HF, and those other services which have largely abandoned HF.

I tune off the ham bands, Dick, and I hear plenty of signals. Surely your antenna can't be that selective on receive. And that divergence is NOT overlooked; it is the reason that I believe what I do. I do not believe that it is healthy for Amateur Radio to be becoming more and more different than the "real" radio world. We never would have been created in the first place if we were so different, we would not have survived the times we have been taken off the air for various national emergencies if we were so different at the time and that difference will not help us to justify spectrum that is becoming more and more threatened. Those are my reasons, Dick, not change for the sake of change, not forcing other hams to my Agenda (whatever the heck that is supposed to mean).

> I believe the main reason for that is there is largely no need felt by
>most hams for ir, particularily on HF. And most of the spectral problems
>on VHF/UHF are because of outdated schemes and regulations instead of
>modal shortcomings.

On HF, I think the main thrust will be first in the area of digital voice. I think it important that some hams be experimenting about it, and I think it important (note important <> forced) that hams understand the principles on which it operates. When future rules changes may be put forth by the FCC about these modes, I think that the amateur community's comments should be correct and appropriate.

> That doesn't mean that there is no benefit at all to
>making wholesale changes, just that there is no demonstraded need.

I do not think that we need to make wholesale changes, Dick. I have said that I believe that it is important that amateurs know the fundamentals of these modern communications techniques. I think it important that some amateurs begin using these modes, and out of that use and experimentation, I think that balance and the appropriate changes to Amateur Radio will naturally evolve.

> The "installed base" principle DOES apply.

Yes, it does, a factor that was very much recognized by the FCC when they chose to retain the 70 cm and above limits on SS. I agree with that decision, although I would like to see some accomodation made for SS on HF, too. I think the subset of those that might experiment with SS on UHF and up may be different than those that would do so HF. The nature of SS implementation would be significantly different on HF than it would be on UHF.

As SS does become more used on UHF (and I sure hope it does), the advantages and disadvantages of the mode will become better understood by amateurs and, if it is as good as the proponents say it is, then hams will glom on to it pretty quickly. If not, it will die a natural death. Do you agree that to be appropriate? If it does have significant advantages, it may very well replace the VHF repeater schemes in use today, although I believe that some spectrum

should be reserved for such operation (diversity is important).

> The political problems on VHF/UHF might be releived by changing to SS
>but look at the huge cost involved for the small benefit, and I really
>don't think most hams would benefit at all.
I am not sure the cost will all that huge, nro am I sure that the benefit will be all that small. I don't know, and I don't believe that you do either. I do know that if hams are to remain valuable to mainstream radio, they need to learn what mainstream radio is today, and SS and other digital techniques are very much a part of it.

> I see it as merely "change for the sake of change".

Yes, it is change, and we need to change, Dick. But I am proposing a change of adding knowledge to the base of Amateur Radio, adding diversity to Amateur Radio and under rules that exist right now, doing so in a way that doesn't force anyone to do anything. For the life of me, I can see why you think my views to be so onerous.

> With the serious decline in use of much of the
>present repeater system having occurred I doubt if much activty would
>survive.

Would there be more repeater useage if none of those who wanted to put up a repeater were told they can't? How much use would you make of HF if you were told that you would not be given the use of a frequency to do your thing, but would have to join in QSOs already in progress?

> Would I buy a completely new VHF rig to replace the FM rig that
>I rarely use now? I seriously doubt it, unless some new factor became
>involved.

No, you could continue not using your FM rig if you wish.

> Replacing all the FM gear now in use is a huge project that I
>just don't see happening at all, wsithout some more compelling reason
>than just updating the technology.

Perhaps the compelling reasons will be found if the FCC carries out whatever is promoting people like Hatfield to tell us that we need to modernize. Perhaps the compelling reason will be found on 2.4 GHz as the upper part of the band fills with spread-spectrum devices by the millions.

>> >We've listed dozens of other objects which are
>> >also obsolete, and are still in universal use today, but that makes no
>> >difference.

>> Yes, they are in universal use today. How many of them are a mandatory
>part of
>> testing for any priveleges, amateur or otherwise?

> How many match the unique attributes of radiotelegraphy?

I assume that if you listed them as justification for retaining the CW tests, they had some relative bearing on CW tests.

>> >It is clear that the entire movement to "modernize" is nothing more
>> >than another push to get rid of the code.
>>
>> Is that what you think that retired Dale Hatfield from the FCC was seeking
>>to do?

> Of course not.

Then what do you think Hatfield was trying to accomplish?

> On the other hand, I sure do believe that he has been greatly influenced by
the
>stridency of people like Carl Stevenson. Don't you?

No, I do not. Carl may be expounding some of the factors that have influenced Hatfield and the FCC, though. If you think that Stevenson's views carried more weight with the FCC than does the fact that modernization of radio is taking place all around us, to alleviate a growing spectrum shortage, then you are, IMHO, quite incorrect.

> After we've been flatly told that "a few people can change the world and
> just did"? After FCC near-totally ignored the ARRL BOD in the restructuring
> decision and gave NCI almost everything they
>whined for and some they didn't?

To what extent that would have happened without NCI, I don't know, but I think that the FCC really did want to reassess whether it wanted to retain Morse code testing in the Amateur Radio Service in the light of the fact that Morse code use under its jurisdiction in all other radio services has virtually disappeared. Had the Amateur comments been overwhelmingly in support of what ARRL had proposed, its views would have carried more weight.

>> There's that "agenda" thing again. Do you really think that the only
>reason I
>> say that I believe more hams should learn the fundamentals of modern
>> communications technology is to "get rid of the code?"

> No, Ed, you're not nearly the main part of the problem. You're only a
>side feature of it, in that you have decided to agree to cave in to the
>shrillness that is total opposition to ANY Morse code operational test
>requirement.

Dick, have you ever known me to cave in to anything? I find it hard enough to walk away from a discussion here. Those who know me well know that I am as stubborn as they come.

I don't understand why you believet hat I am in total opposition to any Morse code operational test requirement. What gave you that idea? I have said a number of times (gosh, it is getting tiresome to have to repeat things so often) that I believe that amateur testing should contain 5 minutes of sent Morse text with a reasonable number of questions about its content, included as part of the overall score. That would test Morse code to the same extent that

other modes are tested. It is difficult to have a discussion you when you imagine I said things then disagree with me for saying them.

> Evidently the entire ARRL heirachy has.
The ARRL heirarch has decided to accept the inevitability of the removal of the Morse code requirement at the international level. It has decided that it is not changing its position wrt US testing at this time. It is difficult to have a discussion with you when you imagine what the ARRL Board has decided and then criticize them for doing so.

> Three or four years ago, not long after I first landed on this NG I
>said something about "Where's the beef? Why isn't there any gear
>available to actually use if these glitzy new modes are so great? When
>are some of the strident advocates going to put their expertise where
>their mouths are?"

A very good question. The needed rules changes went into place a few years ago. I am disappointed that more progress has not been made.

> If they are in fact all that beneficial and applicable to ham radio why
>are there NO renditions available today on the market, even as kits?

There are thousands and thousands of spread spectrum devices that operate on the ham bands, Dick. Soon, there will be millions.

> I looked over the TAPR website you gave, and yes indeed, I believe it
>is proper to add a few questions on that material to the question pools.
>But the tests, instead of being reduced in scope and number of
>questions, would be better expanded when including new material,
>otherwise they actually are being reduced in scope of coverage.

I think that out of 1200 questions in the pool, it should be possible to cover the subject pretty well. Even if no questions about these topics were added to the pool, I am sure that some hams will learn the material on their own, for their own reasons.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3270. Re: Code Requirement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-12 00:53:15 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010211195315.17629.00000402@ng-da1.aol.com>
Source record: 3419

>From: Jon Bloom jbloom@arrl.org

>> It's only 5 wpm so any lazy ass ought to be able to pass it.

>"Lazy ass?" Hmmm, should we replace QLF with QLC(heek)?

I was at a club meeting once where they... naw, never mind. It is a thought I
just can't bear to conjure up. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3271. Re: Code Requirement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-12 00:55:22 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010211195522.17629.00000403@ng-da1.aol.com>
Source record: 3421

>From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

>> Has the archaic code requirement been removed from Ham Radio testing yet?

> Have you removed that archaic gasoline engine from your car yet?

No, but I don't have to feed my horse oats; I don't own a horse. :-)

Of course, I do heat 100% with wood, so I am not opposed to archaic. But I don't think that everyone should be forced to take a firewood splitting test before they are allowed to heat their homes with oil.

Watch those analogies, Dick; it is real easy to think up analogies that appear to apply to either side of this.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3272. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-12 00:58:34 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010211195834.17629.00000404@ng-da1.aol.com>
Source record: 3422

>From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

>I would think that a 23db power advantage to the other mode might do
>it. (5 watts vs 1500).

I agree, Dick. Larry was saying that if a CW signal goes up against an SSB signal, the CW signal will lose. I believe he is incorrect.

The 23 dB might be a bit optimistic, though, unless the CW receiver really is using minimum necessary bandwidth. Although in wider bandwidths, some CW ops have a decent "mental" filter that can gain back some of what a measurement would say isn't there.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3273. Re: New Zealand protest to FCC - Code Discriminates

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-12 01:00:01 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <967cie$tu9$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 3428

In article <966pf4emm1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
K0HB <k0hb@my-deja.com> wrote:
> Just re-read Fred W5YI's CQ article about "code is discriminatory",
> based on comments to the FCC from NCI enthusiasts in New Zealand.

Sicko crap snipped.

I don't get it, Hans. You're making a funny over handicapped people?
Maybe you're prepping for the Howard Sterno show. Just when we thought
the world was ready for more "Good Ops," we get Hans.

Apparently, "Know Code" doesn't mean squat anymore. Its being degraded
by the very people who prize it above all else. What are the rest of us
who consider it just another mode to think?

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

3274. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-12 01:01:40 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010211200140.17629.00000405@ng-da1.aol.com>
Source record: 3423

>From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

>Yeah, Larry. Go ahead and "positively think" radiotelegraphy out of
>existance.

I hate to tell you this, Dick, but if the FCC removes the code test altogether at some point, "positive thinking" will be the main tool we have to promote CW use among newcomers. That is true even today; those who pass a test will not be inclined to try the mode if all they hear and read about CW is that it a difficult thing needed to be a test of character. It is hard to undo that damage once it is said.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3275. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-12 01:05:14 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010211200514.17629.00000406@ng-da1.aol.com>
Source record: 3424

>From: Cecil Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

> Nocoders have no code experience so their opinions about Morse
> code don't matter. Non-Extras are not fast enough at Morse code to
> have a valid opinion. Post April 15 Extras didn't prove their Morse
> code skill so they also have no right to post their personal opinions.
> Members of NCI shouldn't post their personal opinions. ARRL
> employees shouldn't post their personal opinions. See the pattern?
> Anyone who disagrees with Larry on the subject of Morse code
> testing should not post their personal opinions. :-)

Yes, I understand now. And those of us that slip by that filter are only saying what we are saying because some external factor is forcing us to do so. Thanks, now I can sleep at night knowing I am not lying to Larry.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3276. Re: I heard a CB'er on 20 meters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-12 01:06:00 UTC
From: Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
Message-ID: <967ctl$ua9$1@nnrp1.deja.com>
Source record: 3430

In article <20010210082749.23230.00000032@ng-fm1.aol.com>,
w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:
> >I always thought that "break" was an "pseudo emergency" "pro sign" in
FFC or
> >maritime language not to be used routinely.
> >What do others think.
>
> I know that on the County Hunters and Mobile Emergency Net, "Break
Break" is
> used only in actual emergencies.
>
> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

Thats a whole lottsa sending. Isn't there something shorter to send in
actual emergencies?

Sent via Deja.com
http://www.deja.com/

3277. Re: Morse Code replacement? Bigtime flame war article!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-12 01:08:19 UTC
From: kelly@dvol
Message-ID: <3a871d50.254735960@news2.dvol.com>
Source record: 3425

On 11 Feb 2001 13:27:57 GMT, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:

>In article <3a861468.186914703@news2.dvol.com>, kelly@dvol says...
>
>>Squiggy doesn't have a fist, he couldn't communicate with dots &
>>dashes if his life or anybody else's life depended on that ability
>
>Actually, at one point, Carl was approaching 20 wpm. He could certainly manage
>a code QSO today, though he has not accepted my invite to do so.
>
Whatta a huge surprise! Just before "the" April 15 he jumped into this
NG crowing abt he was gonna immedaitely suck up a 5wpm Extra, he had
his big HF antenna farm and towers already laid out in his usual
provacative format, yadda, yadda. He's still a Tech Ed. What does that
tell you?
>
>Maybe I will have to be him a lobster dinner that he can't. :-)
>
For that you get raw squid.
>
>>he advocates elimination of all subands,
>
>The US is one of few countries that has actual sub-band allocations; they sort
>themselves out by band plan. His basic recommendation is that the rules say
>"these are your bands; stay within them." Unfortunately, what works in some
>countries would possibly not work in the US.
>
Exactly my belief when it comes to what works elsewhere not working
here.
>
>On 160 M, for example, the band
>plan for CW operation is regularly stomped on by phone operators, some who know
>better; some who do not. I think the same mentality that drives the Know Code =
>no Ham spams would show up with a small, but very noisy, group, who could make
>it rapidly unworkable.
>
Absolutely.
>
>Why, even our Cecil wanted to engage someone in a 5 wpm
>QSO in the DX windows, just because he can.
>
There'a a lot of completely wifty mythology floating around about what
actually goes on in those " Lower 25 Extra DX Sanctuaries". 99% of the
comments I see posted in this village on the topic clearly demonstrate

that the commenters have no bloody clue, they've never operated there,
or they've never listened there, or they didn't pay attention if they
did listen, or they can't decode it, whatever but they know all about
it. Fact is that the lower 25s are NOT high speed cw countries nor are
they some fancied, "exclusive dx windows".
>
True, the dx tends to hang out below .025 but certainly not
exclusively. Many of my rarest catches have been well above .025. The
speeds used depend almost exclusively on the speed used by the dx
station and/or the prevailing band conditions. Yeah, you bet, you
don't work long path JAs on 80 at 40 wpm, more like 10-15 wpm if that
fast.
>
I'll be happy to qso Cecil at 5wpm on 7.002 or 14.002. When the qso is
over nobody will even notice let alone "get spanked" and absolutely
nothing will have been "proven" except that we participted in the Ham
Radio Non-Event of 2001. Bleh.
>
>
>
>>he advocates the use or wideband
>>digital modes on the HF ham bands
>
>I think that some FHSS needs to be permitted on HF.
>
Now you're down to Darby Creek snails for din-din.
>

> He wants to give it carte
>blanche, however.
>
Yeah, right: Kick my noise floor up so that he can diddle with his
cellphone chipsets? I think not. Not that I believe for one minute
he'd bother putting FHSS on the air.
>
>Is there room for it on 80 M? How about 160M? How about
>30M, where some commercial stations could be already using it? How about 10 M?
>
Pray tell exactly what would running FHSS on the HF bands do to
enhance ham communications? What advantages would the op accrue?? What
would running FHSS do to "enhance" the Service? What's the bottom-line
point?
>
We've been here before Ed. How 'bout "they" get ham FHSS running where
it's already legal? Where's the ham FHSS the FCC bent over backward to
facilitate but ain't happened yet despite their best efforts?
>
>
>>and he goes off on anti-cw rants at
>>neighborhood ham club meetings

>
>He has said here a number of times that he doesn't believe that CW use should
>be abolished at all. Does he say different things at club meetings?
>
He simply rails against cw in general at any and every opportunity to
be heard and is well known in this region for being a real crackpot on
the subject. Dumping the sub-bands and implemting FHSS are very much
in line with his lust for burying cw operations.
>
<snip>
>
>73,
>Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
w3rv

3278. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-12 01:10:12 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010211201012.17671.00000495@ng-da1.aol.com>
Source record: 3426

>From: tlbryant@my-deja.com (T. L. Bryant)

>So how many more contradictions can we expect to see from you?

As many as it takes for him to make his point? :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3279. Re: Morse Code replacement? Bigtime flame war article!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-12 01:10:59 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010211201059.17671.00000496@ng-da1.aol.com>
Source record: 3427

>From: Brian brianburke@my-deja.com

>A 5wpm QSO would have put a smiley on my face 13 years ago.

I'm still game if you are, just not in the DX window. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3280. Re: Engineers, Technicians, and Appliance Operators

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-12 01:13:54 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010211201354.17671.00000497@ng-da1.aol.com>
Source record: 3429

>From: Brian brianburke@my-deja.com

>> >Hello Ed. I've notice that Steve uses a lot of CAPITALIZATION in his
>> >posts. Do you have any thoughts on that? Thanks, Brian

>Now come on Ed. You speculate that Len gets "far afield" when he uses
>caps, but cannot speculate why Steve uses caps?

Um, I did; I just identified it as speculation, instead of pronouning it to be
fact. Perhaps that is what confused you.

>> I would imagine that most people who use all caps do so to emphasize

>> I think that those who use a capitilization only on the first
>character of a
>> word do so to give it an Importance that it wouldn't otherwise have.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3281. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-12 02:05:54 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A874502.810B6040@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3431

"T. L. Bryant" wrote:
> So how many more contradictions can we expect to see from you?

Another one today. Larry previously said that I was annoying.
Today he said no way could I do anything that would annoy him.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

3282. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-12 02:12:11 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A87467B.611E42D6@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3432

N2EY wrote:
> Yep - and kits are back.

What's the best 100w HF transceiver kit? (with DSP?)
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

3283. Re: ARRL HQ "Attitude" (Was: Re: Pride)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-12 02:14:44 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A874714.9B84B27E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3433

"T. L. Bryant" wrote:
>
> yodoc@aol.comnospam says...
> >No, Cecil -- now stop trying to be annoying!
>
> Cecil didn't write it. Try reading the e-mail address of the poster once and
> awhile.

"Cecil" is the name Larry calls everyone who annoys him. Of course,
today he denied that I have the capability to annoy him.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

3284. Re: ARRL HQ "Attitude" (Was: Re: Pride)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-12 02:15:48 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A874754.DC7CB3F5@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3434

"T. L. Bryant" wrote:
> If you're not annoyed, you certainly have a funny way showing it.

If he's not annoyed, why does he tell us how annoying we are? :-)
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

3285. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-12 02:19:02 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A874816.DB232035@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3435

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Yeah, Larry. Go ahead and "positively think" radiotelegraphy out of
> existance.

While negative thinking about CW is going to save it?????
Very strange logic, Dick.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

3286. Re: Code Requirement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-12 02:42:53 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nospam.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.g8m9si0.pminews@ca.news.verio.net>
Source record: 3436

On 12 Feb 2001 00:53:15 GMT, W1RFI wrote:

>>> It's only 5 wpm so any lazy ass ought to be able to pass it.
>
>>"Lazy ass?" Hmmm, should we replace QLF with QLC(heek)?
>
>I was at a club meeting once where they... naw, never mind. It
>is a thought I just can't bear to conjure up. :-)

Are you referring to the "Seat of the Pants" code contests that
we used to have at conventions? <ggg>

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

3287. Re: I heard a CB'er on 20 meters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-12 03:26:11 UTC
From: dana <danay@primenet.com>
Message-ID: <Pine.BSI.4.02.10102112225330.16782-100000@usr06.primenet.com>
Source record: 3437
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner

I couldn't agree with you more there partner.

On 7 Feb 2001, T. L. Bryant wrote:

> In article <t83gklsrh99ca1@corp.supernews.com>, zmbwf@acadia.net says...
> >
> >Havent operated on the old ham bands for a couple years now. I keep the
> >license up to date, but there are just too many idiots on the air for it to
> >be anywhere near enjoyable any more. don`t worry. the FCC is selling them
> >off piece by piece anyway. Ham radio has had its day, and the ARRL and FCC
> >let it go down the drain. It is now going to die a well - deserved death,
> >and leave us all in peace. We still have the internet, and we can easily
> >talk round the world on it. I stopped putting up with CB pond scum years
> >ago, and since that is what the Ham Bands are on their way to becoming, I
> >think it derserves equal attention .....
>
> The downslide began well before the current license testing scheme was put into
> effect. If the bands are sold off, so be it. I'll take my entire share of the
> profits of such a sale down to the corner Starbucks and by myself tall caramel
> macchiato.
>
>
>

3288. Re: Code Requirement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-12 03:42:05 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <ujme8tgi1lhirkaeoe2bo659ofi4p58704@4ax.com>
Source record: 3438

w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:
>I don't think that everyone should be forced to take a firewood splitting test
>before they are allowed to heat their homes with oil.

I've never had to split wood in my life, so I likely would be mighty
slow at it. Why would you make me take a slow speed wood splitting
test, say 5 logs an hour, before I would be allowed to heat with
oil?? :-)

3289. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-12 03:51:09 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <967mjdqob0@208.206.142.65>
Source record: 3439

```
Cecil wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Cecil is dead wrong when he says that DSP is the SSB of the 50's. It
> > just isn't so.
> > But to insist that SSB be abaindoned in favor of digitized voice on
> > HF-whatever the mode, just becase it is technically possible, is
> > ludicrous ...
>
> Uhhhhhhhhh Dick, DSP handles SSB just fine. DSP doesn't mean the end
> of SSB - it means enhanced SSB.

Yes I know it does, and SSB make out just fine without it, also.
```

3290. Re: Who is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-12 04:04:22 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010211230422.03673.00002110@nso-ck.aol.com>
Source record: 3440

...someone sent me a message in private e-mail. Without revealing
their identity, I'll address a few points in public -

>Does a spelunker know more about caving than a non-spelunker?

Amateur radio is not about cave exploration but some amateurs
have been a dark cave too long...

>Does an attorney know more about law than a non-lawyer?

Amateur radio is NOT a profession. It is a radio activity engaged
in NOT for pecuniary purposes. Lawyers often bill clients for as
much as, well, the law allows...

>Does a pilot know more about flying an aircraft than a non-pilot?

Although pilots are licensed by a federal agency, there is NO
resemblance between the tests and skills required for piloting
as compared to even the highest "upgrade" in US amateur radio.

>Does a fisherman know more about fishing than someone who has never
>baited a hook?

Actually, yes, fly fishing comes to mind. :-)

>You are absurd.

No more absurd than the US civil radio regulation agency NOT
requiring its Commissioners or staff to hold amateur radio
licenses.

No more absurd than the thought that an amateur radio license
grant entitles them to be expert (or even knowledgeable) about
gun control, politics, voting procedures, or everyone's morals
and ethics. All of those subjects have been "argued" in this
newsgroup. Absurd indeed!

The fallacy in the unamed correspondent's reasoning is that
radio is NOT exclusive to amateur radio and amateur radio
activities are NOT secret, nor are they at any higher plane of
radio arts than other radio services.

>> Seems to me that such an attitude turns people away...unless
>> they like living under self-professed, self-appointed non-comms
>> with a superior control-freak compulsion.

>You mean the kind of attitude which provides free instruction on the
>"how to's" of amateur radio and assists someone who knows nothing about
>amateur radio in obtaining a license?

While it is considered thoughtful to "elmer" a newcomer, the chances that such newcomers "know nothing about radio" is very slim indeed. A case can be made for newcomers knowing nothing about amateur radio but such introduction can be done with any one of several books or an Internet session accessing the ARRL website.

What turns away newcomers is the patronizing arrogance that They and only They "know what is best for all amateurs" and that all newcomers should follow their example and experiences.

>Follow orders? Our way or die? You are absurd.

Not me absurd. What is absurd is the continuing rationalization of the already-licensed to "do it as they did it" without question for that is the "correct way."

What is more absurd is the maximally-upgraded radio amateur trying to say that testing should be as they were tested...even though they will never have to take a single amateur radio test in their entire life. Such is an extreme case of "doing it as they did it" for no other reason than they feel they "control" amateur radio through license tenure.

>What the hell are you ranting about, Len? Is it your opinion that
>licensed radio amateurs should sit here and read material written by a
>non-amateur which attempts to tell those who have been radio amateurs
>for decades how it is and how it should be?

In a sense, yes, for several reasons. A clarification: I do not presume to dictate communications practices as they are done on the air except for the gray area of bandplans that separate classes of licenses.

Another clarification: The FCC tells ALL radio amateurs what regulations are, permissible bands and modes, and some of what is permissible communications in addition to granting licenses. ALL of that yet not a single FCC employee is required to hold an amateur radio license.

I am referring to REGULATIONS set by the FCC in regard to amateur radio LICENSE TESTS. Those amateurs who took tests "decades ago" did not take tests under regulations of today or the near future. Newcomers will.

As far back as a decade ago, the FCC said that it did not consider a morse code test as a true requirement to show them that an examinee was worthy of an amateur radio license grant. They said essentially the same thing in 1999. The FCC is required to keep a morse code test due to an ITU-R standard, a political situation, not one for licensing.

>You speak of egos. What
>kind of enormous ego demands the respect which you seem to feel is due
>you by us based on your past military service and your experience as an
>engineer?

Not a big ego here, certainly, but it is obvious I've punctured the self-centered, self-professed amateur "experts" who expect all kinds of respect based solely on license tenure...without any evidence of having learned anything new since test time.

US amateur radio is NOT a military service branch. There is no true rank, yet the "upgraded" assume more "rank" than "lesser ranks and are not hesitant to say so. That is not respect for a fellow radio amateur.

US amateur radio is NOT defined as some living museum of antique radio standards, modes, procedures, or anything else yet the "ranking" members seek to keep the old, resist change, yet prattle on about "advancing the state of the art" and "saving lives through amateur radio morse code ability" as if there were another Titanic awaiting rescue. This is the year 2001, not the year 1912. Amateur radio is a hobby, not a living museum or a public safety radio service defined in Part 90, Title 47 CFR.

Radio spectrum is regulated for ALL citizens, not just radio amateurs. Radio amateurs think nothing of voicing their opinions on other radio services and certainly on other subjects having little or nothing to do with radio. Why should amateur radio be "immune" to comment from those who do not hold amateur licenses? Why should amateur radio be sacrosanct from criticsm of any kind?

didit

3291. Changing my mailing address.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-12 04:13:36 UTC
From: danayeo@bellsouth.net
Message-ID: <QpJh6.1104$Uc6.22723@news2.atl>
Source record: 3441

I have my uls number, and I am blind, and can't get this program to work on the fcc's web site. They have that damn java script, and don't know what that is, but wish they would just put it in plain text. Guess that damn stuff is a sighted thing, don't know, but if someone could help, e-mail back. Thanks from n4pge in griffin, ga.
mailto:danayeo@bellsouth.net
http://www.randomc.com/~dana

Net-Tamer V 1.12 Beta - Registered

3292. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-12 04:52:20 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A876C04.498214A6@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3443

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> Cecil wrote:
> > Uhhhhhhhhh Dick, DSP handles SSB just fine. DSP doesn't mean the end
> > of SSB - it means enhanced SSB.
>
> Yes I know it does, and SSB make out just fine without it, also.

But DSP removes the need for a lot of specialized SSB hardware.
The hardware is completely generalized. The software is specialized
and can be loaded depending on the mode selected.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

3293. Re: Code Requirement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-12 04:52:59 UTC
From: Jim Wayda <jwayda@killspam.home.com>
Message-ID: <L_Jh6.70128$Ti5.1087368@news1.alsv1.occa.home.com>
Source record: 3442
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.policy
Body handling: HTML body converted to readable text

Yes,

But do they still require 13 and 20 WPM for advanced and extra?
Hopefully, they will do away the code requirement all together at the next
ITU meeting.
Code should be an elective mode.

-jim

T. L. Bryant wrote in message
news:9673hc120mj@enews3.newsguy.com...
> In article ,
> jwayda@killspam.home.com says...
> >
> >Ham Radio and Code.
> >
> >Has the archaic code requirement been removed from Ham Radio testing yet?
> >
> >-jim
>
> It's getting there. There's only one code test now, and that's 5 WPM for
the
> class of licenses that require it.
>

3294. Re: Code Requirement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-12 05:12:42 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A8770CA.E4C4291F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3444
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Jim Wayda wrote:
> But do they still require 13 and 20 WPM for advanced and extra?

Nope, 5wpm for General and Extra. Advanced class is a lame duck now.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

3295. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-12 05:54:32 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010212005432.00445.00001855@nso-bj.aol.com>
Source record: 3445

In article <9654p4$9eq$1@nnrp1.deja.com>, n2ey@aol.com writes:

>In article <20010209185914.17176.00001513@nso-ba.aol.com>,
> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:

<snip>

>> In order to separate code-tested from non-code-tested,
>> I made an additional posting regarding the 27 months between
>> the start of 1998 and the end of March 2000.
>
>Which has no effect on the errors in your analysis of the period
>following the restructuring.

Why isn't that pre-April-15 analysis nit-picked in another huge
posting? :-)

>> The total number of code-tested US ARS licensees is decreasing.
>> The number of non-code-tested US ARS licensees is increasing.
>> It has been that way for over three years..
>
>Nobody questions that. The probelm is that you unnecessarily misstate
>both the increase in "non-code-tested" and the decrease in "code-
>tested" by a very significant percentage.

Not a significant percentage compared to the ARS licensees as
a whole or by license class.

The whole point of the first post in this thread was attempting to
point out that the number of code-tested licensees are
decreasing while the number of non-code-tested licensees are
increasing.

You agreed to that but went on at great lengths, very great
lengths to do practically a word-by-word critique in order to
show I was "wrong." That seems to be a great hobby with
the code-tested licensees since others have fun the same
way trying to prove all no-code-test advocates "wrong."

Denial is the psychological syndrome of your activity.

<snip>

>> >End result is that your numbers are way off.
>>
>> No.
>
>Yes, they are way off.

See? :-)

>> I am not ASSUMING anything about "renewals" or expirations
>> or anything else,
>
>Yes, you are. You are assuming that ALL Technicians are "noncodetested"
>even though it is clear that thousands of them ARE "codetested".

Now how can I be both "wrong" and "right" at the same time?
:-)

>> >The number of new Technician licenses proves one thing: Most people
>> >starting out in ham radio do so by getting a Technician license.
>>
>> How do you KNOW that?
>
>Simple: Most new licenses are granted to new hams. Most new licenses
>are Techncian licenses.

But not ALL of them. :-) Please count the Novices, Generals,
Advanced, and Extras prior to April 15th. [I did that for you but
it's best you do it yourself...try the raw FCC database to avoid
any possibility of error]

>Sure. Just look at the "new licenses" page on the AH0A site. It's right
>there.

I did that. I said that. You did not acknowledge that. :-)

>Sure - plenty of them. See the above page. But the most new licenses
>are Technicians. Nobody disputes that.

Yet you make such a fuss over numbers after April 15th...and
concede that numbers are okay prior to April 15th?

>It's not the future that is in question. It's how many upgrades have
>occurred in a given time period. The Speroni site doesn't say.

You can calculate that yourself. The raw data is available
to everyone with Internet access to the FCC website.

>Then you ARE predicting the future when you make statements like the
>one above.

There's a difference. As an example, a Bode plot may show a
breakpoint where frequency response begins changing. One
can consider the new slope of the Bode plot to continue on with
the new slope. One can liken the plot to a "trend." On the
other hand predicting some percentage renewal is akin to saying
that there will be another breakpoint with a different slope on the
Bode plot...except we cannot see it yet. The we-can't-see-it-yet
is the "renewal."

>Unless the conditions change in that time period. Like the fact that
>the first post-Feb-14-1991 Technician licenses will start to expire

>very soon.

It is fair to say that you will probably enjoy that. :-)

And the more the merrier for the code-test advocates. :-)

>All I'm doing is pointing out some easily-avoided errors in your
>methods.

All I did in reply to your "error" statement was try to establish
the basis for the original thread posting. Since you apparently
don't like no-code-test advocates of most kinds, that became
an ISSUE of great magnitude to point out "errors" as you
did. In effect you changed conditions to suit whatever agenda
that you had (presumably to show code-tested licensees in a
better light), concentrated on the period following April 15, 2000,
and condescendingly "conceded" the trends shown in the years
prior to April 15, 2000.

Despite the strong efforts at denial, the unfortunate fact is that
the number of US ARS code-tested licensees are decreasing
and the number of US ARS non-code-tested licensees are
increasing. It is "unfortunate" for those who strongly favor
morse code testing. It is expected by those who do not favor
code testing.

>I have no idea what you are talking about, Len. I'm just pointing out
>some easily-avoided errors in your methods.

...and I pointed out the ERRORS in your own "analysis." The
fact of Who is What has been lost in the fury of trying to show
error-error-error. :-)

>No, it's more accurate because the method takes into account relevant
>data that your method ignores. The errors introduced by your methods
>and assumptions are significant.

The use of "significant" is subjective, not a good analytical tool
to show absolutes. You are committed to showing absolutes
by as much detail as possible in order to show code-tested
licensees as "better."

>No, they were reasonable estimates.

:-) :-) :-)

>> No sh*t?
>
>Why the vulgarity, Len?

Is the word "shot" vulgar?!? Oh, my, that will not sit well with
anti-gun-control advocates!

Jim, "code" is a four-letter word. :-)

>> No sh*t?
>
>No reason for that, Len.

Ok, ok, shooting is noisy. I'm sorry your ears hurt. Apologies.

>I have no idea what that is supposed to mean. What is a "job
>technician"?

Electronics industry description of a technician, most often
called "electronics technician." As opposed to the amateur
radio license category of Technician class.

>> and "many" of the existing Techs will drop out,
>
>That's not what I wrote. 5% per year is not "many" - it's one in 20.

Ok, if it's okay for you to change original conditions then it
should be okay for me to change original conditions on you. :-)

How many of the General-through-Extra license classes will
drop out. None? Some? Define "some." How about 5%?

5% isn't many or some, it's just one in 20. :-)

>Never claimed that at all. What IS your problem with Morse code, Len?

My problem and that of many others is that a test for it is in
the regulations for any license having below-30-MHz privileges.

>The whole code-test thing is a dead issue. FCC reduced the code test
>for a US ham license to the absolute bare minimum under the treaty back
>in April.

ITU-R standard S25.5 does NOT specify any morse code rate at all.

The code-test issue is NOT dead...but a denial syndrome is evident
by you saying "it is a dead issue."

> Their comments, and their actions for the past 20+ years make
>it clear that the treaty is the only reason they kept 5 wpm testing.

Error, error, error? The 1990 Report and Order creating the Technician
class stated that the FCC did not consider a morse code test to be
relevant to their determining an amateur license grant. The FCC said
almost the exact same thing in the 1999 Report and Order concerning
US amateur radio restructuring. That is 11 and 2 years, respectively,
not "past 20+ years."

>Unless FCC decides to ignore the treaty, no more reduction will occur
>until the treaty changes.

Incorrect. The WRC working groups in the ITU-R may decide to delete
or amend S25.5 in the very near future.

"The Treaty" refers to the US adminstration's acceptance of membership
in the ITU. Standards defining amateur radio are the relevant items

which may or may not have a basis for the FCC changing amateur radio regulations. There is no separate "treaty" with the ITU-R in regards to amateur radio.

Meanwhile, newcomers are tending towards US amateur radio licenses not requiring code tests and the numbers of US code-tested amateur radio licenses are decreasing. You DO have a problem accepting that.

didit

3296. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-12 09:53:01 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010212045301.24681.00000727@ng-fl1.aol.com>
Source record: 3446

>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)

>Now how can I be both "wrong" and "right" at the same time?
>:-)

You are quite correct that most new hams enter ham radio under the NCT license.
You were incorrect in assuming that all Techs in the database have not passed a
code test.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3297. Re: ARRL HQ "Attitude" (Was: Re: Pride)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-12 09:58:30 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010212045830.24681.00000729@ng-fl1.aol.com>
Source record: 3447

>From: Cecil Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>> If you're not annoyed, you certainly have a funny way showing it.

>If he's not annoyed, why does he tell us how annoying we are? :-)

Now, to be fair, he really did only address K1ZZ. He said that Dave goes out
of his way to annoy him; he didn't actually say whether he succeeded. It is
possible that Larry went off like that without actually having been annoyed.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3298. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-12 10:05:31 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010212050531.24681.00000730@ng-fl1.aol.com>
Source record: 3448

>From: tlbryant@my-deja.com (T. L. Bryant)

>If it means nothing to you, why are you showing such concern for his welfare
>by bringing it up?

For the same reason he appears to be so annoyed as he tells us that he wasn't
annoyed when Dave went out of his way to annoy him? :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3299. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-12 10:11:09 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010212051109.24681.00000731@ng-fl1.aol.com>
Source record: 3449

>From: Jon Bloom jbloom@arrl.org

>Because, Dick, you tend to meet prinicipally those hams who are
>interested in the same things you are since you meet them in the course
>of doing what interests you. That gives you a biased view of what hams
>think, just as those who stay away from the things that interest you
>tend to have opposite biases.

Remember, Jon, this one started when I said to Dick that I didn't believe that most hams exhibited the "can't do" attitude I believe he has been projecting.

73,
Ed, W1RFI

3300. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-12 10:12:55 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010212051255.24681.00000732@ng-fl1.aol.com>
Source record: 3450

>From: billsohl@mindspring.com (Bill Sohl)

>I've seen Ed talk to hundreds at a hamfest. To suggest that
>someone like Ed would only talk to so few people in a hamfest
>setting is a joke.

Hundreds would very much be the exception. 30 or so is more typical. Once, I think it was in Hunstville, I gave a talk on Product Review testing. The size of the audience doubled halfway through when the second ham walked in. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3301. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 04:26:29 UTC
From: tlbryant@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <96d1dl01ncf@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 3753

It was posted as a joke. Maybe if you ask nicely, Hans will explain it to you,
since you obviously haven't got a clue.

In article <3A89FA8D.4781B2A0@erols.com>, ik7565@erols.com says...
>
>There is no 97.102(c).
>
>73 de N8IK
>
>
>
>K0HB@arrl.org wrote:
>>
>> Richard Harrison wrote:
>>
>> > Creative individuals such as Mr. Carroll try to read more into it to
>> > suit their own purposes, but if it isn`t written in the rules, it isn`t
>> > a mandate.
>>
>> Sure it is.
>>
>> "97.102(c) Everything not specifically prohibited in these rules is
>> mandatory."
>>
>> 73, de Hans, K0HB

3302. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 04:55:54 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <96d34q$q91$0@208.207.71.136>
Source record: 3751

W1RFI wrote:
>
> >From: Dave Heil k8mn@ovis.net
>
> >Cub Scouts here...age ten. Didn't find out about amateur radio until
> >age twelve and wasn't licensed until age 14.
>
> Now, Dave, you must be mistaken. Some of our self-proclaimed experts here
> assure us all that no one would learn Morse code except to get their SSB and/or
> FM priveleges. :-)
>

I'm sure Dave knows, as do you and I, that there is considerable
difference in learning to recognize the characters and in acquiring the
skill level needed to pass a ham radio test.

3303. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 05:02:20 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <96d3gsrgi0@208.207.71.136>
Source record: 3752

W1RFI wrote:
>
> >From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
>
> > <The FCC> still considered(s) the ARS to be a "fundamentally technical
> service"
>
> Do you agree with them? In saying that, they restructured the service in a way
> that they feel it is fundamentally technical.
>
> Can't have it both ways, Dick.
>
> > So you believe that the Extra class license is 'just an entrance exam'?
> > I don't.
>
> If you used your license to go on an learn many more things than you learned to
> pass your Extra, it was an entrance exam. If you felt that learning the
> material for an Extra was all you intended to do, it was a graduation
> certificate.
>
> The FCC believes it is a license.
>

Sure they do. One representing a certain level of accomplishment. So
when the license can be issued without the licensee having reached that
minimal level of accompliahment......????

3304. Re: Morse Code replacement? Bigtime flame war article!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 05:33:25 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010214003325.00445.00001950@nso-bj.aol.com>
Source record: 3755

In article <966bk6$43g$1@nnrp1.deja.com>, Brian <brianburke@my-deja.com>
writes:

>In article <20010211082757.16173.00000424@ng-cu1.aol.com>,
> w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:
>> In article <3a861468.186914703@news2.dvol.com>, kelly@dvol says...
>>
>> >Squiggy doesn't have a fist, he couldn't communicate with dots &
>> >dashes if his life or anybody else's life depended on that ability
>>
>> Actually, at one point, Carl was approaching 20 wpm. He could
>certainly manage
>> a code QSO today, though he has not accepted my invite to do so.
>
>Perhaps Jim needs to talk to the USCG about people's lives depending on
>one's ability to send/receive dots and dashes.

Jim who?

>Once he clears that
>little hurdle, perhaps he can convince the FCC to restructure yet
>again, and ingnore the upcoming WRC-2003. Kick the requirement back up
>to 20wpm AND mandate 20hrs of CW use per month to keep your skills
>current.
>
>That will ensure that the ARS will be prepared to be the life saving
>service that all of the other professional life saving services aren't.
>
>Furthermore, I don't think that whatever Jim had in mind that would
>prevent Carl from making it back ("Don't bring that sumbitch to
>Bookbinders for the RV/EY lobsterfest, he'll never make it back to
>Allentown") is appropriate behavior between hams whether on the air or
>here!

Jim who? If you mean me, please note that nothing you quoted in this post was
written by me.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3305. Re: Morse Code replacement? Bigtime flame war article!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 05:33:26 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010214003326.00445.00001951@nso-bj.aol.com>
Source record: 3756

In article <20010211082757.16173.00000424@ng-cu1.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>In article <3a861468.186914703@news2.dvol.com>, kelly@dvol says...
>
>>Squiggy doesn't have a fist, he couldn't communicate with dots &
>>dashes if his life or anybody else's life depended on that ability
>
>Actually, at one point, Carl was approaching 20 wpm.

Maybe. 5 wpm is "approaching 20 wpm". ;-)

>He could certainly
>manage
>a code QSO today, though he has not accepted my invite to do so.

I wonder why not? More than a year ago I recall him posting that he was going for Extra, had a new house with no antenna restrictions, the works. None of it has happened. No articles on SS or anything else that I've seen, either.
>
>Maybe I will have to be him a lobster dinner that he can't. :-)
>
>>he advocates elimination of all subands,
>
>The US is one of few countries that has actual sub-band allocations;

How many other countries have as many hams as the USA with HF privileges and power greater than QRP? Think about WHY the USA has subbands.

>they sort
>themselves out by band plan.

They are supposed to - but the foreign 'phones are now down below 7050, for example.

There is also a growing philosophy of "if it's not prohibited by the FCC, I'm gonna do it, don't tell me about no steenking bandplans". I have seen it here and elsewhere.

>His basic recommendation is that the rules say
>"these are your bands; stay within them."

That's not the end of it. He wants NO "support for legacy modes". Translation: If your QRP CW signal gets buried under his highpower DSSS signal, too bad, you should get with the program and stop using the legacy mode.

>Unfortunately, what works in some
>countries would possibly not work in the US. On 160 M, for example, the band

>plan for CW operation is regularly stomped on by phone operators, some who
>know
>better; some who do not.

Agreed. The best system I can think of is to have subbands-by-mode, not by
license class.

> I think the same mentality that drives the Know Code
>=
>no Ham spams would show up with a small, but very noisy, group, who could
>make
>it rapidly unworkable.

It is the phone boys who stomp on the CW folks in your example, though.

>Why, even our Cecil wanted to engage someone in a 5
>wpm
>QSO in the DX windows, just because he can.

Maybe. One never knows. Except for myself, W3RV and K4YZ, I have no knowledge
that any of the regular posters here ever actually get on the air at all. (I
know about those two because I've worked 'em.)
>
>>he advocates the use or wideband
>>digital modes on the HF ham bands
>
>I think that some FHSS needs to be permitted on HF.

Why? What are the advantages?

>He wants to give it carte
>blanche, however. Is there room for it on 80 M? How about 160M? How about
>30M, where some commercial stations could be already using it? How about 10
>M?

Doesn't matter. He wants a "free market of modes" - and that includes DSSS, not
just FHSS. No limits, and if the existing narrow-band users are interfered
with, tough.
>
>>and he goes off on anti-cw rants at
>>neighborhood ham club meetings
>
>He has said here a number of times that he doesn't believe that CW use should
>be abolished at all.

Then he proposes things that will make its use impractical or impossible.

> Does he say different things at club meetings? He may
>be
>swept up in the easy trap of having to tear something down completely in
>order
>to justify change.

Glad you recognize it as a trap.

> There are some here who say some pretty bad things about
>CW
>to justify keeping it.

Lemme at 'em!!!! ;-)

73 de Jim, N2EY

3306. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 05:33:27 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010214003327.00445.00001952@nso-bj.aol.com>
Source record: 3754

In article <20010213184720.02997.00002302@nso-mg.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) writes:

>In article <20010213003313.02997.00002284@nso-mg.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>(N2EY)
>writes:
>
>>I have no idea what that is supposed to mean. All I did was point out your
>>mistakes and how to fix them. Why does that bother you so much?
>
>No, you wanted to make a case of of it, changing the original
>conditions to suit your contention that errors existed.
>
>
>>>You can calculate that yourself. The raw data is available
>>>to everyone with Internet access to the FCC website.
>>
>>Why should I do that? I'm not the one making the errors.
>
>Yes you are. You've changed the original conditions and
>then make a big case out of "errors."

How did I "change the original conditions"? Your first post labeled all Technician licensees as "noncodetested" (which I have proved to be not the case at all) and all other licensees as "codetested".

It is this mislabeling that I have contested. That's all.
>
>You avoided the pre-April 15 period counting in detail yet you
>HAD to make a big thing out of post-April 15 numbers.

You did not post the pre-April 15 numbers until later. You, not I changed the "original conditions".
>
>Too bad, all that "pointing out 'errors'" for nothing.

Not for nothing. Any reasonable person reading my posts will recognize and agree that you mislabeled several thousand "code-tested" licensees as "noncodetested". To be exact, you mislabled at least 3303 of them out of less than 14,000. That's a prettty big error.

> The
>newcomers are going for the no-code-test Technician
>license class and have been for years.

And I have agreed with that in every post. Why do you keep repeating the obvious?

>They are still doing
>it after restructuring.

Of course. The Technician was the easiest US ham license to get before restructuring and now it's even easier to get. And the privileges granted are extensive. So extensive, in fact, that the only reason to upgrade beyond Technician is to get on the HF/MF ham bands.

>Try to understand where US amateur radio is going for the future.

I thought you claimed that I could not predict the future, Len. Are you predicting the future?
>
>Denial of the obvious is not a good thing, benefits no one,
>cannot change official positions.

Then why do you keep denying the obvious errors you have made in your posts?

N2EY

3307. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 05:59:36 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <96d6s8$6ce$0@208.207.71.136>
Source record: 3757

Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:96ag6m$ps1$0@208.207.71.146...
>
> > Jim Kelley wrote:
> >
> > > My only point (the one I didn't miss) was I wondered whether you'd
> > > actually taken any of these tests that you seem to be such an authority
> > > on.
> >
> > Not for license creditsince I took the Extra over 30 years ago. I
> > *have* administered a lot of them, as you probably recall. You have too.
>
> I recall, Dick. I also know that you don't have to be able to answer the
> questions in order to check the test paper. Let me suggest that you
> actually take a few tests to get a better feel for that of which you speak.
> A lot of things change in 30 years time.

You're years too late. I imagine I've probably taken more ham radio
exams than most anyone around. I mean the question pool variety. Just to
see what they amounted to and to detect any errors.

> > But I'd ecpect the crowd you administer to is a different sort of
> > applicant, and many of yours are already technically trained people. Is
> > that not correct?
>
> We administer exams to people who are interested in radio. That's about the
> only way I can characterize them as a group. I'd be surprised if your group
> couldn't be characterized in the same way.

Of course they could, but of course that's not the only way they can be
characterized.

> > Away from centers of technical education and expertise, out where the
> > 'rubber meets the road' so to speak, and most ham radio aspriants have
> > no technical background it's different.
>
> I assume from your remarks that you had a technical background when you were
> first licensed. Is that an accurate assumtion? Do you feel that should be
> a prerequisite to obtaining an amateur radio license?

No, I was a 14 year old high school freshman. And No, I do not. I
merely point out what Ed denies - that is easier to word-associate most
questions and answers than it is to learn the material. That is exactly
what Dick Bash had going in the 70's.

> As a VE and fellow radio amateur, I'm less concerned with how they learn the
> material than with whether they've learned the material. I'm in agreement
> with the FCC and the VECs that when someone passes the tests, they have
> demonstrated the requisite knowlege for obtaining an amateur radio license.

We all agree that is the objective. But it is clear to me that it
frequently is not met. I don't suppose it really matters, but what it
has done over time is to cause the validity of the testing system- and
many of its licensees to come under serious ridicule-from many other
hams. And I don't mean me, either. I frequently hear it on the air.

> I'm also congnizent of the fact that this knowlege represents only the most
> rudimentary aspects of amateur radio. But I feel that the balance is best
> learned in practice - with experience.

I suppose it was inevitable when they made the Extra class license
available with no experience requirement and with a test system of given
questions and answers, that inexperienced Novice type Extras would
result. So there is really nothing extra about today's Extra class
licensee.

I don't feel that the exams can be
> expected to determine who is going to make a good radio amateur because that
> is a matter principally of attitude. But, in my limited experience I have
> found that the vast majority of people who go to the trouble of studying for
> the exams have the proper attitude to make good radio amateurs.

No question that is probably the most important factor. With it one
will learn what he needs to know, but he still misses much he should
have gotten in study of material instead of just the pools. Sure, some
applicants do study other things. Most have no need to. They can pass
the tests, one at a time, by studying that element in the pools. You
don't get much detailed information in the pools.

>
> > Ed doesn't think that any significant amount of hams do it that way.
> > I'm sure they do. But it doesn't matter, as a VE if they turn in a
> > passing score your obligation is to see that they get the license, and
> > of course we did.
>
> Since there were no cheet sheets brought into the exam, you can be confident
> that the applicants had knowlege of the facts queried on the exam.

You can if you think you should, based on your experiences. I never
expected to come to the opposite conclusion, and it developed over
several years time experience as a VE. I saw things that all finally
summed up to it. All confirmed by the considerably lowered knowledge
level demonstrated by so many new licensees. As I said, it's not their
fault and I don't intend that they should suffer for it. But improvement
in the tests is way overdue. Problem is the VE QPC is also voluntary,
and effective changes to questions to make them so that they can't
easily be memory associated, as the few that Ed posted, takes a lot
scarce volunteer time, thus is unlikely.

These
> facts are deemed to be those which are the most relevant to amateur radio
> knowlege. If you feel the material covered by the question pools is
> insufficient, then I'm sure everyone would be grateful if you were to offer
> specific suggestions as to how that material should be supplemented.

I imagine you're tired of hearing about it. Don't blame you, I'm tired
of saying it, especially when I get accused of spreading falsehoods.

> > Just for practice, and to try to catch flaws in the questions and
> > anwers,(and I did find a few errors) I used to "take" the written tests
> > as new ones came out. I was the keeper of the test material and the
> > contact VE for the team, and handled all the paperwork before and after
> > the sessions, after team had finished. So I know what the tests and
> > material amounted to.
>
> Past tense. I think there are now roughly 1000 questions in the pool. Since
> the question pool is a permanent reality, and since code proficiency is not
> useful for demonstrating the kind of knowlege we're discussing here, your
> efforts would be better focussed on ways of addressing your concerns within
> the constraints of the current system.

So, no whistleblowers allowed?
I did offer to Ed to use one of his new defective Handbooks to form
some questions on new material, but he ignored me. I wasn't surprised.
But I don't own a new handbook, though I started to buy one at a hamfest
a month ago. But every copy each vendor had was shrinkwrapped in
celophane. Not even a single sample was open for inspection. And I guess
I'm just stubborn enough that I wouldn't buy one without being able to
look it over first. There was another ham, an older fella there also
looking at them. He turned to me and said, "That's like buying a pig in
a poke", and we both walked away emptyhanded. I bought Moxon's "HF
Antennas For All Locations" instead. ARRL would do well to send those
"bent cover" issues out to vendors to use as samples if they have so
much handling damage they have to shrinkwrap every copy. The new
handbook must not be a very big seller.

> Question for you: how did you first learn the resistor color code? Was it;
> bad boys rape our young girls but violet gives willingly?

That wasn't the way I first learned it as a ham, but it's how they
taught it in military electronics school.

73, Dick W0EX

3308. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 06:13:52 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <96d7n0$8gj$0@208.207.71.136>
Source record: 3758

"R.L. Tannehill, P.E." wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > W1RFI wrote:
> > >
> > > This discussion did not start with "high tech for the masses," Dick; it started
> > > with my statement that I have talked to lots of hams and I don't think that
> > > most share your "can't do" attitude. I will say it again for you, I am
> > > offering that hams should learn more about the fundamentals of modern radio
> > > communications technology. If you have any suggestions for how I can say that
> > > in a way that you will not misunderstand, please offer them here.
> >
> > For one you could refrain from invoking FCC officials statements which
> > clearly -at least in any reasonable reading- say much more.
> > When I'm told that I need to "modernize", and I consider my amateur
> > operation and how it has changed over the years, it is clear to me that
> > I
> > HAVE modernized, regularly over the years. I don't operate on spread
> > spectrm, aside from my cordless telephone, and find no reason to want
> > to do so.
> > Neither does the state Public Safety agency I used to work for. Neither
> > does any serious percentage of that of other states, so far as I can
> > determine.
>
> Boy are you behind the power curve on this one Dick. How long have you
> been retired? Many states have started programs to build statewide
> interoperable trunked radio networks at 800MHz/700 MHz using the APCO25
> (TIA/EIA 102a) digital standard. States already in the construction
> stage include Michigan, Wisconsin, Florida, Colorado, and Pennsylvania.
> Several dozen more, including Arizona are in the planning stages. (Part
> of my job) In addition, many statewide public safety systems are
> planning upgrades of their mobile data terminal (MDT) networks to become
> high-speed Mobile Data Computer (MDC) links in the 700 MHz band running
> up to 384 Kbt over-the-air. (Aggregated channels up to 150 KHz wide are
> available in the 700 MHz band) In short, the days of simple analog FM
> repeater-linked-by-microwave operation are rapidly coming to an end.
> The future is here, now, and I see it daily, coming like a freight
> train. We will all either jump on, or be run over by it. :) I am
> encouraging the League to encourage amateur use of the APCO25 digital
> voice technology as a symbiotic relationship with the public safety
> world. This would be easy to do as the League already has an MOU with
> APCO.

Rick, I can only offer you my sympathies and remind you about the "best laid plans...". Don't plan any vacations for the rest of your career.

Dick W0EX

3309. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 06:17:00 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <0o8k8t84n1a2e37hta0bb6rpu0eprmrgag@4ax.com>
Source record: 3760

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>I remember Phoenix (Tempe, actually)

I grew up in Tempe. It was about 5000 population then.
Now I think it's around 150,000...

> Was amazed to find out how far away the mountains were.

You need new glasses Jim. One of those mountains is
right in downtown Tempe... :-)

>[The good stuff is on cable...]
>Depends on how you define "good stuff".

History Channel, Discovery Channel, American Movie Classics, CNBC,
Headline News, CNN, MSNBC, Cspan 1&2, Turner Classic Movies, The
Learning Channel, The Travel Channel, ect...

>If you told the folks who came out with the NTSC
>B&W standard in 1946 and the NTSC color standard in 1954 that those ancient TVs
>would still be usable in 2001, they'd have probably thought you were nuts.

Imagine what Morse would have thought... :-)

3310. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 06:17:03 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <6o8k8tcsf1hp8c2nk0s4m041bc9vn1m2e3@4ax.com>
Source record: 3759

tlbryant@my-deja.com (T. L. Bryant) wrote:
>Never mind. I think I will list some more. I'm sure you'll recognize these
>names, with some comments on some of them.
>Paul Allen and Bill Gates (Founders of Microsoft)
>Frank Lloyd Wright (Architect)
>Arthur C. Clarke (Author of "2001: A Space Odyssey")
>Walt Disney (Animator)
>William Faulkner (Author, Nobel prize winner. He received no higher than a "D"
>in college English)
>Peter Jennings (News Anchor)
>Steve Jobs (Founder of Apple Computer)
>Stanley Kubrick (Film director. He didn't even pass his admissions tests to
>college)
>Louis L'Amour (Author)
>Chuck Yeager (Aviator)
>Michael Dell (Founder of Dell Computer)
>I could list more from the history books, but I think I've made my point.

If your point is that most people will be better off with a library
card instead of getting a college degree, I think you're missing the
big picture... :-)

3311. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 06:20:56 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <96d848$8gj$1@208.207.71.136>
Source record: 3761

"Ed Hare, W1RFI" wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>
> > They say that hams should learn the basics of modern communications, to
> > meet the objectives laid out by FCC luminaries, yet they believe that
> > little to no real knowledge is necessary for licensing, and never
> > actually was, to hear some tell it.
>
> Who at ARRL HQ said that, Dick? It is another of your exaggerations to try
> to make your point.
>
> It is very difficult to discuss things with you when you make up things that
> you claim other people said then take issue with them for having said it.

If that is not the clear meaning of your postings to date you have some
explaining to do.

3312. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 06:22:09 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <B6AF8E41.2099%stewartx@sccoast.net>
Source record: 3762

Dick Carroll wrote:

>>> Dwight Stewart wrote:
>>>>
>>>> By definition, this is a hobby radio service
>>>> for amateurs.
>
> Earth to Dwight: Sure it's a hobby. **But it
> IS NOT 'JUST' A HOBBY!**
>
> THEY call it the Amateur Radio Service. Emphasis on
> Service. The day that FCC considers it, as you
> clearly have stated you do, as "Just a Hobby" is the
> day spectrum falls away on demand like so many
> leaves in October.

Read my sentence above, Dick. Obviously, I never denigrated ham radio by saying that it is "just" a hobby. Because, like you said, it is more than just a hobby - it is a hobby that also offers a service to others (public service, etc).

But, since most hams already know that, I really didn't see the need to spell it out again. Furthermore, that aspect simply didn't relate to the context of the discussion (experts versus amateurs - which is what my sentence above was addressing).

By the way, several people (not Dick) have privately voiced dismay that defining ham radio as a hobby somehow takes away from its value, or the value of the effort they've put into it. Since others may feel the same, let me state here that I strongly disagree.

Much of the best aspects of culture has its roots in hobbies (art, writings, music, etc). And we can all be proud of our efforts to obtain that license (because of it, we know far more about radio and electronics than the average joe on the street today). And, finally, we can all most certainly be proud of our service to the public (very few people today do half as much).

The only thing taken away, by constantly reminding people that this is a hobby, is the elitist attitudes and behavior that so often drives people away (from anything - including ham radio).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net

3313. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 06:29:27 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <96d8k7auc0@208.207.71.136>
Source record: 3763

"Ed Hare, W1RFI" wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>
> > I understood you to quote Riley Hollingworth and Dale
> > Hatfield's comments which seemed clear enough to me. "Modernizing" I
> > took to mean something more than just learning bare basics of a couple
> > late technologies. It made me think that we were being shunted toward
> > abandoning some of our present much-uses modes in favor of later things,
> > as Cecil and others have strongly insisted. Sorry if I assumed the same
> > for you.
>
> In quoting those words, I felt that I was quoting something that hams needed
> to read. When the FCC says those sorts of things to us, we really should
> pay attention. IMHO, Hatfield and Hollingsworth are sending us a message
> that Amateur Radio needs to make effective use of the frequencies we have
> been given. How many QSOs have you had on 2.4 GHz?

Ed: I have never owned equipment useful on any frequency above 440 mhz
and I traded off my 440 rig because there was no use for it here. It
would shake me not at all if FCC took most of 440 and everything above
it. As I do believe will eventually happen, less the possibility of
some sharing.

IMO, they are also
> telling us that Amateur Radio needs to continue to make technical
> contributions and to ensure that Amateur Radio continues as a valuable
> educational tool so that people who would otherwise be ignorant of radio
> technology would learn about the technology that is in use all around them.
> I believe that Amateur Radio should be as connected to the technology of
> today as it was connected to the technology of the 1940s during the 1940s.
>
> I have never said that I believed that we need to abandon anything. I
> couldn't figure out for the life of me why you kept holding on to that no
> matter how many times I told you that I felt that new technology should be
> added to what we are doing.

"Modernize" doming with "Adopt new technologies" and "Luddite" sort of
added up.

> > I know of nothing that I "fear". I lament the departure of an Amateur
> > Radio that is time tested and proven, open and valued for what it is and
> > was by virtually all who participate.
>
> The amateurs of the days you lament took pride in learning and doing things

> with what was then modern radio technology.

I can only say that the technology sitting on my desk is more modern
than that of most hams.

> > It has become clear to me that malcontents who seem to believe that anyone
> who willingly and even
> > eagerly met the requirements for all the available licenses are in some
> way their enemies, are pushing
> > hard to remake the ARS to their own specifications.
>
> And just who made Amateur Radio to those specifications? The ones who, when
> those specifications were made, brought the technology of the day into
> Amateur Radio. You were there and part of that, Dick; did the old timers of
> the day lament the loss of what had gone before and discourage you from
> doing so?

That's nonsense! To a man they would have ridiculed upheaving change
for its own sake when no demonstrated need for it was anywhere apparent.

> > That is what I abhor, and I don't see much chance of that changing.
>
> You abhor those that want to bring new technology into Amateur Radio?

Reread it, Ed. You clearly missed the first time through

3314. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 06:33:12 UTC
From: kelly@dvol
Message-ID: <3a8a15bd.41917529@news2.dvol.com>
Source record: 3765

On Tue, 13 Feb 2001 00:27:08 -0500, Dwight Stewart
<stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote:
>
> That is not the justification I heard, Brian. As far as I know, no person
>has ever been judged worthy, or not worthy, of being a ham based on his or
>her ability to "flood the bands with new technologies."
>
I'm not talking about "worthiness" or any lack thereof. I'm
specifically talking about one of of "justifications"which were posted
in this NG on inumerable occasions in support of the reduction and/or
elimination of the code tests. Those comments are carved in stone in
Deja. As history has clearly demonstrated it's miserably failed
excuse. Bogus to the core.
>
>What I heard was a desire to allow those interested in alternative
>technologies to enter the ham bands without being "hindered" by the code
>tests.
>
The U.S. Unhindered have been on the air for a decade. Where are their
"altenative technologies"?? The only "alternative technologies
(modes)" I've seen in the past decade are the plethora of new and
rapidly emerging HF digital modes cobbled together by a multinational
collection of 12/13/20 wpm code-tested "dinosaurs".
>
>For example, there is very little use for CW in the VHF/UHF
>frequencies.
>
You run EME with packet or what?
>
>Why then should those mainly interested in technologies
>relating to VHF/UHF, because of employment or whatever, be required to know
>code?
>
I don't have a problem in this world with the nocodes so let's get
past it Dwight. My position is that the nocodes are on the air in the
most endangered of our spectrum spaces in profusion and are certainly
doing more to preserve those spaces than I am and God bless 'em. But
cut the crap about any technical contributions they make, ain't
happened yet.
>
> Technology has changed over the years. Once, HF (complete with it's large
>antennas, Morse Code, etc) dominated what was known as radio. That
>situation has changed today.
>

Tune 14.000-14.050 Mhz this coming Sat/Sun mornings, stand back, then
and get back to me about the "death" of HF and CW. Heh-heh . . !
>
>Today the emphasis is on computers,
>satellites, digital modes, and so forth. With that, the necessary skills
>have changed also. And CW is simply not one of those necessary skills.
>
> The license changes to reduce the emphasis on code reflects those changes
>in radio.
>
Uh-huh. G'Nite Dwight.
>
>Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
>http://www.qsl.net/w5net
>
w3rv

3315. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 06:33:22 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <96d8riauc1@208.207.71.136>
Source record: 3764

Jim Kelley wrote:

> So what's an IIRC?

It's either "if I remember correctly" or an "international intenational
reply coupon".

3316. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 06:45:28 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <96d9i8$d15$0@208.207.71.136>
Source record: 3766

"T. L. Bryant" wrote:
>
> In article <96c8lrkpi0@208.206.142.108>, dixie@townsqr.com says...
>
> > Earth to Dwight: Sure it's a hobby. **But it IS NOT 'JUST' A HOBBY!**
> >
> > Who says so? The FCC, is who, and in case you still don't understand,
> >they trump Funk and Wagnall's every time on the subject of radio law in
> >the USA.
> >THEY call it the Amateur Radio Service. Emphasis on Service.
> > The day that FCC considers it, as you clearly have stated you do, as
> >"Just a Hobby" is the day spectrum falls away on demand like so many
> >leaves in October.
>
> What is the motivation for most people to want to obtain an amateur license? Do
> you think it's because the want to provide and be a part of a service, or do
> you think it might be a nice hobby to persue? Listen to the conversations on
> the air. With a few (very few) exceptions, do you really believe most of these
> conversations are providing a service?

I spent the evening today at our monthly RACES meeting. With Spring on
the way, it was also the annual "Storm Spotters Training Session", with
the house filled with non-ham sheriff's deputies, local police, firemen,
EMT's and other volunteer storm spotters. (We have lots of foul Spring
weather in the Midwest including your share of tornados).
The training session was conducted by a very competent young
meteoroligist from the National Weather Service. One of his points was
that ham radio operators are invaluable in the conduct of this program.
He noted that the regional NWS HQ where the regional doppler radar is
located has a ham radio station with at least one operator active each
time severe storms are anticipated, along with the many trained hams who
are weather spotters in the field, and that they consider this effort to
be critical to the success of effective weather warning.
You can regard that as hobby if you wish. I call it service.

3317. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 06:45:41 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <B6AF93C2.209A%stewartx@sccoast.net>
Source record: 3767

Dick Carroll wrote:

> [snip] OR is this just another method of easing
> us all out of a *real* ham radio into a purely
> hobby-CB sort of "service", as Dwigbt Stewart
> so clearly described a few posts back? [snip]

Dick, you must have a reading comprehension problem, because I never described any such thing. I was addressing a very specific issue in that message - "expert" hams in a hobby radio service as those relate to license exams.

Beyond that, my comments neither addressed, or were intended to address, a description of any radio service. And, after reading my message again, I still have absolutely no idea where you came up with this CB nonsense.

Since you have agreed with me in this very thread that ham radio is a hobby, and every ham already knows that service is a part of ham radio, would you please explain to me what the heck you're talking about?

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net

3318. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 06:48:14 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <96d9ne$d15$1@208.207.71.136>
Source record: 3768

"T. L. Bryant" wrote:
>
> In article <96bnp1$41d$0@208.207.71.143>, dixie@townsqr.com says...
>
> >And that, dear friend, is the reason that education is "structured". The
> >novice who sets out to learn *may* have some vague idea what he 'wants'
> >to know but he rarely has any idea what it is that he needs to know. So
>
> ...and why should anyone be put in a position to decide that for someone else?
> Most students don't use any more than 10% of what they learned in school once
> they reach adulthood. This goes for college as well.
>
> >it is with ham radio, despite all the squawking and verbiage to the
> >contrary. Even if it truly becomes "only a hobby". They, too, have some
> >level of necessary knowledge.
>
> So then why should you or anyone else decide what *I* want to get out of ham
> radio?

It's for your own protection, T L, so you won't get ran over when you
get in the way.

3319. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 06:50:15 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <96d9r7$d15$2@208.207.71.136>
Source record: 3770

Cecil wrote:
>
> "Ed Hare, W1RFI" wrote:
> > It is very difficult to discuss things with you when you make up things that
> > you claim other people said then take issue with them for having said it.
>
> It's called a straw man, Ed. It's one of about ten well known
> diversionary tactics that people tend to use when they are losing
> an argument.

Just like incorporating a reference then denying that you meant to use
it?

3320. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 06:51:07 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <B6AF950B.209B%stewartx@sccoast.net>
Source record: 3769

T. L. Bryant wrote:

> To some, ham radio is a religion, and
> religious fanatics will never quit
> perpetuating a myth.

You're probably right, but every so often the heretic has to come along
and shake things up a bit. :-)

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net

3321. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 06:54:55 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <96da3v$d15$3@208.207.71.136>
Source record: 3771

"Ed Hare, W1RFI" wrote:
>
> Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
>
> > "Ed Hare, W1RFI" wrote:
> > > It is very difficult to discuss things with you when you make up things
> that
> > > you claim other people said then take issue with them for having said
> it.
>
> > It's called a straw man, Ed. It's one of about ten well known
> > diversionary tactics that people tend to use when they are losing
> > an argument.
>
> Strawman ideas are generally presented as tentative and are expected to be
> battered about.
>
> I don't think that the term "strawman" applies to deliberate
> misinterpretation of what someone says.

You err if you believe I deliberately misrepressnted anything you said.
I assumed that your use of the references of FCC officials statements
meant the same thing to you they did to me.

3322. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 07:11:30 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <B6AF99D0.209C%stewartx@sccoast.net>
Source record: 3772

T. L. Bryant wrote:

> What is the motivation for most people
> to want to obtain an amateur license?
> Do you think it's because the want to
> provide and be a part of a service, or do
> you think it might be a nice hobby to
> persue? Listen to the conversations on
> the air. With a few (very few) exceptions,
> do you really believe most of these
> conversations are providing a service?

Since your question is a derivative of my comments, let me add my two cents worth. I think a lot of people do it for both reasons. When I got into ham radio, I did so with visions of contacting people in far off lands and was also very interested in the MARS program. Of course, since I went to Italy shortly thereafter, contacting people in far off lands was a lot easier than I expected. And, because of that extended trip overseas, I never really did anything about my interest in MARS (by the time I got back, the C.G. Aux had my interest instead).

And you might be amazed at how many of those people conversing on the radio are involved with public service. Ninety-five percent of the C.G. Aux communications personnel are hams. And good number of hams in this area are registered with civil defense. Of course, there is never enough people involved in public service, but there is still a respectable number of hams involved.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net

3323. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 07:15:13 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <B6AF9AB1.209D%stewartx@sccoast.net>
Source record: 3773

T. L. Bryant wrote:

> dixie@townsqr.com says...
>>
>> **Is there anyone out there who truly
>> believes that REAL ham radio is not
>> in its final throes after reading this
>> masterpiece?????***
>
> I fail to see ANY correlation between
> Dwight trying to dispel some myths and
> the demise of "real" ham radio. Please
> post one of your usual 15,000 word
> essays explaining your reasoning.

I'd like to hear that myself. I'm still trying to figure out how he arrived at those opinions after reading my comments. His opinions about my comments and my actual comments don't seem to relate at all.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net

3324. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 07:33:36 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010214023336.03673.00002226@nso-ck.aol.com>
Source record: 3775

In article <3A89D433.EA7B644@IEEE.org>, Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>"Ed Hare, W1RFI" wrote:
>> Strawman ideas are generally presented as tentative and are expected to be
>> battered about.
>>
>> I don't think that the term "strawman" applies to deliberate
>> misinterpretation of what someone says.
>
>From Webster's: "straw man - an imaginary opposition set up only
>to be easily confuted" Dick uses his imagination on what you
>posted and then he confutes the imagined result.

...he has a Confuter Program that generates them... :-)

didit

3325. Re: This Should Be A Warning

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 07:33:37 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010214023337.03673.00002227@nso-ck.aol.com>
Source record: 3774

In article <3A89E0B5.B2B234FF@uci.edu>, Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> writes:

>If you'd looked, you would have found articles that answer those
>questions in QST.

I'm not a subscriber to QST. Please tell all for the benefit of those
who haven't been through one.

>Things are not at all how you try to portray them.

Sorry, but a rather large press corps and broadcasting covered
the event. I'm not stating anything that wasn't already reported
or seen by the administration.

>If you were at all
>personally involved in emergency preparedness you would know the extent
>to which police and fire have improved their ability to respond since
>the Oklahoma City disaster.

I was talking about the Northridge Earthquake of January 17, 1994.
The Muraugh Building bombing in Oklahoma City happend April
19, 1995, over a year later. Were you referring to "another"
Oklahoma City disaster?

> And you would also know the extent to which
>amateur radio is an integral part of the response plan in California.

I know of the California Office of Emergency Services and the
Auxilliary Communications Service, RIMS, SEMS, and the
federal SHARES. I have some unknown-currency information
on the activity of the California National Guards. Is there more?
Please, tell all so that everyone will benefit.

>But you don't know, and so you just make stupid comments about it in an
>attempt to vilify amateur radio. Who needs you?

No one needs someone who cannot argue, discuss, or even
debate a subject without trying to attack the person.

The nation of India has seen a truly terrible disaster in an
earthquake ten times and more stronger than the Northridge
Earthquake of 1994. That was seven years ago for the Los
Angeles area, plenty of time for all truly concerned to begin
planning for a similar real emergency. The Los Angeles area
was already so planned, drilled, exercised and did its task
well. How did amateur radio licensees help in this effort?

If there is anyone "villifying" something it is Jim Kelley who
seems to imagine more than what was ever said.

didit

3326. Re: This Should Be A Warning

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 07:33:41 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010214023341.03673.00002228@nso-ck.aol.com>
Source record: 3776

In article <3A89EE81.7992@bellsouth.net>, Jerry Oxendine
<joxendi@bellsouth.net> writes:

>Mr Len,
>
>Just as stated in Jim Kelley's response to your post, I can state that
>without a doubt, *most* of your posts including this one are without
>merit.

Why? Because they don't go into virtual hysterics on giving High
Fives to all licensed radio amateurs?

For your benefit, my name is Leonard H. Anderson, not "Mr. Len."
My mailing address is 10048 Lanark Street, Sun Valley, CA,
91352...located in the eastern part of the San Fernando Valley
area of Los Angeles.

>You seem to forget that, while it is absolutely correct for
>professional emergency response teams to be ready for any event, most
>volunteers ARE involved and neither ask for, nor receive, much credit
>for what they do.

That was not a subject of my response. As a citizen-volunteer
myself on various occaisions, I've never asked nor demanded
"credit" or anything else. That was not the subject or intent (not
even implicit) of my posting.

>If, as you state, the usual public communications
>media are not damaged, then there is not as much need for assistance
>as there would be if the reverse were true.

The state of California has an Office of Emergency Services under
the governor and specifically for communications, the Auxilliary
Communications Service (ACS). The ACS has its origins in
RACES but has been expanded to include unlicensed persons
in the event of a real emergency. The California OES is also
involved with SHARES, the federal HF network...which can tie
in the state National Guard and the US military.

The standard argument from amateurs for Real emergency
communications is that "cell phones will be useless" as well
as the landline telephone system. That may happen in small
sections of the country during any emergency...but it also
presumes that the telephone system is the only communications
means. That isn't so, but it is convenient for the purpose of
achieving message points in a newsgroup. There are many and
varied ways to communicate in Real emergencies since there

exist many and varied radio services in addition to amateur radio.

The question to ask in REAL emergencies is whether or not any individual radio amateur's station or even part of radio equipment will survive. Such equipment is usually ready-built, purchased and not designed for emergency environments. Much of the professional/commercial equipment is designed for harsher environments. This includes antennas and towers.

To find out more about the California OES and ACS, link to

http://www.state.ca.us.

and look around the OES home page. [there's also a lot on the California energy problem]

> DUH! Every situation is
>not the same. In 1989 my area experienced a full blown hurricane called
>Hugo.

It is realized that REAL emergencies vary by region, locality, and with many variations of disaster. My comment to K4YZ emotional plea about the India-Pakistan earthquake concerned another earthquake that happened uncomfortably close to my home on 17 January 1994 at roughly a quarter to five AM. That particular earthquake killed 57 people, injured 11,846 others and caused over 40 billion dollars in property damage. One MHV power line tower toppled, cutting off ALL primary electrical power to about ten million of us scattered over an urban area of roughly 20 by 40 miles (estimate by self).

> ALL power lines were down. NO-
>BODY had power--some for as much as a month. Repeaters, both commercial
>and amateur, were off the air. Suddenly that service you denigrate as
>"just a hobby" became VERY important. Police and fire comms were either
>down or greatly hampered. Who filled in? The HAMS, that's who! THEY
>provided both backup comms and spare generators to the emergency author-
>ities. Where generators were not available due to the vast destruction,
>and the huge amount of traffic, hams used their mobile HF radios (me
>included)to augment what comms there were.

Yes, the amateurs came to the aid of the communities even though their repeaters were down (your statement). My comment concerning the Northridge Earthquake of 1994 did not state that radio amateurs were not helping. I asked simply "where were they?" They were not in evidence, either observed or on broadcast radio and television. Note: The tower causing the total electrical power outage was jury-rigged upright within four hours by utility workers but the entire area had to come back up through a "black start" (power term denoting putting the electric power grid up from a total absence of input). Electrical power was restored to about 90% of the area before midnight. Radio and TV broadcast stations were back on the air as soon as their emergency power

generators could be started.

Meanwhile, hospitals and medical centers had their emergency
power generators keeping health facilities working, the various
Fire Departments were never out of order, the various Police
Departments were never out of order (except for two patrol cars
caught on collapsed overpasses). Utility crews were mobilized
for repairs using their own radio system, as were many different
combined city emergency services. There is an emergency
communications center in Los Angeles that coordinates such
emergency work and it rode out the earthquake along with
many aftershocks.

> And if you think that the
>local governments and emergency management teams weren't grateful, you
>are mistaken.

You are trying to imply that I said bad things about radio
amateurs. I did not do so.

> If you could truly know how little you know, you would not
>post such drivel.

I know more than many radio amateurs about communications
in both regular services as well as REAL emergencies. The
California Office of Emergency Services is not in the "drivel"
business nor is the California ACS communicating "drivel."

I repeatedly asked the same question about a devestating
local earthquake big enough to kill 57 outright, hurting
several thousand others, and causing widespread destruction.
It was simply "Where were the radio amateurs?"

That was 7 years ago. I've been directed to a certain copy
of QST to "read all about it." Thank you, I was in the middle
of it, and got quite a bit of information from the local press
and broadcasting.

>Like it or lump it, sir, Amateur Radio is here to stay and enjoys the
>respect of governments throughout the world, as well as the populations
>that have benefitted from hams' volunteer service.

You have inferred far too much from my posting. I was replying to
an emotionally-fired posting concerning the very REAL devestating
earthquake centered in the nation of India. While the Northridge
Earthquake was not on the scale of the Indian one, it nonetheless
killed human beings, injured many, and caused billions of dollars
in damage. Why go into ranting of an India quake when the USA
has already had more than one in the last seven years?

Are radio amateurs REALLY equipped, trained, and ready-to-go
at every emergency, local, state, or federal? The California plan
for ACS allows not-licensed-in-amateur-radio to participate in REAL

emergencies. I've not seen that in RACES' plans. Perhaps you
can fill me in to avoid "drivel" repetition.

> As a volunteer, both
>as a ham and in other organizations, I resent your ignorant ramblings
>about ham radio, volunteers, and their contributions to the well-being
>of our communities, states, and Nation.

I've never ranted about any volunteer work by anyone...but I have
ranted about flag-waving, phrase-making repetitions of those who
were NOT in REAL emergencies...I have ranted about the chest-
puffers, the medal-wearers of non-accomplishment who have no
evidence of their volunteerism other than repeating the same trite
phrases of "value to the community." There's a BIG difference
between TRUE volunteerism and the bragging seen too often in
here.

The problems many radio amateurs face is an ignorance of the
existing infrastructure of both landline and radio communications.
They do not join in any organization as a general rule, do not
train because they are not members. They, as a general rule,
simply say "I am ready!" and don't understand that such chest-
beating is not enough. "Radio" is more than ham stuff, CB,
cell phones, and broadcasting. There is much more to the
entire radio community available for REAL emergencies.

>I am both proud and willing to serve when needed.

My US Army serial number was RA 16 408 336. If you know the
old system of the US military, the "RA" denotes a volunteer.
That was in 1952 to 1960. Can one volunteer MORE than one's life
for one's country? I don't think anyone can.

>Further, I have rarely heard one word of support for
>hams in your posts, rather your posts consist of whining and belittling
>subjects you so obviously know NOTHING about.

Translation: I don't stand up and cheer wildly when someone
mentions amateur radio...I don't repeat trite phrases of self-
praise for the "good of the service," nor have I memorized all
the self-promotional mantras of the amateur organizations.
REAL emergencies are unaffected by anyone's propaganda.

Sorry, I'm still a professional in radio who got started legally in
24/7 HF communications in 1953.

My main purpose on getting into this newsgroup was to argue
the elimination of the morse code test for the amateur radio
license test. Since that time a bit over 3 years ago, I have
been a target of personal abuse by those who cannot defend
the sanctity or need of the morse code test for an amateur
radio license. Since they cannot logically support the code
test as it applies to newcomers, they attempt abusing those

persons who wish to remove it.

>I don't have to get into
>it with you to make my point; you have made it already.

You must. You imagine that someone tried to tear down
amateur radio as, apparently, YOU KNOW IT, and want a
pound of flesh. Sorry, I cannot imagine what your imagination
conjurs up, only that you want to hurt someone physically
for imagined insults.

>My own hat is
>off to volunteers EVERYWHERE who do so much with so little, and receive
>barely a word of acknowledgement for their efforts. If I had to put up
>with that crap in person after I have slogged around in the mud dodging
>poisonous snakes for 2 days (like hurricane Floyd), I'd punch the a**
>hole in the mouth!!!!!!!! GRRRRRRRRR!

Just exactly who "slighted volunteers?" I volunteered to help in
searching the Veteran's Hospital collapse in the Sylmar
Earthquake of 1971. Nobody gave me any praise, coffee,
certificate of appreciation or anything else beside a handshake
and that was enough for me. I spent three days at the Sylmar
Veteran's Hospital rubble. You are free to call me all the names
you want, imagine whatever you wish (quite a bit), but physical
violence is going to be more difficult to accomplish than you
think. It won't make your imaginary case.

I'll ask again and expect something besides a reference to a
QST article. In the 1994 Northridge Earthquake where were the
radio amateurs? That was 7 years ago (plus almost a month).
I know where the professionals and commercial people were,
what they were doing.

Has anyone briefed themselves on the California ACS or the
OES, do they know anything about SHARES? Or is everyone
just reading what is written in ham organization literature and
then imagining what real emergencies are like, how they feel,
all the while sitting safe in their ham shacks...?

didit

3327. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 07:37:49 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <B6AF9FFB.209E%stewartx@sccoast.net>
Source record: 3777

WA8ULX wrote:

>> Dwight Stewart wrote...
>>
>> Instead, the license class only shows
>> that the person has demonstrated to the
>> FCC that he/she has learned the basic
>> skills necessary to operate properly and
>> safely in the frequencies used by that
>> license class.
>
> And just how did they learn anything, let
> alone basic skills by memorizing a bunch
> of questions which mean NOTHING to them.

Gee, I know you're so much smarter than the average human being, WA8ULX, but I know I learned something by memorizing those questions and answers. And I learned even more by reading the rest of the book that contained those questions and answers. And I learned still more by further reading not associated with that license exam. And I learned still more from my experiences since obtaining that license.

A large part of learning is memorization, WA8ULX. I assume even you had to once memorize things as part of your learning process (but maybe you were too smart to need that). When we're children, we learn to speak by memorizing what others have said. Later, we memorize rules for spelling, shapes for writing, dates in history, formulas for math, theories for science, and so forth.

After we memorize all those things, we can then go forward to apply those memories to the real world (and perhaps if we remember how we applied them, we might learn still more).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net

3328. Re: This Should Be A Warning

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 08:56:44 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <B6AFB27A.209F%stewartx@sccoast.net>
Source record: 3778

Len Over 21 wrote:

> The question still remains - Where
> were the radio amateurs here and a
> few years earlier in the Bay Area
> of middle California who have
> constantly kept the mantra of
> "radio amateurs 'always come
> through' during emergencies?"

Actually, there were articles in several ham magazines describing the efforts of hams during both of these incidents. No, hams don't "always" come through in every circumstance, Len. But large numbers do at least try.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net

3329. Re: This Should Be A Warning

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 09:05:37 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <B6AFB491.20A0%stewartx@sccoast.net>
Source record: 3779

Steve Robeson wrote:

> "According to one Indian media account,
> however, hams in India have complained
> that because ham radio is considered a
> hobby, they are not taken seriously by
> the politicians"

Well, since ham radio is a hobby (and everyone knows that), the way to change that impression is to become involved in public service activities and perform those services in a manner that convinces people to take those efforts seriously.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net

3330. Re: This Should Be A Warning

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 09:34:48 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <B6AFBB65.20A1%stewartx@sccoast.net>
Source record: 3780

Jerry Oxendine wrote:

> [snip] Definition of Cottonmouth Water Moccasin:
> a venomous snake characterized by the white
> color of its mouth, usually dark mottled gray
> or near black. Usually around 3 1/2 feet to 4
> feet long. Very irritable and bites readily
> (kinda like me right now!), normally found in
> low lying creeks, ponds, amd swamps. Toxic
> venom slightly more so than the Copperhead
> commonly found in the same areas. Use caution
> in known habitats (especially if area has suf-
> fered a flood [My addition].

Ah, Cottonmouths are not that bad, Jerry. I have a whole hurd of them in the creek behind my house. In fact, the snakes and the snapping turtles seem to have a feud going on since the first part of last summer. And, before the cold weather hit, the snapping turtles were winning - they attack the snakes from below as the snakes swim across the surface. A few strikes from the two to three foot snapping turtles and it is pretty much over for the snakes. At that point, a number of turtles move in to finish off the meal. It is amazing to watch.

To be honest with you, I'm not used to all this. While I have spent some time on the farm during my childhood, I'm mostly a city person. I never knew that snapping turtles grew this large. I never knew that snapping turtles ate meat and would attack living things in the water. And I darn sure don't like all the snakes in the area. In other words, this is way too much country for me.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net

3331. Re: > Sign "BOYCOTT KENWOOD" after your call!!!! <

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 11:03:48 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010214060348.17693.00000937@ng-da1.aol.com>
Source record: 3781

>From: Cecil Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>CW not CB wrote:

>> Kenwood -- proven anti-coders.

>Kenwood rigs won't send CW?

Cecil, you really didn't expect logic from someone who posts and reposts the same mantra year after year did you?

The no-code folks love him; he supports their cause by making the pro-code folks appear bad.

Either that or he just figured that choosing that "side" would be the most fun and stir up the most trouble.

Either way, logic will not play any part of what he posts or any responses.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3332. Re: Morse Code replacement? Bigtime flame war article!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 11:15:11 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010214061511.17693.00000938@ng-da1.aol.com>
Source record: 3782

>From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)

>>He could certainly manage a code QSO today, though he has not accepted
>>my invite to do so.

>I wonder why not?

He told me that he simply doesn't want to because he didn't think he would
enjoy it at all.

> More than a year ago I recall him posting that he was going
> for Extra, had a new house with no antenna restrictions, the works.
> None of it has happened.

I can give you a list of things that I wanted to get done in the past year that
have not happened either.

>No articles on SS or anything else that I've seen, either.

That is, IMHO, much more unfortunate than his not getting an Extra. He
certainly has the ability to design that SS transceiver that seems to be
missing from Amateur Radio. Considering his technical talents, IMHO, that
would be a more unique contribution to Amateur Radio than his leadership of
NCI. Bill Sohl could take over, with his skills at politics, leaving Carl free
to make technical contributions. :-)

>How many other countries have as many hams as the USA with HF privileges and
>power greater than QRP? Think about WHY the USA has subbands.

The reasons I think the US has subbands have nothing to do with power level.
Most countries that have HF priveleges have power limits >> 5 W.

>They are supposed to - but the foreign 'phones are now down below 7050, for
>example.

And the US digital folks are now above 7050, for example.

>There is also a growing philosophy of "if it's not prohibited by the FCC, I'm
>gonna do it, don't tell me about no steenking bandplans". I have seen it here
and elsewhere.

That is probably the reason we have mode allocations.

>That's not the end of it. He wants NO "support for legacy modes".
>Translation:
>If your QRP CW signal gets buried under his highpower DSSS signal, too bad,
>you should get with the program and stop using the legacy mode.

That is pretty much his view. I disagree with him (Dick, please take note for future reference.)

>>I think that some FHSS needs to be permitted on HF.

>Why? What are the advantages?

The only reason I suggest that is that I believe that Amateur Radio should be engaging in as much experimentation as possible. That is one of many. Note my use of "some." Now, the way to do that could be via STA, but those that were doing anything with the last STA, if any, were not reporting their results widely.

>Doesn't matter. He wants a "free market of modes" - and that includes DSSS,
>not just FHSS. No limits, and if the existing narrow-band users are
>interfered with, tough.

That was pretty much his view the last time he posted here. Of course, when it comes to SS on UHF and above, the rules are very clear about interference.

>> There are some here who say some pretty bad things about
>>CW to justify keeping it.

>Lemme at 'em!!!! ;-)

You are quite welcome to join the "tag team." :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3333. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 11:16:58 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010214061658.17693.00000939@ng-da1.aol.com>
Source record: 3783

>From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

>Sure they do. One representing a certain level of accomplishment. So
>when the license can be issued without the licensee having reached that
>minimal level of accompliahment......????

The FCC knows full well how question pools work. They apparently don't believe that vast hordes of hams are memorizing over a thousand questions without learning something in the process.

Today's licencees meet all of the accomplishments stipulated by law. What more are you asking them to do?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3334. Re: Who is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 11:18:34 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010214061834.17693.00000940@ng-da1.aol.com>
Source record: 3784

>rom: Cecil Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>> > Every Real Texanï¿½ knows the best people drive a pickup.

>> And the best ones drive a CHEVY! LOL!

>On a quiet night, you can hear the Fords rusting. :-)

My GMC makes a bit of noise now and again. I listen to it carefully, and if
any noise stops, I stop the truck and go back and pick up whatever just fell
off.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI
>--
>http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca
>
>
>
>
>
>
>

3335. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 11:41:30 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010214064130.17693.00000941@ng-da1.aol.com>
Source record: 3785

>From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)

>>Not the Novice I took.

>You didn't specify which Novice.

1963, the same Novice I have talked about the many other times I have cited this tale. :-)

>The test I took required knowing stuff like Ohm's Law. The current tech does >not.

Ohm's law was on the 1963 Novice, but that really was just about it for techncial content. No questions about antennas, feed lines, SWR, propagation and a host of others that are on today's Tech test.

Ohm's law most certainly IS on today's Tech, Jim. The pool even has questions about the formula for Ohm's law, expressed both as E=I*R and in plain English.

>>I studied 4 pages and passed easily.

>I very much doubt you started out knowing nothing about radio before those >four pages, Ed.

I had dabbled in Electronics some, as a kid. But I don't recall anything on the test that was not virtually word for word what was on the study guide.

>And the number of pages is no indicator of the level of the material.

It was in this case. I had posted the entire study guide to this NG a month or so back.

>3) Because you were interested.

> That leaves 3). And the end result is an ARS with a few
> knowledgeable folks. Perhaps that is unavoidable.

I don't believe that every ham is interested in technology, Jim, but I think the interest level is higher than you think. People don't become hams because they don't want to learn. I would agree that the depth of technical testing may be less than it was, although that General required me to study 16 pages of study guide for a few weeks, so you tell me.

But that mile-wide river is a LOT wider than the river I had to cross when I got my General, and the entry level tests cover territory I didn't even know existed when I was first licensed. I found myself a year ago teaching the RF safety material to a Tech class and when I was teaching them the differences between the reactive near field, the radiating near field and far field conditions, so they could better understand how to answer certain questions, I

was amazed that this is what we require of beginners.

When I was a Novice, old Hub, W1BNB, handed me those 4 pages and told me to study them. Today, we hand people a Now You're Talking and tell them that THIS is what they need to know to be a beginner. I gotta' tell you, if I had been handed that book when I was 13 instead of those 4 pages, I wouldn't have become a ham. If we wonder why there are not as many kids in ham radio as there once were, compare the 4 pages to NYT and give me an analysis. The published question pools along take up about 90 pages in the book.

Add to that all of this bitterness about "dumbing down" that some are posting and reposting on newsgroups and elsewhere. Now, if someone had handed me the NYT book, but then handed me a General and an Extra and told me that NYT was a really easy accomplishment and if I wanted to be a "real ham" I would also have to learn that, too, and THEN said that it was all dumbed down from the 16 pages he had to study to get all amateur priveleges, I would have thought that hams were totally whacko and simply walked away. Some newcomers are subjected to exactly that treatment by some who probably honestly believe that they are doing Great Good for the Service by doing so.

>What W2ILP and many others are concerned about is that as the
>"average ham" becomes less operationally skilled and
> technically knowledgeable, our future is threatened.

I share those concerns. I just don't think that any licensing process could properly address them. The only way it could have meaning is if it were all incentivized, and I see no value into further compartmentalizing Amatuer Radio by license class.

The number of topics that SHOULD be known (not by individual amateurs, Dick -- by the Service as a whole) is greater than nearly any individual would be expected to accomplish. The depth of knowledge that could be known (Dick, this is not forcing you to have to learn anything, I promise) is greater than most hams would ever learn across the board. IMHO, once hams have met the requirements of our licensing structure, they are free to learn, or not learn, as they will. Look at the reaction here by one individual just because I said that hams should (not must) learn modern radio technology. Would you really want to see that reaction multiplied by encoding that Hare-brained idea into a license structure? I wouldn't.

I think that the best way to accomplish learning is to lay the foundation with testing and then rely on the very nature of the Service to take care of the rest. Things like ARRL's education and certification program need to be expanded past the one course they offer now on emergency communication. Tutorials in books or free on web pages abound on various technical topics, so hams can learn and do more.

Maybe what is needed is for folks to take steps to foster the development of a "can do" culture in ham radio (again?). I think some of what I have seen said here has had just the opposite effect.

Just another "whimper" from one of the gang in Newington. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3336. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 11:42:41 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010214064241.17693.00000942@ng-da1.aol.com>
Source record: 3786

>From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)

>>Even then it is likely that the FCC will ask that the applicant be retested
>>by
>>a VEC, either by specifying the VEC or by making a stipulation that it be a
>>different VEC than coordinated a questionable test session.

>Precisely! The FCC's involvement in testing is that limited.

The FCC also does approve the question pools before they are official.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3337. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 11:44:19 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010214064419.17693.00000943@ng-da1.aol.com>
Source record: 3787

>From: wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX)

>And just how did they learn anything, let alone Basic skills by Memorizing a
>bunch of Questions which meaN NOTHING to them.

Another "can't do" in operation.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3338. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 11:47:07 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010214064707.17693.00000944@ng-da1.aol.com>
Source record: 3788

>From: Jim Kelley jwkelley@uci.edu

>We spoke in person at the SW Division Convention in San Diego - outside,
>after the ARRL talk at the end of the day. I'll buy dinner if the
>opportunity ever presents itself.

Yes, I do remember that, Jim. As I recall, it was a nice old-hippie to
old-hippie conversation. :-)

I may be in San Diego later this year, for an IEEE/ANSI C.63 "RFI" committee
meeting. I will keep you posted. I will also be at Riverside this year, and
possibly Pacificon.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3339. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 11:50:23 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010214065023.17693.00000945@ng-da1.aol.com>
Source record: 3789

>From: Jim Kelley jwkelley@uci.edu

>Almost all the colors look the same to me on those blue colored film
>resistors.

And we don't even want to talk about chip resistors. The only one in the Lab that can read the values without a magnifying glass is Zack.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3340. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 11:53:36 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010214065336.17693.00000946@ng-da1.aol.com>
Source record: 3790

>From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

>> We administer exams to people who are interested in radio. That's about
>> the only way I can characterize them as a group. I'd be surprised if
>> your group couldn't be characterized in the same way.

> Of course they could, but of course that's not the only way they can be
>characterized.

I have seen some of your characterization, Dick. I see it as an extremist view and do not believe that it represents a characterization of most people taking tests.

People are not becoming hams because they don't want to learn anything.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3341. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 11:54:49 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010214065449.17693.00000947@ng-da1.aol.com>
Source record: 3791

>From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

>I merely point out what Ed denies - that is easier to word-associate most
>questions and answers than it is to learn the material.

It is easier to learn a few simple formulas and apply grammar-school math to
solve them than it is to memorize over 1000 questions without understanding.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3342. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 11:57:46 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010214065746.17693.00000948@ng-da1.aol.com>
Source record: 3792

>From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

>We all agree that is the objective. But it is clear to me that it
>frequently is not met. I don't suppose it really matters, but what it
>has done over time is to cause the validity of the testing system- and
>many of its licensees to come under serious ridicule-from many other
>hams. And I don't mean me, either. I frequently hear it on the air.

I don't believe that I have ever been in a QSO where the op on the other end told me that he thought the current spate of amateur tests was dumbed down and that vast hordes of people were doing no more than memorizing them. What percentage of your QSOs contained this content? Did the op on the other end bring it up on his own, or did you initiate that discussion. Did his wife call him to dinner very soon after? :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3343. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 11:59:19 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010214065919.17693.00000949@ng-da1.aol.com>
Source record: 3793

>From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

>They can pass
>the tests, one at a time, by studying that element in the pools. You
>don't get much detailed information in the pools.

There are more correct answers in the General pool than there were sentences in the 16-page General study guide I read to get my General license.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3344. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 12:12:33 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010214071233.17693.00000950@ng-da1.aol.com>
Source record: 3794

>From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

>Sure, some applicants do study other things. Most have no need to.

Dick, you have no personal knowledge of what 99% of those who took tests before you studied. Your view of what they studied is speculation. You have often here offered the worst possible interpretation of people's words and then built a whole house of cards about what it meant. I am sure you are doing the same. Jim is apparently a VE, too, and he is not prone to wild speculation; his view appears to be more balanced and reasoned to me than yours.

>I never
>expected to come to the opposite conclusion, and it developed over
>several years time experience as a VE. I saw things that all finally
>summed up to it.

Just like your summing up of the things I didn't actually say here, Dick?

>Problem is the VE QPC is also voluntary,
>and effective changes to questions to make them so that they can't
>easily be memory associated, as the few that Ed posted, takes a lot
>scarce volunteer time, thus is unlikely.

I am sure that all of the questions that you have been sending to this group of volunteers you have oft' soundly criticized will help. Could you post the things you have sent to the QPC here so we can discuss them?

I also suggest that you re-read the question pool, Dick. The example I posted was about the best of them, but there are many groups of questions with very similar answers that cannot be word-association memorized, IMHO. If you will re-read it, I won't have to do another edit job to cut and past the relevant questions. Would you mind?

>If you feel the material covered by the question pools is
>> insufficient, then I'm sure everyone would be grateful if you were to offer
>> specific suggestions as to how that material should be supplemented.

> I imagine you're tired of hearing about it. Don't blame you, I'm tired
>of saying it, especially when I get accused of spreading falsehoods.

Is that really your answer to his question? It looks like a total non-sequitor to me. Did you cut and paste the wrong answer in composing the email?

> So, no whistleblowers allowed?
> I did offer to Ed to use one of his new defective Handbooks to form
>some questions on new material, but he ignored me. I wasn't surprised.

I was off the ng for several weeks, Dick; I do not read every post. Of course, with all of the griping you have been doing about the QPC and all of the errors you say you have found in the pools, you have been sending them questions all along, right? Could you post them here so we can discuss them?

>I bought Moxon's "HF Antennas For All Locations" instead.

I am sure you can write some excellent questions from that.

>I'm just stubborn enough that I wouldn't buy one without being able to
>look it over first.

I'll tell you what, Dick, if you buy the Handbook and don't like it, I will personally buy it back from you.

>ARRL would do well to send those
>"bent cover" issues out to vendors to use as samples if they have so
>much handling damage they have to shrinkwrap every copy.

Most dealers open one up and put it on display. The ARRL Lobby does the same. Of course, it does get a bit dogeared from the few who sit in the Lobby and read it so they don't have to buy one.

> The new handbook must not be a very big seller.

Seems to sell about as well as it ever did, according to my inside sources. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3345. Re: Gay History should be taught by schools

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 12:22:36 UTC
From: "J. Duffy Beischel" <duffyb01@fuse.net>
Message-ID: <t8ku2j3ncfflb4@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 3795
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Unless the discussion is how well an HT works stuck up some homosexual's ass, I fail to see the relevance in discussing homosexualty, destroying the fine reputation of the Boy Scouts, etc., in a ham radio newsgroup.

Let's discuss the hobby, communication methods, etc. The hobby is the purpose of this newsgroup.

"Bruce W" <ham22@lambda.org> wrote in message news:96cteg$qo4$0@pita.alt.net...
>
> A good article to show your local principal:
>
>
> 'Gay History' Advocated for Public Schools
>
> NewsMax.com Wires
> February 12, 2001
>
> (CNSNews.com) - A leading homosexual rights advocacy group Friday called
> on the Boy Scouts of America to "end discrimination" against homosexuals
> and called for the teaching of "gay history" in schools.
>
> At a breakfast briefing in Los Angeles, top legal strategists from the
> Lambda Legal Defense and Education Fund outlined what they consider to
> be leading discrimination problems facing homosexuals. ...
>
> (read the full text at Newsmax.com)

3346. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 12:41:17 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010214074117.17693.00000953@ng-da1.aol.com>
Source record: 3796

>From: Vincent Biancomano

>No they didn't, Ed. They engaged in governmental double speak to
>wash their hands of the Service. Trivializing the Service was
>the way to go, an economic decision.

Why do you feel it would be in the best interest of specific FCC staff to lie about it rather than address it head on by making whatever rules changes they felt were in the public interest?

I have never met any FCC staff that I felt would do that. Can you describe to us what dealings you have had with the FCC that leads you to that conclusion.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3347. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 12:42:35 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010214074235.17693.00000954@ng-da1.aol.com>
Source record: 3797

>From: Vincent Biancomano 103520.355@CompuServe.COM

>That aside, the Commission has essentially told
>the Service to "take a hike."

I didn't see that in the Report and Order. What paragraph do you feel the
Commission intends us to perceive as "take a hike?"

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3348. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 12:44:15 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010214074415.17693.00000955@ng-da1.aol.com>
Source record: 3798

>From: Vincent Biancomano 103520.355@CompuServe.COM

>Dream on. One thing you can hand the Commission---
>after getting nailed, they know enough to keep quiet,
>simply to avoid getting in deeper. "When in doubt, punt."

In what way would the commission get in trouble for what decisions about
Amateur Radio, and who would bring that trouble down upon them?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3349. Re: This Should Be A Warning

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 12:46:03 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010214074603.13040.00001849@ng-cg1.aol.com>
Source record: 3799

>Subject: Re: This Should Be A Warning
>From: Dwight Stewart stewartx@sccoast.net
>Date: 02/14/01 4:05 AM Eastern Standard Time

> Well, since ham radio is a hobby (and everyone knows that),...(SNIP)

Ham radio in the United States is a SERVICE that is ALSO a hobby. It has specific basic criteria that it must meet in order to fulfil it's "Basis and Purpose".

That a great number of Hams do NOT participate in Emergency Services is a given, but those that DO help carry the day.

There are other aspects of Amateur Radio that meet the B&P splendidly, and it is the combination of all those factors that routinely save out bacon from the spectrum guzzlers.

>the way to change that impression is to become involved in public service activities
>and perform those services in a manner that convinces people to take those
>efforts seriously.

The problem is not here. It's there. But the "it's just a hobby" crowd are teh ones who undermine our foundation with the policy makers. You can build the greatest bridge, but pull the one keystone out, and all you have is a pile of rubble. Doesn't matter how well the rest of it was put together.

73

Steve, K4YZ

3350. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 12:49:34 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010214074934.17693.00000956@ng-da1.aol.com>
Source record: 3800

>From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

>> I have never said that I believed that we need to abandon anything. I
>> couldn't figure out for the life of me why you kept holding on to that no
>> matter how many times I told you that I felt that new technology should be
>> added to what we are doing.

>"Modernize" doming with "Adopt new technologies" and "Luddite" sort of
>added up.

Except that I never used the term "Luddite," Dick. If you unimagine that I called you a "Luddite," does it still add up to you that if I say that Amateur Radio should modernize and that hams should learn more about modern radio communications technologies but that I feel mode diversity is important to preserve that I am telling you that hams need to abandon everything they are doing?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3351. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 12:52:51 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <3A8A7FA3.5CBB29F7@arrl.org>
Source record: 3551

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> Ed: I have never owned equipment useful on any frequency above 440 mhz
> and I traded off my 440 rig because there was no use for it here. It
> would shake me not at all if FCC took most of 440 and everything above
> it.

Now, when I said:
> > Much of the difficulty we experience in the amateur
> > community arises from those who are unwilling to accept that the
> > interests of others are as valid and valuable as their own.

Dick said:
> Nonsense, and you know it.

Yet Dick would be unshaken if the activities of hams who frequent 440
and above were done away with. It would be hard to think of a clearer
example of the destructive attitude I was referring to.

Jon

3352. Re: This Should Be A Warning

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 13:03:39 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010214080339.13040.00001852@ng-cg1.aol.com>
Source record: 3552

>Subject: Re: This Should Be A Warning
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 02/13/01 6:47 PM Eastern Standard Time

> <most of an emotion-heavy posting snipped...>

This was exactly what I expected. And exactly wny Lennie Anderson's true colors come out. This creep has no valid concern for the future of Amatuer Radio in ANY form.

>The professionals were prepared with "snazzy technology" which worked according to plan.

Yes, they did. And they weren't the only ones.

>Where were the emergency-prepared amateurs?

In the hospitals providing internal communications. At the fire departments. At the shelters. Not that YOU would have known anything about them.

>The Northridge Earthquake happened here 7 years ago. When the
>Great K4YZ was confronted with a description of emergency
>preparedness at work (about two years ago) he passed it off
>as "...small states cannot afford expensive emergency equipment"
>and some other minor rationales for His area not being prepared.

No, Lennie...YOU dismiss the idea that everyone had multimillion budgets for the gadgetry that you profess is so prolific in SoCal.

>The question still remains - Where were the radio amateurs here
>and a few years earlier in the Bay Area of middle California who
>have constantly kept the mantra of "radio amateurs 'always come
>through' during emergencies?"

There is NO question. It was in the written press, both Amatuer and popular media, on television (April Moell was interviewed at one hospital as they helped with internal communications) and on the radio (commercial broadcast, not 2M.

>Both Northridge and Loma Prieta earthquakes happend over 7 years ago. How much time is >needed? Or isn't the original post of this thread just some kind of emotional rant by someone >who can only function on the newsgroups and needs the forum for whatever personal >reasons?

"....needs the forum for whatever personal reasons?"......

HAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA

Coming from a CREEP like you, this is HILLARIOUS! This is your ONLY forum!

>Perhaps it is time to recognize that amateur radio is really only a hobby, an enjoyable hobby, >one that _might_ be of service to the community but not some fall-back activity given >lip-service for years but seldom done.

I am sure THAT'S how YOU percieve it, however, again, you dismiss the ONGOING support that Amateur Radio enjoys from COUNTLESS private AND governmental agencies for it's SERVICE!

3353. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 13:07:19 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <3A8A8307.F9EC64CF@arrl.org>
Source record: 3553

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> The training session was conducted by a very competent young
> meteoroligist from the National Weather Service. One of his points was
> that ham radio operators are invaluable in the conduct of this program.
> He noted that the regional NWS HQ where the regional doppler radar is
> located has a ham radio station with at least one operator active each
> time severe storms are anticipated, along with the many trained hams who
> are weather spotters in the field, and that they consider this effort to
> be critical to the success of effective weather warning.

Did he happen to mention that only those hams who passed a "real" exam
-- not the ones given during the last two decades -- are contributing to
the success of the NWS activities? If not, maybe the NWS can't tell the
difference between the "real"
hams and the others. Maybe there is no difference.

Jon

3354. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 13:08:38 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <3A8A8356.BB049F97@arrl.org>
Source record: 3554

Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
> I'd like to hear that myself. I'm still trying to figure out how [Dick]
> arrived at those opinions after reading my comments. His opinions about my
> comments and my actual comments don't seem to relate at all.

Welcome to the club.

Jon

3355. Re: This Should Be A Warning

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 13:12:36 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010214081236.13040.00001853@ng-cg1.aol.com>
Source record: 3555

>Subject: Re: This Should Be A Warning
>From: Jim Kelley jwkelley@uci.edu
>Date: 02/13/01 8:34 PM Eastern Standard Time

>If you'd looked, you would have found articles that answer those questions in QST.
>Things are not at all how you try to portray them.

That's a given. Lennie is lost. A complete idiot.

>If you were at all personally involved in emergency preparedness you would know the extent
>to which police and fire have improved their ability to respond since the Oklahoma City >disaster.

Lennie can't prepare himself top take a good dump, let alone be able to respond to ANY kind of emergency.

How do I know this? Just look at all the crap he spews here. Not a bit of validity to it. Just more "I Hate Ham Radio And This Is How I Will Get Back At Them". Not a shred of truth to it.

>And you would also know the extent to which amateur radio is an integral part of the >response plan in California. But you don't know, and so you just make stupid comments >about it in an attempt to vilify amateur radio.

Tens-of-thousands of dollars are spent in CA to implement an Amateur Radio response in almost all aspects of planning where communications is involved. Of course Lennie ignores this...as he does EVERY fact that dispells his LIES.

And yes...Leonard H Anderson is a liar. Unmitigated. Unrepentant. Unrelenting.

>Who needs you?

Who indeed.

3356. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 13:14:12 UTC
From: Vincent Biancomano <103520.355@CompuServe.COM>
Message-ID: <96e0b4$4gu$1@sshuraac-i-1.production.compuserve.com>
Source record: 3556

>In what way would the commission get in trouble for what
>decisions about Amateur Radio, and who would bring that trouble
>down upon them?

You've missed the point entirely. Either that, or you like shifting the question to your liking. The Commission will do what it wants, say what it wants, which is exactly what it's doing. It doesn't have to address any petitions, owes no allegiance to anyone.

Regards,
Vince, WB2EZG

3357. Re: This Should Be A Warning

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 13:20:12 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010214082012.13040.00001854@ng-cg1.aol.com>
Source record: 3557

>Subject: Re: This Should Be A Warning
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 02/14/01 2:33 AM Eastern Standard Time

>>If you'd looked, you would have found articles that answer those
>>questions in QST.

>I'm not a subscriber to QST. Please tell all for the benefit of those
>who haven't been through one.

Which only FURTHER substantiates my assertion that you have NO valid basis
upon which to make anything even REMOTELY approximating an "informed opinion".

>Sorry, but a rather large press corps and broadcasting covered
>the event. I'm not stating anything that wasn't already reported
>or seen by the administration.

I believe it was KTLA that interviewed April Moell during this event as
they helped hospitals with internal communications and routing of patients.

> Is there more? Please, tell all so that everyone will benefit.

It's been expressed by more than ONE person on more than one occassion.
You always dismiss it as irrelevant. I guess that's what it is when it ruins
your lying rants, Anderson.

>If there is anyone "villifying" something it is Jim Kelley who
>seems to imagine more than what was ever said.

You mean "villifying" as in dispelling even more of your lying? More of
your cowardly ramblings?

>The Los Angeles area was already so planned, drilled, exercised and did its
task
>well. How did amateur radio licensees help in this effort?

No need to repost the hundreds of roles that they played, Lennie. It
happend, CONTRARY to the way YOU assert that it did.

3358. Re: This Should Be A Warning

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 13:47:13 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010214084713.13040.00001860@ng-cg1.aol.com>
Source record: 3559

>Subject: Re: This Should Be A Warning
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)

>Date: 02/14/01 2:33 AM Eastern Standard Time <<<<< Time noted

Had to stay up late so Mrs A the counsellor couldn't read over your shoulder and see what a patheic, pathological liar you are?

>For your benefit, my name is Leonard H. Anderson, not "Mr. Len."
>My mailing address is 10048 Lanark Street, Sun Valley, CA,
>91352...located in the eastern part of the San Fernando Valley
>area of Los Angeles.

Jerry, just call him "Lennie". Or Lennie NoCalls. Or Lennie the Loser. Lennie the Licenseless. As for his address...well...If I were one of his neighbors, I wouldn't want this creep broadcasting that information because it can potentially lower property values. Who want to live next to a creep like this?

>That was not a subject of my response. As a citizen-volunteer
>myself on various occaisions, I've never asked nor demanded
>"credit" or anything else. That was not the subject or intent (not
>even implicit) of my posting.

However YOU try to make some point of how Ham Radio allegedly wasn't a part of the recovery efforts in SoCal earthquakes just becuase there are no banner headlines "HAM RADIO SAVES DAY" in the LA Times.

>That isn't so, but it is convenient for the purpose of achieving message points in a newsgroup.

What "points", Lennie? In the last 12 months alone it's happened in three different areas of the United States, each time Ham Radio was used to supplement both commercial and Public Saftey nets. It happend. It's a fact. And it's contrary to YOUR rants that it doesn't!

> I asked simply "where were they?" They were not in evidence, either observed or on >broadcast radio and television

Oh...I SEE ! ! ! ! Just because they weren't upfront in the cameras, it "didn't happen".

I guess that since there weren't any "human interest" pieces on cooks and bakers during those events, no one got fed?

>The tower causing the total electrical power
>outage was jury-rigged upright within four hours by utility workers
>but the entire area had to come back up through a "black start"

>(power term denoting putting the electric power grid up from a
>total absence of input).

Lennie tries to impress us with his use of power company vernacular.

>You are trying to imply that I said bad things about radio
>amateurs. I did not do so.

Leonard H Anderson of 10048 Lanark Street, Sun Valley CA 91352 is a
LIAR....

Again.....

>I know more than many radio amateurs about communications
>in both regular services as well as REAL emergencies.

Now Lennie exerts his OWN "rank" on Amateur Radio operators. HE knows
more.

NOT!

>Why go into ranting of an India quake when the USA has already had more than
one in the >last seven years?

The point was NOT about emergency preparedness. It was about maintaining
a positive impression on the political arena that may hold sway over our
allocations, and even our existance.

>Just exactly who "slighted volunteers?"

You did. Shall we rehash your "Civil Defense is a joke" slurrs?

>I volunteered to help in searching the Veteran's Hospital collapse in the
Sylmar Earthquake >of 1971. Nobody gave me any praise, coffee, certificate
of appreciation or anything else >beside a handshake and that was enough for
me.

So you got dirty once 30 years ago. Go figure. Some of us have been
doing it FOR 30 years, and continue to do so to this day.

>You are free to call me all the names you want, imagine whatever you wish
(quite a bit), but >physical violence is going to be more difficult to
accomplish than you think.

At this point in time I would thing that a prudent man would stop and ask
WHY he invokes such a response in more than one person. Of course Lennie is
NOT prudent (eg: posting his address) and like others of his ilk, it's ALWAY'S
the other guys fault.

>Has anyone briefed themselves on the California ACS or the OES, do they know
anything >about SHARES?

Well, obviously you HAVEN'T or you'd know that each has a place for
Amateur Radio.

>Or is everyone just reading what is written in ham organization literature and then imagining >what real emergencies are like, how they feel, all the while sitting safe in their ham shacks...?

In as much as you have acknowledged NOT subscribing to one of the three major Amateur Radio publications in the United States, how would YOU know what's in any of that literature?

Nothing like facts to once again shoot a hole in Lennie the Liar's rants.

Putz.

3359. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 13:47:17 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <3A8A8C65.EDD18AA8@arrl.org>
Source record: 3558

Vincent Biancomano wrote:
>
> >In what way would the commission get in trouble for what
> >decisions about Amateur Radio, and who would bring that trouble
> >down upon them?
>
> You've missed the point entirely. Either that, or you like
> shifting the question to your liking. The Commission will do what
> it wants, say what it wants, which is exactly what it's doing. It
> doesn't have to address any petitions, owes no allegiance to
> anyone.

If that's the case, there is no reason for them to engage in "double speak," is there?

Jon

3360. Re: This Should Be A Warning

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 14:01:41 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010214090141.13040.00001863@ng-cg1.aol.com>
Source record: 3560

>Subject: Re: This Should Be A Warning
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 02/14/01 2:33 AM Eastern Standard Time

>You have inferred far too much from my posting. I was replying to
>an emotionally-fired posting concerning the very REAL devestating
>earthquake centered in the nation of India. While the Northridge
>Earthquake was not on the scale of the Indian one, it nonetheless
>killed human beings, injured many, and caused billions of dollars
>in damage. Why go into ranting of an India quake when the USA
>has already had more than one in the last seven years?

The point, Most Ignorant One, was NOT about "emergency preparedness"...It
WAS about the perception of Amateur Radio as JUST a hobby and the consequences
of that perception as it pertains to dealing with politicians.

A point convieniently avoided by The Ranting One in order to make another
"Amateur Radio Ain't **** " post. And as usual, as equally ineffective.

Annoying, but ineffective.

>Sorry, I'm still a professional in radio who got started legally in 24/7 HF
communications in >1953.

How's that, Lennie? You said you let your "lifetime" GROL expire last
October 12th. Now you are COMPLETELY unlicensed.

>My main purpose on getting into this newsgroup was to argue the elimination of
the morse >code test for the amateur radio license test. Since that time a bit
over 3 years ago, I have
>been a target of personal abuse by those who cannot defend the sanctity or
need of the >morse code test for an amateur radio license.

If he were able to tell the truth, jerry, he would tell you how in at
least one case (mine) he spent three months calling me a "jackbooted thug", a
"neo-nazi elitist", etc, etc. Then when it get's turned BACK on him, HE is a
"victim".

What he IS is a LIAR.

Rant on, Lennie rant on...we know you for the liar and malcontent you are,
and your word and your character count for nothing here. YOU have seen to
that.

3361. Re: This Should Be A Warning

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 14:03:50 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010214090350.13040.00001864@ng-cg1.aol.com>
Source record: 3561

>Subject: Re: This Should Be A Warning
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 02/14/01 2:33 AM Eastern Standard Time

>No one needs someone who cannot argue, discuss, or even
>debate a subject without trying to attack the person.

Then that pretty much leaves YOU with nothing to say. That would be like trying to get an Italian to sit on his hands and talk.

3362. Re: This Should Be A Warning

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 14:05:08 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010214090508.13040.00001865@ng-cg1.aol.com>
Source record: 3562

>Subject: Re: This Should Be A Warning
>From: Cecil Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>Date: 02/13/01 11:17 PM Eastern

>Madison county here in East Texas is home all four poisonous U.S. snakes.

Five. =)

3363. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 14:21:01 UTC
From: Vincent Biancomano <103520.355@CompuServe.COM>
Message-ID: <96e48d$jn2$1@sshuraab-i-1.production.compuserve.com>
Source record: 3563

>If that's the case, there is no reason for them to engage in
>"double speak," is there?

There certainly is. That's because they're still cognizant of
their own "image." It's a main goal of institutions, especially
government institutions, to leave the public with the impression
that all decisions are arrived at logically. Unfortunately, same
organizations always manage to blow huge holes in that logic when
they get around to drafting their R&Os.

Regards,
Vince, WB2EZG

3364. Re: Gay History should be taught by schools

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 14:22:36 UTC
From: Kevin Muenzler WB5RUE <wb5rue@stic.net>
Message-ID: <20010214.092236.wb5rue@stic.net>
Source record: 3576
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Now here's a candidate for RF exposure guidlines!

If they want to teach about "gay" history why don't they go all the way back to Sodom and Gamorah?

J. Duffy Beischel" <duffyb01@fuse.net> writes:

>Unless the discussion is how well an HT works stuck up some homosexual's
>ass, I fail to see the relevance in discussing homosexualty, destroying the
>fine reputation of the Boy Scouts, etc., in a ham radio newsgroup.

3365. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 14:27:46 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A8A95E2.AE4630C0@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3566

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> W1RFI wrote:
> >
> > >From: Dave Heil k8mn@ovis.net
> >
> > >Cub Scouts here...age ten. Didn't find out about amateur radio until
> > >age twelve and wasn't licensed until age 14.
> >
> > Now, Dave, you must be mistaken. Some of our self-proclaimed experts here
> > assure us all that no one would learn Morse code except to get their SSB and/or
> > FM priveleges. :-)
>
> I'm sure Dave knows, as do you and I, that there is considerable
> difference in learning to recognize the characters and in acquiring the
> skill level needed to pass a ham radio test.

Not anymore, Dick. Seems to me, anyone who readily recognizes aural
Morse code characters can do so at 5 wpm.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

3366. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 14:31:27 UTC
From: Vincent Biancomano <103520.355@CompuServe.COM>
Message-ID: <96e4rv$6mh$1@sshuraac-i-1.production.compuserve.com>
Source record: 3564

>>If that's the case, there is no reason for them to engage in
>>"double speak," is there?

>There certainly is. That's because they're still cognizant of
>their own "image." It's a main goal of institutions, especially
>government institutions, to leave the public with the impression
>that all decisions are arrived at logically. Unfortunately, same
>organizations always manage to blow huge holes in that logic
>when they get around to drafting their R&Os.

>Regards,
>Vince, WB2EZG

A second reason is that they're also cognizant of the touchy
political nature of the hobby as being "technical," and want to
stay above that fray. But again, the bottom line ALWAYS comes
out because sooner or later, they have to release an R&O.

Regards,
Vince, WB2EZG

3367. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 14:32:52 UTC
From: K0HB@arrl.org
Message-ID: <96e4uk$l22$1@news.netmar.com>
Source record: 3568

In article <3A89FA8D.4781B2A0@erols.com>, <ik7565@erols.com> writes:

>There is no 97.102(c).
>
>73 de N8IK

There is in my copy. It says --

"97.102(c) Everything not specifically prohibited in
these rules is mandatory."

73, Hans, K0HB
--
All reality is aspect dependent.

----- Posted via NewsOne.Net: Free (anonymous) Usenet News via the Web -----
http://newsone.net/ -- Free reading and anonymous posting to 60,000+ groups
NewsOne.Net prohibits users from posting spam. If this or other posts
made through NewsOne.Net violate posting guidelines, email abuse@newsone.net

3368. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 14:34:03 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A8A975B.62BE@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3567

Vincent Biancomano wrote:
> The Commission will do what
> it wants, say what it wants, which is exactly what it's doing. It
> doesn't have to address any petitions, owes no allegiance to
> anyone.

How can they "get nailed" and why do they "have to keep quiet"
(your words) when they can do what they want and say what they want?
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

3369. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 14:36:18 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <3A8A97E2.BEE753C8@arrl.org>
Source record: 3565

Vincent Biancomano wrote:
>
> >If that's the case, there is no reason for them to engage in
> >"double speak," is there?
>
> There certainly is. That's because they're still cognizant of
> their own "image." It's a main goal of institutions, especially
> government institutions, to leave the public with the impression
> that all decisions are arrived at logically. Unfortunately, same
> organizations always manage to blow huge holes in that logic when
> they get around to drafting their R&Os.

But you said they owe no allegiance to anyone. So why would they care
about the public impression?

Jon

3370. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 14:38:30 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A8A9866.3FD5D8D0@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3569

Dick Carroll wrote:
> > The FCC believes it is a license.
>
> Sure they do. One representing a certain level of accomplishment.

You didn't answer my question, Dick. Exactly what part of ham radio does an Extra class licensee graduate from? The Extra class license is nothing more than a minimum requirements entrance exam into the Extra class.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

3371. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 14:40:28 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A8A98DC.5B5D95B2@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3570

Dick Carroll wrote:
> > So then why should you or anyone else decide what *I* want to get out of ham
> > radio?
>
> It's for your own protection, T L, so you won't get ran over when you
> get in the way.

Why would you want to run over a fellow ham, Dick. What is wrong with
live and let live?
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

3372. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 14:47:10 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A8A9A6E.406A9998@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3571

Dick Carroll wrote:
> You can regard that as hobby if you wish. I call it service.

But it is voluntary service, Dick. It is not required. Hams who
don't enjoy public service don't have to do it. Voluntary public
service is usually classified as a hobby even outside of ham radio.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

3373. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 14:52:47 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A8A9BBF.D8DAF6AD@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3572

Dwight Stewart wrote:
> Much of the best aspects of culture has its roots in hobbies (art,
> writings, music, etc).

Yep, "hobbyist" and "amateur" are virtually synonymous.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

3374. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 15:00:32 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A8A9D90.615100FC@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3573

Dick Carroll wrote:
> So there is really nothing extra about today's Extra class licensee.

The result is a ham being judged for his actions rather than for
his license and that's a good thing.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

3375. Re: > Sign "BOYCOTT KENWOOD" after your call!!!! <

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 15:06:14 UTC
From: tlbryant@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <96e6t602q9l@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 3586

In article <3A8A04DF.9F607C1E@ix.netcom.com>, wa2ise@ix.netcom.com says...
>
>Wouldn't that be considered business communications, and
>as such not allowed on the ham bands?
>
>CW not CB wrote:
>
>> Kenwood -- proven anti-coders. It is time to pull their CB plug.
>> SIGN "BOYCOTT KENWOOD" AFTER YOUR CALL.
>

Yes, especially if he's making money from such a botcott by promoting it on the
air.

3376. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 15:06:43 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A8A9F03.4DF20037@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3574

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Just like incorporating a reference then denying that you meant to use
> it?

I have no idea on earth what this means, Dick.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

3377. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 15:09:22 UTC
From: tlbryant@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <96e73212q9l@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 3588

In article <3A8A0514.C369D3AA@ovis.net>, k8mn@ovis.net says...

>Clerks at convenience stores sell cigarettes but not all of them smoke.

I know of one lunchmeat company that makes a lot of ham and pork products, and the owner is Jewish.

3378. Re: Gay History should be taught by schools

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 15:16:22 UTC
From: tlbryant@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <96e7g622q9l@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 3589
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <96dnig$b6m$0@pita.alt.net>, ham22@lambda.org says...
>
>
>On Tue, 13 Feb 2001 22:18:44 -0600, 'Doc <w5lz@oio.net> wrote:
>
>: PS - I can't care less about your sexual preferences. I DO care
>
>Sure you do.
>
>: when you get 'in my face' with them. You keep your preferences
>
>See there? You have a rationalization immediately handy. That is
>immediately followed by the prejudiced, homophobic statement below:
>
>: to your self, and I'll keep how I feel about your 'type' of
>: perversion to my self. Hows that?
>
>Your perversion is your complete dedication to preserving your
>own personal ignorance. You need help.

Which is more important to you, Bruce? Furthering anti-discrimination awareness, or personal liberties of an individual or group of individuals? Be careful how you answer.

3379. Re: Morse Code replacement? Bigtime flame war article!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 15:23:32 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A8AA2F4.E282F3F4@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3577

N2EY wrote:
> Jim who?

Why does every Jim on the newsgroup think every posting about Jim
is about him? :-)
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

3380. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 15:25:23 UTC
From: tlbryant@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <96e81332q9l@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 3599

In article <6o8k8tcsf1hp8c2nk0s4m041bc9vn1m2e3@4ax.com>, nomail@nomail.com says...
>
>tlbryant@my-deja.com (T. L. Bryant) wrote:
>>Never mind. I think I will list some more. I'm sure you'll recognize these
>>names, with some comments on some of them.
>>Paul Allen and Bill Gates (Founders of Microsoft)
>>Frank Lloyd Wright (Architect)
>>Arthur C. Clarke (Author of "2001: A Space Odyssey")
>>Walt Disney (Animator)
>>William Faulkner (Author, Nobel prize winner. He received no higher than a "D"
>>in college English)
>>Peter Jennings (News Anchor)
>>Steve Jobs (Founder of Apple Computer)
>>Stanley Kubrick (Film director. He didn't even pass his admissions tests to
>>college)
>>Louis L'Amour (Author)
>>Chuck Yeager (Aviator)
>>Michael Dell (Founder of Dell Computer)
>>I could list more from the history books, but I think I've made my point.
>
>If your point is that most people will be better off with a library
>card instead of getting a college degree, I think you're missing the
>big picture... :-)

My point is that greatness is not always reached by following the path that everyone says you must follow.

3381. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 15:28:49 UTC
From: tlbryant@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <96e87h42q9l@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 3600

In article <96d9i8$d15$0@208.207.71.136>, dixie@townsqr.com says...
>> What is the motivation for most people to want to obtain an amateur license?
D
>o
>> you think it's because the want to provide and be a part of a service, or do
>> you think it might be a nice hobby to persue? Listen to the conversations on
>> the air. With a few (very few) exceptions, do you really believe most of
these
>> conversations are providing a service?
>
> I spent the evening today at our monthly RACES meeting. With Spring on
>the way, it was also the annual "Storm Spotters Training Session", with
>the house filled with non-ham sheriff's deputies, local police, firemen,
>EMT's and other volunteer storm spotters. (We have lots of foul Spring
>weather in the Midwest including your share of tornados).
> The training session was conducted by a very competent young
>meteoroligist from the National Weather Service. One of his points was
>that ham radio operators are invaluable in the conduct of this program.
>He noted that the regional NWS HQ where the regional doppler radar is
>located has a ham radio station with at least one operator active each
>time severe storms are anticipated, along with the many trained hams who
>are weather spotters in the field, and that they consider this effort to
>be critical to the success of effective weather warning.
> You can regard that as hobby if you wish. I call it service.

...and that fits into the catagory of very few exceptions that I mentioned.

3382. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 15:28:53 UTC
From: Vincent Biancomano <103520.355@CompuServe.COM>
Message-ID: <96e87l$a6g$1@sshuraaa-i-1.production.compuserve.com>
Source record: 3575

>But you said they owe no allegiance to anyone. So why would they
>care about the public impression?

I just told you, Jon. The political environment mandates that FCC doesn't come across as dictatorial, that they work with, not against the infrastructure in making logical decisions. Because when they're viewed as working to counter purposes, it stirs up an underlying issue with Congress as to whether FCC should exist at all.

Regards,
Vince, WB2EZG

3383. Re: This Should Be A Warning

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 15:30:37 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A8AA49D.E5B69E7@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3579

Steve Robeson wrote:
>
> >From: Cecil Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>
> >Madison county here in East Texas is home all four poisonous U.S. snakes.
>
> Five. =)

Cottonmouth, Coral, Copperhead, Rattlesnake, _____?
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

3384. Re: This Should Be A Warning

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 15:33:29 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A8AA549.F2637348@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3582

Dwight Stewart wrote:
> I never knew that snapping turtles grew this large.

Around here, their shells are often two feet long.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

3385. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 15:33:55 UTC
From: tlbryant@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <96e8h352q9l@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 3601

In article <B6AF950B.209B%stewartx@sccoast.net>, stewartx@sccoast.net says...
>
>T. L. Bryant wrote:
>
>> To some, ham radio is a religion, and
>> religious fanatics will never quit
>> perpetuating a myth.
>
>
> You're probably right, but every so often the heretic has to come along
>and shake things up a bit. :-)
>
>
>Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

Too bad for some of them that burning at the stake was outlawed 200 years ago.

3386. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 15:36:25 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <3A8AA5F9.461D0C98@arrl.org>
Source record: 3578

Vincent Biancomano wrote:
>
> >But you said they owe no allegiance to anyone. So why would they
> >care about the public impression?
>
> I just told you, Jon. The political environment mandates that FCC
> doesn't come across as dictatorial, that they work with, not
> against the infrastructure in making logical decisions. Because
> when they're viewed as working to counter purposes, it stirs up
> an underlying issue with Congress as to whether FCC should exist
> at all.

Oh, so they *do* owe an allegiance: to Congress.

Jon

3387. Re: This Should Be A Warning

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 15:37:42 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A8AA646.5E14591F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3584

Steve Robeson wrote:
> Ham radio in the United States is a SERVICE that is ALSO a hobby.

Yep, from Webster's: "service - an administrative division" The "service"
is actually a service being performed *for* the citizens *by* the FCC.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

3388. Re: This Should Be A Warning

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 15:40:01 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <jGxi6.232$HH5.1283924@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 3580

Len Over 21 <lenover21@aol.com> wrote:

> For your benefit, my name is Leonard H. Anderson, not "Mr. Len."

Can I assume from this that you intend to drop your use of dimunutive cute names for some this NG's participants?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3389. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 15:41:19 UTC
From: "Kevin Muenzler, WB5RUE" <wb5rue@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <zGxi6.1551$wb6.159103@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 3581

Who writes the checks?

"Jon Bloom" <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
news:3A8AA5F9.461D0C98@arrl.org...

> Oh, so they *do* owe an allegiance: to Congress.
>
> Jon
>

3390. Re: Gay History should be taught by schools

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 15:41:43 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A8AA737.31339A93@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3585
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Bruce W wrote:
> Sorry, you don't get to decide for everyone just what is the purpose of
> "this" newsgroup

You guys need to take a course in, "How to win friends and influence
people."
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

3391. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 15:43:26 UTC
From: tlbryant@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <96e92u62q9l@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 3602

In article <96d9ne$d15$1@208.207.71.136>, dixie@townsqr.com says...

>> So then why should you or anyone else decide what *I* want to get out of ham
>> radio?
>
> It's for your own protection, T L, so you won't get ran over when you
>get in the way.

It's strange that you chose that analogy. It's usually the people that have been driving for years that are in the way. You know the type; The drive below the minimum speed limit (45 MPH on most limit access freeways), they can't see over the top of the steering wheel, and when you pass them, all you see is the top of a head that has white hair on it.

3392. Re: > Sign "BOYCOTT KENWOOD" after your call!!!! <

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 15:43:55 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A8AA7BB.F1AAFED5@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3590

W1RFI wrote:
>
> >From: Cecil Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>
> >CW not CB wrote:
> >> Kenwood -- proven anti-coders.
>
> >Kenwood rigs won't send CW?
>
> Cecil, you really didn't expect logic from someone who posts and reposts the
> same mantra year after year did you?

It was rhetorical logic, Ed. :-)

> The no-code folks love him; he supports their cause by making the pro-code
> folks appear bad.

Maybe he's a nocoder?
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

3393. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 15:45:24 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <3A8AA814.67E8CE3D@arrl.org>
Source record: 3583

If you mean who authorizes the FCC budget, it's Congress.

"Kevin Muenzler, WB5RUE" wrote:
>
> Who writes the checks?
>
> "Jon Bloom" <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
> news:3A8AA5F9.461D0C98@arrl.org...
>
> > Oh, so they *do* owe an allegiance: to Congress.
> >
> > Jon
> >

3394. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 15:47:14 UTC
From: tlbryant@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <96e9a272q9l@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 3603

In article <B6AF99D0.209C%stewartx@sccoast.net>, stewartx@sccoast.net says...
>
>T. L. Bryant wrote:
>
>> What is the motivation for most people
>> to want to obtain an amateur license?
>> Do you think it's because the want to
>> provide and be a part of a service, or do
>> you think it might be a nice hobby to
>> persue? Listen to the conversations on
>> the air. With a few (very few) exceptions,
>> do you really believe most of these
>> conversations are providing a service?
>
>
> Since your question is a derivative of my comments, let me add my two
>cents worth. I think a lot of people do it for both reasons. When I got
>into ham radio, I did so with visions of contacting people in far off lands
>and was also very interested in the MARS program. Of course, since I went
>to Italy shortly thereafter, contacting people in far off lands was a lot
>easier than I expected. And, because of that extended trip overseas, I
>never really did anything about my interest in MARS (by the time I got back,
>the C.G. Aux had my interest instead).
>
> And you might be amazed at how many of those people conversing on the
>radio are involved with public service. Ninety-five percent of the C.G. Aux
>communications personnel are hams. And good number of hams in this area are
>registered with civil defense. Of course, there is never enough people
>involved in public service, but there is still a respectable number of hams
>involved.
>
>
>Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

That would fit in with the very few exceptions. The score is now as follows:

Hobby: 1500
Service .002

3395. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 15:52:56 UTC
From: "Kevin Muenzler, WB5RUE" <wb5rue@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <sRxi6.1336$sn5.146769@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 3587

They that's where the "allegiance" is. If Congress isn't happy they write
smaller checks.
But I think that the answer to whom they owe their allegiance to is the
president. Aren't they an arm of the executive branch like the EPA?

Kevin, WB5RUE
http://www.qsl.net/wb5rue

"Jon Bloom" <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
news:3A8AA814.67E8CE3D@arrl.org...
> If you mean who authorizes the FCC budget, it's Congress.
>
> "Kevin Muenzler, WB5RUE" wrote:
> >
> > Who writes the checks?
> >
> > "Jon Bloom" <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
> > news:3A8AA5F9.461D0C98@arrl.org...
> >
> > > Oh, so they *do* owe an allegiance: to Congress.
> > >
> > > Jon
> > >

3396. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 15:55:53 UTC
From: tlbryant@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <96e9q982q9l@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 3606

In article <B6AF9FFB.209E%stewartx@sccoast.net>, stewartx@sccoast.net says...

> Gee, I know you're so much smarter than the average human being, WA8ULX,
>but I know I learned something by memorizing those questions and answers.
>And I learned even more by reading the rest of the book that contained those
>questions and answers. And I learned still more by further reading not
>associated with that license exam. And I learned still more from my
>experiences since obtaining that license.
>
> A large part of learning is memorization, WA8ULX. I assume even you had
>to once memorize things as part of your learning process (but maybe you were
>too smart to need that). When we're children, we learn to speak by
>memorizing what others have said. Later, we memorize rules for spelling,
>shapes for writing, dates in history, formulas for math, theories for
>science, and so forth.
>
> After we memorize all those things, we can then go forward to apply those
>memories to the real world (and perhaps if we remember how we applied them,
>we might learn still more).
>
>
>Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

WA8ULX should pay more attention to the rules and regulations part of the exams. He lived and operated from his current QTH for roughly two years before changing his address with the FCC.

3397. Re: This Should Be A Warning

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 15:59:40 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <3A8AAB6C.8D76EA09@arrl.org>
Source record: 3591

Cecil wrote:
>
> Steve Robeson wrote:
> > Ham radio in the United States is a SERVICE that is ALSO a hobby.
>
> Yep, from Webster's: "service - an administrative division" The "service"
> is actually a service being performed *for* the citizens *by* the FCC.

Also from Webster's: "service - the act of copulating with a female
animal"

But neither of those definitions is applicable. The Webster's definition
that *is* applicable is:

service - a facility supplying some public demand <telephone ~><bus ~>

Jon

3398. Re: > Sign "BOYCOTT KENWOOD" after your call!!!! <

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 16:01:11 UTC
From: tlbryant@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <96ea4792q9l@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 3607

In article <96e6t602q9l@enews3.newsguy.com>, tlbryant@my-deja.com says...
>
>In article <3A8A04DF.9F607C1E@ix.netcom.com>, wa2ise@ix.netcom.com says...
>>
>>Wouldn't that be considered business communications, and
>>as such not allowed on the ham bands?
>>
>>CW not CB wrote:
>>
>>> Kenwood -- proven anti-coders. It is time to pull their CB plug.
>>> SIGN "BOYCOTT KENWOOD" AFTER YOUR CALL.
>>
>
>Yes, especially if he's making money from such a botcott by promoting it on
the
>air.
>

Sorry. That should be "boycott"

3399. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 16:03:53 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <3A8AAC69.F55BEAE@arrl.org>
Source record: 3592

"Kevin Muenzler, WB5RUE" wrote:
>
> They that's where the "allegiance" is. If Congress isn't happy they write
> smaller checks.
> But I think that the answer to whom they owe their allegiance to is the
> president. Aren't they an arm of the executive branch like the EPA?

No, although that's a common misconception. See:

http://www.fcc.gov/cib/handbook.html#communications

wherein it says:

"The FCC was established by the Communications Act of 1934 as an
independent United States government agency directly responsible to
Congress."

Jon

> Kevin, WB5RUE
> http://www.qsl.net/wb5rue
>
> "Jon Bloom" <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
> news:3A8AA814.67E8CE3D@arrl.org...
> > If you mean who authorizes the FCC budget, it's Congress.
> >
> > "Kevin Muenzler, WB5RUE" wrote:
> > >
> > > Who writes the checks?
> > >
> > > "Jon Bloom" <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
> > > news:3A8AA5F9.461D0C98@arrl.org...
> > > >
> > > > Oh, so they *do* owe an allegiance: to Congress.
> > > >
> > > > Jon
> > > >

3400. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 16:08:42 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <96eaia$7d0$0@208.207.71.170>
Source record: 3593

W1RFI wrote:
>
> The number of topics that SHOULD be known (not by individual amateurs, Dick --
> by the Service as a whole) is greater than nearly any individual would be
> expected to accomplish. The depth of knowledge that could be known (Dick, this
> is not forcing you to have to learn anything, I promise) is greater than most
> hams would ever learn across the board.

Aw, shucks...no opportunity for a comeback?

IMHO, once hams have met the
> requirements of our licensing structure, they are free to learn, or not learn,
> as they will. Look at the reaction here by one individual just because I said
> that hams should (not must) learn modern radio technology.

Thats what you think you said, but youi forgot that you incoirporated
the output of two FCC officials on the same subject, and that was
included with your opinion. You already know, if you want to recognize
it, my beliefs on hte subjects of what hams should know.

Would you really
> want to see that reaction multiplied by encoding that Hare-brained idea into a
> license structure? I wouldn't.
>
> I think that the best way to accomplish learning is to lay the foundation with
> testing and then rely on the very nature of the Service to take care of the
> rest.

Which makes the validity and quality of the tests even more imppotant.

It does no good to have all these high flown beliefs if the
implementation of testing is inadequately poor. I believe it is. You say
you don't. The knowledge level of the "average ham", or lack of it, is
the proof.

3401. Re: This Should Be A Warning

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 16:12:21 UTC
From: K0HB@arrl.org
Message-ID: <96eap5$8bs$1@news.netmar.com>
Source record: 3595

In article <3A8AA49D.E5B69E7@IEEE.org>, Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
writes:
>Steve Robeson wrote:
>>
>> >From: Cecil Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>>
>> >Madison county here in East Texas is home all four poisonous U.S. snakes.
>>
>> Five. =)
>
>Cottonmouth, Coral, Copperhead, Rattlesnake, W6RCA
>--
>http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

----- Posted via NewsOne.Net: Free (anonymous) Usenet News via the Web -----
http://newsone.net/ -- Free reading and anonymous posting to 60,000+ groups
NewsOne.Net prohibits users from posting spam. If this or other posts
made through NewsOne.Net violate posting guidelines, email abuse@newsone.net

3402. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 16:13:01 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <96eaqd$7d3$0@208.207.71.170>
Source record: 3594

W1RFI wrote:
>
> >From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
>
> >> We administer exams to people who are interested in radio. That's about
> >> the only way I can characterize them as a group. I'd be surprised if
> >> your group couldn't be characterized in the same way.
>
> > Of course they could, but of course that's not the only way they can be
> >characterized.
>
> I have seen some of your characterization, Dick. I see it as an extremist view
> and do not believe that it represents a characterization of most people taking
> tests.
>
> People are not becoming hams because they don't want to learn anything.

That;s your story, and you're sticking to it.
But that's right- a large percentage of them become hams because they
want to talk on the radio, and not much else.

3403. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 16:14:31 UTC
From: kelly@dvol
Message-ID: <3a8a92d3.73942348@news2.dvol.com>
Source record: 3596

On Mon, 12 Feb 2001 14:54:52 -0500, Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote:

>
>I think you meant Carl Stevenson (Freudian slip?).
>
. . . uhhhh . .
>
>But Ed, who was
>accused of favoring the "Agenda," isn't Carl. Nor am I.
>
Din say *you* were.
>
>And if you
>search the NG archives (once Google brings Deja back online with the
>full 1995-and-later archive), you'll find that both Ed and I have
>repeatedly challenged Carl's views on just that point.
>
Ed is in here supporting HF spread spectrum ops.
>
>Dick's mistake,
>yours too, I guess, is to think that just because we want to see new
>technology brought into Amateur Radio that we buy the rest of Carl's
>agenda. We don't.
>
I didn't state that Jon, I said that there is a well-defined
multi-point agenda out there which is spearheaded by Stevenson. We all
know what those points are and those are my squawks.
>
>Nor is Carl's agenda an inevitable consequence of
>adopting new technology. Carl and a few others want to give wideband
>modes carte blanche; I don't think that's necessary in order to make use
>of those technologies,
>
I'm having a very difficult time believing that a mode which scatters
bits and bytes all over some significant HF bandwidth is not gonna
materially degrade the noise level for other users of that bandwidth.
That's my whole and only problem with HF wideband modes.
>
>and I think that existing narrowband modes should
>have some protection from wideband (as they do). That's particularly
>true on HF.
>
Good.
>

>> One of The Agenda's favorite hype points for justifying the abolition
>> of the code tests was and is to permit all the technical geniuses who
>> were gonna flood the bands with new technologies to get on the air
>> without being "hindered" by the code tests.
>
>But did I say that? Did Ed?
>
No, but Squiggy and plenty of others certainly have used that line
which was my point.
>
>
>I agree that most hams aren't chomping at the bit to see SS implemented.
>But do you think most hams are *against* it ever being implemented?
>
First off some huge percentage of all hams have no idea what ss is let
alone it's potential upsides and downsides. I'm quite convinced that
if they did understand ss and there was a proposal on the table to
implement HF ss there would be a major uproar in opposition.
>
Second, I'm not opposed to ss as a mode if used in appropriate chunks
of ham spectrum space. Which does NOT include 7.000-7.300 Mhz . .
>
>Also, do you think that those who are interested in bringing modern
>technologies into ham radio are necessarily anti-CW and thus need to be
>suppressed?
>
Of course not. I'm out here applauding the work being done in the
field of HF narrowband digital modes. This work is gonna lead to
something very big one of these days. Note that for the most part
those contributers are not playing the lame old "catch up with the
commercials" game ss proponents are playing.
>
>I agree that the historical model of amateur adoption of technology
>probably continues to be the best path. I see no reason why FHSS or any
>other technology that confers real benefits should not follow that path.
>I don't think the HF amateur bands are best suited to that particular
>technology, nor that the potential benefits of that technology are
>maximized at HF. But I think there are real potential benefits at VHF
>and UHF, I think those benefits can begin to be realized without unduly
>bothering existing narrowband users,
>
We're 100% agreed here. There's plenty of absolutely dead VHF/UHF ham
spectrum space, use it or lose it, go for it. Or make it happen or
quit babbling about it.
>
>and I'm disappointed that we
>haven't made more progress along those lines.
>
The question is "Why hasn't more progress been made?". I suspect the
answer lies in the realities of Marketing 101. "I already have a 56.6

kbs connection", etc. My own bottom line is that if ss stays above 30 Mhz where it belongs I have no problem with or particular interest in ss.
>
>I don't perceive one iota
>of anti-CW agenda in that.
>
My comments were aimed at Squiggy's agenda which is a rabid anti-cw stance from top to bottom.
>
>Jon
>
w3rv

3404. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 16:15:26 UTC
From: kelly@dvol
Message-ID: <3a8a9031.73267986@news2.dvol.com>
Source record: 3598

On Mon, 12 Feb 2001 13:35:34 -0600, Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
wrote:

>
>I'm sure there were forward looking hams talking up SSB in the 30's,
>Brian. Do you think they were way off base?
>--
Those guys weren't "forward looking", they implemented a
commercialized technology - which is exactly what this ss thrash is
all about.
>
AT&T commercialized tranoceanic ssb years before it first showed up on
the ham bands in 1934. In the case of ssb the mode was and is
compatible with the existing HF modes and existing regulations .
Spread spectrum is neither which is one big difference.
>
>http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca
>
w3rv

3405. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 16:16:49 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <96eb1h$8et$0@208.207.71.170>
Source record: 3597

W1RFI wrote:
>
> >From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
>
> >We all agree that is the objective. But it is clear to me that it
> >frequently is not met. I don't suppose it really matters, but what it
> >has done over time is to cause the validity of the testing system- and
> >many of its licensees to come under serious ridicule-from many other
> >hams. And I don't mean me, either. I frequently hear it on the air.
>
> I don't believe that I have ever been in a QSO where the op on the other end
> told me that he thought the current spate of amateur tests was dumbed down and
> that vast hordes of people were doing no more than memorizing them. What
> percentage of your QSOs contained this content? Did the op on the other end
> bring it up on his own, or did you initiate that discussion. Did his wife call
> him to dinner very soon after? :-)

Ed, I have never considered you a smartass, but I do believe you're
about to get there. Most of my information on the subject has been
gleaned not from my qso's but from listening to that of others.
You really are ignoring reality, and I'm far from the only other ham to
know it.

3406. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 16:39:17 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <96ecblbhd0@208.207.71.170>
Source record: 3604

Jon Bloom wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > Ed: I have never owned equipment useful on any frequency above 440 mhz
> > and I traded off my 440 rig because there was no use for it here. It
> > would shake me not at all if FCC took most of 440 and everything above
> > it.
>
> Now, when I said:
> > > Much of the difficulty we experience in the amateur
> > > community arises from those who are unwilling to accept that the
> > > interests of others are as valid and valuable as their own.
>
> Dick said:
> > Nonsense, and you know it.
>
> Yet Dick would be unshaken if the activities of hams who frequent 440
> and above were done away with. It would be hard to think of a clearer
> example of the destructive attitude I was referring to.

Except that: Dick has seen firsthand, during a thirty year career, how the public need for frequencies outweighs any "hobby" need, more especially when those frequencies go virtually unused. His attitudes on this subject are far from new.

Factually, if there was any activity in the region I would have most likely joined in, even at the microwave frequencies. I just don't like talking to myself. Why do you think I bought a 440 rig in the first place? Once for a while there acutually was a 440 machine in range, but its infrequent use led to its abandonment. I doubt it would shake all that many if much of out UHF/SHF spectrum was taken. I still have a dualband HT, and take it along with I travel. The lack of use on those allocations is good reason for their withdrawal.

So you Great Leaders at Newington carry on. I believe we're finally beginning to see where you really are coming from.
(We know, you're posting here "personally")

3407. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 16:42:51 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <96ecibbul0@208.207.71.170>
Source record: 3605

Jon Bloom wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > The training session was conducted by a very competent young
> > meteoroligist from the National Weather Service. One of his points was
> > that ham radio operators are invaluable in the conduct of this program.
> > He noted that the regional NWS HQ where the regional doppler radar is
> > located has a ham radio station with at least one operator active each
> > time severe storms are anticipated, along with the many trained hams who
> > are weather spotters in the field, and that they consider this effort to
> > be critical to the success of effective weather warning.
>
> Did he happen to mention that only those hams who passed a "real" exam
> -- not the ones given during the last two decades -- are contributing to
> the success of the NWS activities? If not, maybe the NWS can't tell the
> difference between the "real"
> hams and the others. Maybe there is no difference.
>

Hell no, man, a Real Hamï¿½ is one who has a piece of paper in his pocket
and is smart enough to find an AC plug for the "radio" and, maybe, to
plug a PL259 into it. Just don't ask him to solder on the PL259.

3408. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 16:51:45 UTC
From: Vincent Biancomano <103520.355@CompuServe.COM>
Message-ID: <96ed31$e70$1@sshuraaa-i-1.production.compuserve.com>
Source record: 3608

>Oh, so they *do* owe an allegiance: to Congress.

No, they're independent; all they "owe" is to render
respectful decisions, i.e., ones that don't take on
a dictatorial flavor.

> "The FCC was established by the Communications
>Act of 1934 as an independent United States government
>agency directly responsible to Congress."

Your first and second statements are at odds, and implies
confusion. The second statement in itself again is somewhat
at odds: being "independent" and "responsible to" doesn't
actually mesh. Then again, such sentence construction doesn't
surprise me when it comes to politics.

And that's what you're back to: politics. Thus, returning to
our original subject, a Commission-to-Amateur Radio
relationship doesn't exist in a vacuum. FCC has to
interact with the President, the Congress, and legislative
branches. When the Commission is advised to bring a certain
administration policy to completion, it's the Commission's
job to do it seamlessly the way it sees fit. But they won't
arrive at a seamless solution for Joe Ham, because the
Commission's business IS business, and not one whit having
to do with education per se. Thus no surprise when it comes
to their recent R&O. Given the politics, it's simply beyond their
capability to write effectively without being caught in a logic
hole. That's why politics, and politicians, are far worse than
any disease, because they go on forever.

Regards,
Vince, WB2EZG

3409. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 16:52:27 UTC
From: vlfiscus@mcn.net
Message-ID: <t8ldubpio1bc8f@news.supernews.com>
Source record: 3609

How can you say that Ed? We've never had a QSO with each other before.
The ham bands have gotten worse since April 2000. You tell me what's
changed.

KB7ADL

w1rfi@arrl.net (Ed Hare, W1RFI) wrote in
<nRfi6.215$HH5.1232473@news.ntplx.net>:

>I think I will let that be the last word, Vince; you said it better
>than I could with your personal example.
>
>73,
>Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
>
>

3410. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 16:55:04 UTC
From: Vincent Biancomano <103520.355@CompuServe.COM>
Message-ID: <96ed98$e70$2@sshuraaa-i-1.production.compuserve.com>
Source record: 3610

..why do they "have to keep quiet" (your words)

Not my words or context. Read it again.

Regards,
Vince, WB2EZG

3411. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 17:00:50 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <3A8AB9C2.AC45DB20@arrl.org>
Source record: 3611

"Brian Kelly, w3rv" wrote:
>
> On Mon, 12 Feb 2001 14:54:52 -0500, Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote:
> >And if you
> >search the NG archives (once Google brings Deja back online with the
> >full 1995-and-later archive), you'll find that both Ed and I have
> >repeatedly challenged Carl's views on just that point.
> >
> Ed is in here supporting HF spread spectrum ops.

Yes, although Ed has been pretty clear that he wants to ensure that existing users will have protection. Me, I'm from Missouri on this one: I want to see specific proposals and clear analyses of the effect of proposed operations on narrowband users before I support the concept, although I'm not willing to reject the idea of HF SS out-of-hand. So far, no such analyses have been forthcoming. Nor have any specific proposals other than carte blanche.

> >Dick's mistake,
> >yours too, I guess, is to think that just because we want to see new
> >technology brought into Amateur Radio that we buy the rest of Carl's
> >agenda. We don't.
> >
> I didn't state that Jon, I said that there is a well-defined
> multi-point agenda out there which is spearheaded by Stevenson. We all
> know what those points are and those are my squawks.

Mine too. And I'm glad to see that you understand that it's not my, Ed's or ARRL's agenda. Now if you could explain that to Dick, because I've had no luck doing so.

> I'm having a very difficult time believing that a mode which scatters
> bits and bytes all over some significant HF bandwidth is not gonna
> materially degrade the noise level for other users of that bandwidth.
> That's my whole and only problem with HF wideband modes.

I think it may be possible to implement limited FHSS on HF without unduly affecting narrowband users, although I suspect the necessary limitations will reduce the utility of HF SS. Again, I'll await a specific proposal before making any final commitment.

> >I agree that most hams aren't chomping at the bit to see SS implemented.
> >But do you think most hams are *against* it ever being implemented?
> >
> First off some huge percentage of all hams have no idea what ss is let
> alone it's potential upsides and downsides.

Exactly.

> I'm quite convinced that
> if they did understand ss and there was a proposal on the table to
> implement HF ss there would be a major uproar in opposition.

Details, details, the devil's in the details.

> Note that for the most part
> those contributers are not playing the lame old "catch up with the
> commercials" game ss proponents are playing.

The ways in which I would like to see hams using SS have little to do
with what's happening commercially.

> >and I'm disappointed that we
> >haven't made more progress along those lines.
> >
> The question is "Why hasn't more progress been made?". I suspect the
> answer lies in the realities of Marketing 101. "I already have a 56.6
> kbs connection", etc.

I don't think it has even gotten to that stage. There is as yet no
amateur SS implementation against which to compare your 56-k connection.
When there is, I hope it's more than just a means of implementing a
high-speed connection.

Jon

3412. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 17:11:38 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <3A8ABC4A.15644C3F@arrl.org>
Source record: 3612

Vincent Biancomano wrote:
>
> >Oh, so they *do* owe an allegiance: to Congress.
>
> No, they're independent; all they "owe" is to render
> respectful decisions, i.e., ones that don't take on
> a dictatorial flavor.

In other words, decisions that Congress doesn't feel like overturning. Ultimately, Congress has the power, and the FCC knows it.

> > "The FCC was established by the Communications
> >Act of 1934 as an independent United States government
> >agency directly responsible to Congress."
>
> Your first and second statements are at odds, and implies
> confusion. The second statement in itself again is somewhat
> at odds: being "independent" and "responsible to" doesn't
> actually mesh. Then again, such sentence construction doesn't
> surprise me when it comes to politics.

That's only because you fail to put the sentence in context. "Independent" means "independent of the executive branch." With that in mind, the sentence makes perfect sense.

> And that's what you're back to: politics. Thus, returning to
> our original subject, a Commission-to-Amateur Radio
> relationship doesn't exist in a vacuum.

Should it?

> FCC has to
> interact with the President, the Congress, and legislative
> branches. When the Commission is advised to bring a certain
> administration policy to completion, it's the Commission's
> job to do it seamlessly the way it sees fit. But they won't
> arrive at a seamless solution for Joe Ham, because the
> Commission's business IS business, and not one whit having
> to do with education per se.

Their business is the public interest. Clearly, they view promotion of business as part of that public interest, largely because Congress told them to. I'm not always comfortable with the degree to which business interests are promoted by the FCC, but while they are promoting them there is nothing secretive about it.

Jon

3413. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 17:11:57 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010214121157.03673.00002247@nso-ck.aol.com>
Source record: 3613

In article <3A8A0514.C369D3AA@ovis.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net> writes:

>Clerks at convenience stores sell cigarettes but not all of them smoke.
>
>Are you trying to gain a seat on the commission or would you like to be
>a ham?

Clerks at service meat counters in supermarkets sell hams but
they don't have to be one.

Dave, you make truly stupid analogies...sort of like your stated
CW order-wire for RTTY which you say (now) was some kind of
"State Department procedure." :-)

No one has to be accountable to your judgement, certainly not
all the newcomers to US amateur radio who chose non-code-test
licenses over code-tested ones by a large margin. That will
continue if past is prologue...and it does indeed look like that.

didit

3414. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 17:11:57 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010214121157.03673.00002246@nso-ck.aol.com>
Source record: 3614

In article <20010214003327.00445.00001952@nso-bj.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>>Try to understand where US amateur radio is going for the future.
>
>I thought you claimed that I could not predict the future, Len. Are you
>predicting the future?

"...going FOR the future." You have terrible reading comprehension
skills, N2EY.

The future starts immediately after reading this. :-)

>>Denial of the obvious is not a good thing, benefits no one,
>>cannot change official positions.
>
>Then why do you keep denying the obvious errors you have made in your posts?

Why are you denying you've made obvious errors in the thread?
I told you the original conditions. You want to change the
conditions to suit your pro-code agenda and argue with
someone. Put it to rest.

Newcomers to US amateur radio are going more to no-code.

That is not an error. Acceptance is the first step to healing.

didit

3415. Re: This Should Be A Warning

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 17:15:14 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <96eef2$fv9$0@208.207.71.170>
Source record: 3615

Cecil wrote:
>
> Steve Robeson wrote:
> >
> > >From: Cecil Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
> >
> > >Madison county here in East Texas is home all four poisonous U.S. snakes.
> >
> > Five. =)
>
> Cottonmouth, Coral, Copperhead, Rattlesnake, ___Cecil__.
> --
> http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

3416. Re: Morse Code replacement? Bigtime flame war article!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 17:15:31 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <p7fl8tcnah6uivodd6nltec9jgbc0kuebo@4ax.com>
Source record: 3616

From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> More than a year ago I recall him posting that he was going
> for Extra, had a new house with no antenna restrictions, the works.
> None of it has happened.

My Lucent stock dropped another 10% yesterday after their debt rating
was lowered. Put that on top of big losses, alleged financial hanky
panky, and looming layoffs and maybe Carl's got other things to worry
about...

3417. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 17:15:32 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <4rel8tk05u0ovnelj9sed2v4icmes30d9m@4ax.com>
Source record: 3617

w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:
>The FCC knows full well how question pools work.

The FCC probably believes as just as you do. Today's tests are a good as they can be with today's restrictions: No money to properly create and administer FCC monitored tests, and no secrecy due to Bash like Internet web sites.

>They [FCC] apparently don't believe that vast hordes of hams are
>memorizing over a thousand questions

I'm sure the FCC knows exactly what's going on. How could they not know what's going on? These get your Technician license in one day schools should be a clue...

>without learning something in the process.

You do learn "something" by memorizing the tests. But not a reasonable percentage of the tested material...

3418. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 17:15:34 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <gqel8tk69mlfolp2jfg45vd3stjvvjblsp@4ax.com>
Source record: 3618

w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:

>>From: wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX)
>
>>And just how did they learn anything, let alone Basic skills by Memorizing a
>>bunch of Questions which meaN NOTHING to them.
>
>Another "can't do" in operation.

Stating the truth doesn't mean "can't do". Kim and others here have
told you that they used memorization to pass the exam and didn't
understand it. Why won't you admit the obvious... :-)

3419. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 17:15:35 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <6qel8tc2p33cvf3o7eecpga531qnm9ollc@4ax.com>
Source record: 3620

w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:
>People are not becoming hams because they don't want to learn anything.

People are becoming hams because they want to get on the air.
They can do all the learning they want without a license... :-)

3420. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 17:15:36 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <ipel8tg5om7aupj35f4i2iprcc58oret7m@4ax.com>
Source record: 3619

w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:
>It is easier to learn a few simple formulas and apply
>grammar-school math to solve them

Agreed. Learning formulas is easier than memorization...

>than it is to memorize over 1000 questions without understanding.

Disagree, unless you're already an engineer. Electronics questions
that would take months to learn are easier to pass by using
memorization. And you really don't have to memorize a 1000 questions
word for word like a school play. You just have to be able to
recognize the correct answers, a much easier thing to do...

3421. Re: Gay History should be taught by schools

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 17:25:24 UTC
From: Jerry Oxendine <joxendi@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <3A8ABF84.47A1@bellsouth.net>
Source record: 3621
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Homophobia?

I don't believe that I, or anyone else that frequents this newsgroup have "fear" of queers. I, for one, don't happen to believe that homos are discriminated against. Yeah, that's right, NOT discriminated against. You can hold a job, you can do what you like in private, you have freedom of speech--all the rights of any other American. What the "gays" ARE doing is trying to push a filthy, perverted, Godless, and WRONG lifestyle onto the public. But again you have the right to believe what you want, and I have the same right. One of the things that let this particular "cat" out of the bag was the trend in society to blame somebody else for their own actions--relegating responsibility to "others", or some "factor" in their past. The thing here that is missing is personal R-E-S-P-O-N-S-I-B-I-L-I-T-Y. Regardless of one's so-called "orientation", one can CHOOSE how one will act in and towards the public. The simple fact is, normal people, that is, Heterosexual people (the way GOD intended) will NEVER accept sodomy. It is not so much the fact that homos have been around forever, but the fact that they try to ram it down our throats where our gut reaction is similar to coming across a rotted corpse in the woods. It is a NATURAL reaction and will not be changed.

The thing that separates so-called homosexual discrimination, or homo-phobia, as you put it, from racial, female, or age discrimination is that people subject to that kind of discrimination can't CHOOSE their race, or gender, or age. These things are natural, homosexuality is not. Homosexuals may, or may not, "choose" their orientation, BUT they CAN choose whether to engage in sodomy, or whether to try to ram it in the public's face. As to the Boy Scout issue, they are a private organization, and private organizations still have the right to freedom of association--as do individuals. A heterosexual has to wonder WHY it was so important for gays to have access to BSA--especially as it pertains to Scoutmasters. Sorry, we can't help but wonder if it was the temptation of those tender young "sweet" virgin boys that made such access so important. Again, the issue is, not one's orientation, but the attempt to force it upon others. OK, so you're gay. Fine. Just keep it to yourself. People will likely "know" you are gay anyhow. But you are less likely to have trouble if you keep it to yourself. That's ALL. I would not harm a "gay" person just because he is that way--only if he attempts to make a "move" on me might I knock hell out of him.

The Bible says this is wrong. As with everything else, each person can choose to believe this Book or not. But for a quite convincing dis-course against it, read the book of Romans, Chapter 1, starting about

verse 18. After reading that, I cannot help that the "diet" related
to homosexuality IS related--you know, the one that guarantees to make
one slim. Trouble is, you just don't survive it.

Jerry
K4KWH

Bruce W wrote:
>
> On Wed, 14 Feb 2001 07:22:36 -0500, J. Duffy Beischel <duffyb01@fuse.net> wrote:
> : Unless the discussion is how well an HT works stuck up some homosexual's
> : ass, I fail to see the relevance in discussing homosexualty, destroying the
> : fine reputation of the Boy Scouts, etc., in a ham radio newsgroup.
> :
> : Let's discuss the hobby, communication methods, etc. The hobby is the
> : purpose of this newsgroup.
>
> Sorry, you don't get to decide for everyone just what is the purpose of
> "this" newsgroup (Which news group, BTW, since two are involved?)
>
> It has long ago been claimed by members of both news groups that hams
> are political, and therefore it's okay to discuss political issues like
> the last elections which were discussed ad naseum here.
>
> Well, guess what Duffy: Hams also have varying sexual orientations.
>
> Lambda has a ham club, for example, and homosexual issues are important
> to a subset of hams, just like packet radio is important to some subset
> of the larger population of amateurs.
>
> So take your thinly disguised homophobia and peddle it elsewhere.

3422. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 17:36:50 UTC
From: Vincent Biancomano <103520.355@CompuServe.COM>
Message-ID: <96efnighg1@sshuraaa-i-1.production.compuserve.com>
Source record: 3622

>In other words, decisions that Congress doesn't feel like
>overturning. Ultimately, Congress has the power, and the FCC
>knows it.

Not at all. Congress only gets into thinking about getting
involved when they rule that FCC acted improperly on one issue or
another, as they did re: the 220 MHz band.

>> Your first and second statements are at odds, and implies
>> confusion. The second statement in itself again is somewhat
>> at odds: being "independent" and "responsible to" doesn't
>> actually mesh. Then again, such sentence construction doesn't
>> surprise me when it comes to politics.

>That's only because you fail to put the sentence in context.
>"Independent" means "independent of the executive branch." With
>that in mind, the sentence makes perfect sense.

It's not a matter of putting the sentence in context; it's a
matter of the difficulties of expressing the written word in
English, often combined with bureaucratic legalese.

Regards,
Vince, WB2EZG

3423. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 17:37:04 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <1hgl8tou13ljgabatdhb86fids3nlro481@4ax.com>
Source record: 3623

tlbryant@my-deja.com (T. L. Bryant) wrote:
>My point is that greatness is not always reached by following the path that
>everyone says you must follow.

Nobody says that you *have* to go to college. And that's a good thing.
Who would pick up my garbage, clean my streets, and do my landscaping
if everybody were highly educated... :-)

3424. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 17:41:31 UTC
From: Vincent Biancomano <103520.355@CompuServe.COM>
Message-ID: <96eg0bghg2@sshuraaa-i-1.production.compuserve.com>
Source record: 3624

>I'm not always comfortable with the degree to which business
>interests are promoted by the FCC, but while they are promoting
>them there is nothing secretive about it.

Who said they were? I'm on the record not only on the point that
they gave us 20 years notice, but that the decision was based on
economics, as hams just abdicated their position as a technical
learning ground.

"And the FCC cheerfully furnished the required rope."

Regards,
Vince, WB2EZG

3425. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 18:01:46 UTC
From: kelly@dvol
Message-ID: <3a8aaf33.81207436@news2.dvol.com>
Source record: 3625

On Mon, 12 Feb 2001 18:00:19 -0500, "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
wrote:

>Brian Kelly, w3rv <kelly@dvol> wrote:
>
>. . Those changes would be in the direction of making cw
>> operations more difficult. Certainly there's an agenda.
>
>Yes, there is, but the agenda is toward promoting those modes, not in ending
>CW use.
>
We're talking about Squiggy's clear-cut agenda . . .
>
>The fact that CW use would be impacted signficantly (along with
>other narrowband modes) by some of what he proposes is secondary to his
>belief that it is more important that we integrate such modes into amateur
>radio than to preseve the older modes.
>
If he can't integrate new modes into ham radio without negatively
impacting other's use of other modes it simply ain't gonna happen. The
FCC won't let it happen. The only old mode which has completely
disappered is spark and that fell into disuse as a result of the much
more effective cw technology. Ditto (most) HF AM when ssb became the
standard. Neither of those modes posed operational problems for users
of other modes or required rules changes. That's how ham radio works.
His lack of understanding of the fundamentals of what makes ham radio
tick is appalling. Never mind a Tech would "re-invent" HF ham radio by
fiat given the opportunity.
>
>He and I disagree; I believe that our diversity is important. I don't offer
>that adding new modes will not have any impact on other operation, but I
>believe that it is important to do so in a way that balances the old vs the
>new. Where that balance will come out will be determined in part by the
>operation permitted under the present rules, when and if that occurs.
>
Somebody better have really sold wideband modes by demonstration where
they are currently permitted before they will be allowed down the
spectrum where the impacts would become international in scope.
>
> If
>not, maybe those new modes are not so suited for the Amateur Radio Service
>after all.
>
They're suitable up the spectrum, whether they attract a following is

a question. They're entirely unsuitable for use on the HF bands which
is where Dick and I are coming from.
>
>73,
>Ed Hare, W1RFI
>
w3rv

3426. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 18:03:07 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <3A8AC85B.3866413B@arrl.org>
Source record: 3626

Vincent Biancomano wrote:
>
> The Commission will do what
> it wants, say what it wants,

Then:
> I'm on the record not only on the point that
> they gave us 20 years notice, but that the decision was based on
> economics, as hams just abdicated their position as a technical
> learning ground.

So they will do what they want, but 20 years after deciding to eliminate the amateur service they have yet to get it eliminated? That makes no sense at all.

Jon

3427. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 18:17:08 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <3A8ACBA4.96E2D816@arrl.org>
Source record: 3627

"Brian Kelly, w3rv" wrote:
>
> We're talking about Squiggy's clear-cut agenda . . .

Well, we *were* talking about Ed's and my "Agenda" -- at least, Dick was. Do you think Carl's agenda is also ours?

> If he can't integrate new modes into ham radio without negatively
> impacting other's use of other modes it simply ain't gonna happen. The
> FCC won't let it happen.

One hopes.

> The only old mode which has completely
> disappered is spark and that fell into disuse as a result of the much
> more effective cw technology. Ditto (most) HF AM when ssb became the
> standard. Neither of those modes posed operational problems for users
> of other modes or required rules changes.

That's true in the AM case but was not true in the case of spark. There *was* a rule change that made it illegal to use spark. It was necessary because spark was incompatible with CW modes (for reasons similar to our concerns about SS, actually) and because although the vast majority of hams eagerly adopted CW, it would take only a few diehard spark operators to cause real problems.

> They're suitable up the spectrum, whether they attract a following is
> a question. They're entirely unsuitable for use on the HF bands which
> is where Dick and I are coming from.

But do all those who think there may be a place for HF SS have the intention of ridding the world of CW? Unless you agree with that, you and Dick are not coming from the same place at all.

Jon

3428. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 18:17:17 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <MZzi6.233$HH5.1291682@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 3628

Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com> wrote:

> I'm sure the FCC knows exactly what's going on. How could they not
> know what's going on? These get your Technician license in one day
> schools should be a clue...

I could also have probably obtain the license I used to enter ham radio in
one day of studying, too.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3429. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 18:18:44 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <7%zi6.234$HH5.1291673@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 3629

Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

> > People are not becoming hams because they don't want to learn anything.

> That;s your story, and you're sticking to it.
> But that's right- a large percentage of them become hams because they
> want to talk on the radio, and not much else.

And your story is that people are memorizing over a thousand questions so
they won't learn anything.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3430. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 18:21:34 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <O1Ai6.235$HH5.1291984@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 3630

Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

> Ed, I have never considered you a smartass, but I do believe you're
> about to get there. Most of my information on the subject has been
> gleaned not from my qso's but from listening to that of others.
> You really are ignoring reality, and I'm far from the only other ham to
> know it.

I have never overheard a QSO where the topic of discussion was that people are memorizing over a thousand questions without learning anything.

You didn't answer my question about what percentage of your QSOs had that as the subject of the QSO, so perhaps you would be willing to tell us what percentage of the QSOs that you have overheard have had this subject come up during the contact?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3431. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 18:22:03 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A8ACCCB.48A39A1F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3635

Vincent Biancomano wrote:
>
> ..why do they "have to keep quiet" (your words)
>
> Not my words or context. Read it again.

Of course those are your words, Vince. Here's what you said:

> One thing you can hand the Commission---
> after getting nailed, they know enough to keep quiet,
> simply to avoid getting in deeper.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

3432. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 18:24:46 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <P4Ai6.236$HH5.1291991@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 3631

Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

> So you Great Leaders at Newington carry on. I believe we're finally
> beginning to see where you really are coming from.
> (We know, you're posting here "personally")

If you "know" that, Dick, you aren't acting as if you do.

Do you now believe that ARRL makes policy by having Ed Hare and Jon Bloom write posts for rec.radio.amateur.policy?

Do you think I am lying to you when I tell you that I am posting my personal views?

Do you believe that the chief ARRL Lab Rat is the one who makes such ARRL policy?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3433. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 18:26:00 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <X5Ai6.237$HH5.1291984@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 3632

Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

> Hell no, man, a Real Ham® is one who has a piece of paper in his pocket
> and is smart enough to find an AC plug for the "radio" and, maybe, to
> plug a PL259 into it. Just don't ask him to solder on the PL259.

If you had your way, would that "can't do" philosophy be the driving force behind Amateur Radio?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3434. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 18:27:26 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <i7Ai6.238$HH5.1291879@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 3633

Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3A8A9F03.4DF20037@IEEE.org...

> Dick Carroll wrote:

> > Just like incorporating a reference then denying that you meant to use
> > it?

> I have no idea on earth what this means, Dick.

I don't either, Dick. Could you repost the post where someone denied that
they meant to use a reference, whatever that means?

Thanks.

Ed

3435. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 18:29:15 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <%8Ai6.239$HH5.1291841@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 3634

Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

> You err if you believe I deliberately misrepressnted anything you said.

In several cases, Dick, you have mispresented what I have said, then after I clarified what I meant, you later repeated the same misrepresentation. Was that not deliberate?

> I assumed that your use of the references of FCC officials statements
> meant the same thing to you they did to me.

I explained what they meant to me. You explained what they meant to you.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3436. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 18:33:23 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <ScAi6.240$HH5.1292617@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 3636

Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com> wrote:

> >>And just how did they learn anything, let alone Basic skills by
Memorizing a
> >>bunch of Questions which meaN NOTHING to them.

> >Another "can't do" in operation.

> Stating the truth doesn't mean "can't do". Kim and others here have
> told you that they used memorization to pass the exam and didn't
> understand it. Why won't you admit the obvious... :-)

If anyone ever says that a handful of hams memorize without understanding, I will agree that a handful of hams memorized without understanding.

I believe that most hams pass their tests the same way that I did, with a combination of learning, memorizing, lucky guessing and just plain skipping a topic or two, hoping there won't be a lot of questions about it on the test. That seems a lot more obvious to me than the alternative theories based on extremes. I guess we are each seeing the world through our own experiences. Can I offer you some help understanding some of the theory?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3437. Re: Morse Code replacement? Bigtime flame war article!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 18:36:25 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A8AD029.1AC5A911@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3639

Aaron Jones wrote:
> My Lucent stock dropped another 10% yesterday after their debt rating
> was lowered.

My Lucent puts rose. :-)
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

3438. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 18:39:39 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <KiAi6.241$HH5.1292471@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 3637

Vince Fiscus, KB7ADL <vlfiscus@mcn.net> wrote:

> The ham bands have gotten worse since April 2000. You tell me what's
> changed.

I have not heard that the bands have gotten worse, Vince. I have heard a few more "interim" calls than before, and a few more questions from newcomers, but the stepped up enforcment has actually improved the bands. A few months ago, I tuned up to 14.313 and heard a maritime net. There is still a lot of work to do, but the work will be in the area of FCC enforcement, not testing.

IMHO, it is a false hope to expect that the problems facing Amateur Radio will go away if only we could find exactly the right tests for incoming hams.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3439. Re: This Should Be A Warning

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 18:41:18 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A8AD14E.E5228AF6@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3641

Jon Bloom wrote:
>
> Cecil wrote:
> > Yep, from Webster's: "service - an administrative division" The "service"
> > is actually a service being performed *for* the citizens *by* the FCC.

> The Webster's definition that *is* applicable is:
> service - a facility supplying some public demand <telephone ~><bus ~>

I fail to see a substantial difference between "an administrative division"
and "a facility supplying some public demand". The ARS is an administrative
division which supplies some public demand. Like I said, the service is
actually a service being performed for the citizens by the FCC.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

3440. Re: Gay History should be taught by schools

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 18:45:10 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A8AD236.FAA5D3A3@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3642
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Jerry Oxendine wrote:
> The simple fact is, normal people, that is, Heterosexual
> people (the way GOD intended) will NEVER accept sodomy.

On the contrary, Jerry, I'll bet that the majority of the world's
heterosexuals practice sodomy (as defined by the sodomy laws).
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

3441. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 18:45:59 UTC
From: Vincent Biancomano <103520.355@CompuServe.COM>
Message-ID: <96ejp7jrj1@sshuraaa-i-1.production.compuserve.com>
Source record: 3638

>So they will do what they want, but 20 years after deciding to
>eliminate the amateur service they have yet to get it
>eliminated? That makes no sense at all.

After the Commission's R&O, I'm not in agreement we have an
amateur service, Jon. Just a personal radio service.

Regards,
Vince, WB2EZG

3442. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 18:50:40 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A8AD380.B6574335@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3644

Vincent Biancomano wrote:
> After the Commission's R&O, I'm not in agreement we have an
> amateur service, Jon. Just a personal radio service.

Exactly how do you give yourself permission to believe those
delusions, Vince? I fail to see any detectable appreciable
change in the ARS because of the R&O. The Good Old Boys Net
is still in operation.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

3443. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 18:51:15 UTC
From: Vincent Biancomano <103520.355@CompuServe.COM>
Message-ID: <96ek33jrj2@sshuraaa-i-1.production.compuserve.com>
Source record: 3640

You've been demoted to debater 15th class, Cecil.
"Have to keep quiet" does not mean "know enough
to keep quiet." Context changed. Kindly desist
trolling.

Regards,
Vince, WB2EZG

Cecil Moore wrote:
> ..why do they "have to keep quiet" (your words)
>
> Not my words or context. Read it again.

Of course those are your words, Vince. Here's what you said:

> One thing you can hand the Commission---
> after getting nailed, they know enough to keep quiet,
> simply to avoid getting in deeper.

3444. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 18:54:08 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A8AD450.20F2BCC@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3645

Vincent Biancomano wrote:
>
> You've been demoted to debater 15th class, Cecil.
> "Have to keep quiet" does not mean "know enough
> to keep quiet." Context changed. Kindly desist
> trolling.

Of course it means the same thing, Vince. If they "know enough
to keep quiet" then they are having to choose to keep quiet for
some reason.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

3445. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 18:56:16 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A8AD4D0.9A86E3AF@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3646

"Ed Hare, W1RFI" wrote:
> IMHO, it is a false hope to expect that the problems facing Amateur Radio
> will go away if only we could find exactly the right tests for incoming
> hams.

Seems to me, Vince's false hope is that the ARS has already gone away.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

3446. This is TOO funny!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 19:00:31 UTC
From: k8cpa@arrl.net
Message-ID: <3a79af5b.21052584@netnews.att.net>
Source record: 3643
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Hi Folks,

it seems the "Good Ol' Boy Group" AKA... The ARRL world never changes....

The history:

I was interested in becoming a OO, and I figured with my experience with Amateur Radio. I could offer my assistance.

This is the REAL deal... I was reading the paperwork in becoming a OO. and It seems, Me, a Licensed Amateur Radio Operator for 12 years, cannot be an OO for one stupid reason..... I haven't been a ARRL Member for at least 4 YEARS!

MY QUESTION TO THE ARRL BOARD...

WHY THE HECK SHOULD I BE A MEMBER OF A CLUB OR ORGANZATION TO BE A OO?????

I MEAN, WHY SHOULD I GREASE YOU PALMS WITH MY HARD EARNED CASH, JUST TO PROVE I'M ABLE TO BE A OO?????!?!?!?!?

WHEN IN ALL TRUTH, THE DAMN ARRL DOSEN'T GIVE A DAMN ABOUT IT'S MEMBERS, GEORGE RACE PROVED THAT WHEN HE TOLD ME AT A APPEARANCE HE MADE HERE IN DETROIT AND SAID THE FCC WAS GOING TO DO WHAT THEY WANTED, (ABOUT THE LICENSING CHANGES...) NOT MATTER WHAT THE PEOPLE WANTED AND THE ARRL DIDN'T DO ANYTHING ABOUT THIS....

BOTTOM LINE???

THE ARRL IS MORE INTERESTED IN THE BOTTOM LINE: MONEY!!!!

WE DON'T WANT YOUR HELP, UNLESS YOU ARE PAYING US MONEY!

SIGNED,

A SOON TO BE FORMER ARRL MEMBER!

73

-Chuck K8CPA
http://www.qsl.net/k8cpa
k8cpa@arrl.net
k8cpa@qsl.net

3447. Re: This Should Be A Warning

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 19:17:18 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <3A8AD9BE.11065B0C@arrl.org>
Source record: 3647

Cecil wrote:
>
> I fail to see a substantial difference between "an administrative division"
> and "a facility supplying some public demand".

Wow.

Jon

3448. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 19:20:08 UTC
From: tlbryant@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <96elp809gl@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 3653

In article <1hgl8tou13ljgabatdhb86fids3nlro481@4ax.com>, nomail@nomail.com says...
>
>tlbryant@my-deja.com (T. L. Bryant) wrote:
>>My point is that greatness is not always reached by following the path that
>>everyone says you must follow.
>
>Nobody says that you *have* to go to college. And that's a good thing.
>Who would pick up my garbage, clean my streets, and do my landscaping
>if everybody were highly educated... :-)

I'd almost be willing to bet that some of those people you've mentioned have college degrees.

3449. Re: This Should Be A Warning

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 19:22:18 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010214142218.17271.00002118@ng-fi1.aol.com>
Source record: 3648

>Subject: Re: This Should Be A Warning
>From: Cecil Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org
>Date: 02/14/01 10:30 AM Eastern

>Cottonmouth, Coral, Copperhead, Rattlesnake, _Cecilous Grapeswizzoulous_!

3450. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 19:29:00 UTC
From: Vincent Biancomano <103520.355@CompuServe.COM>
Message-ID: <96em9s$3c$1@sshuraab-i-1.production.compuserve.com>
Source record: 3649

>Of course it means the same thing, Vince. If they "know enough
>to keep quiet" then they are having to choose to keep quiet for
>*some reason*.

Keep praying for that break, Cecil.

Regards,
Vince, WB2EZG

3451. Re: This is TOO funny!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 19:29:26 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <3A8ADC96.4476F8C0@arrl.org>
Source record: 3650
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

chuck wrote:
>
> I was interested in becoming a OO, and I figured with my experience
> with Amateur Radio. I could offer my assistance.
>
> This is the REAL deal... I was reading the paperwork in becoming a OO.
> and It seems, Me, a Licensed Amateur Radio Operator for 12 years,
> cannot be an OO for one stupid reason..... I haven't been a ARRL
> Member for at least 4 YEARS!

From http://www.arrl.org/FandES/field/org/oo.html:

2.Must be an ARRL Full Member and have been a licensee of Technician
Class or higher for at least four years.

The four-year requirement applies to being licensed, not to ARRL
membership. You need only be a current ARRL member, which is true for
any ARRL field organization appointment.

> MY QUESTION TO THE ARRL BOARD...

...should probably be addressed to the Board.

> WHY THE HECK SHOULD I BE A MEMBER OF A CLUB OR ORGANZATION TO BE A
> OO?????

Nothing prevents anyone from notifying (politely, one hopes) a ham of a
problem in his or her station operation. You just can't do so under the
auspices of an ARRL appointment unless you are a member and have been
appointed. That doesn't seem unreasonable to me. If you are still
interested, your SM is the place to start.

Jon

3452. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 19:42:01 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A8ADF89.ED22688F@uci.edu>
Source record: 3651

Vincent Biancomano wrote:
>
> >Oh I'm sure they didn't mean to, Vince. It seemed to me they
> >intended that the petitioners should take a hike.
>
> >73, ac6xg
>
> Dream on. One thing you can hand the Commission---
> after getting nailed, they know enough to keep quiet,
> simply to avoid getting in deeper. "When in doubt, punt."

If anyone can be accused of employing imaginative fantasies in these discussions Vince, it is you. The FCC denied the petition, essentially telling the petitioners to take a hike. Doing so does not constitute telling the Amateur Radio Service to take a hike. That allegation is ludicrous.

ac6xg

3453. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 20:09:21 UTC
From: Vincent Biancomano <103520.355@CompuServe.COM>
Message-ID: <96eolh$1o6$1@sshuraab-i-1.production.compuserve.com>
Source record: 3652

>If anyone can be accused of employing imaginative fantasies in
>these discussions Vince, it is you. The FCC denied the
>petition, essentially telling the petitioners to take a hike.
>Doing so does not constitute telling the Amateur Radio Service
>to take a hike. That allegation is ludicrous.

You'd like to believe that Jim, but history is against you.
We've known what's been coming down for 20 years. Many said
"bull" to comments regarding easing of code AND theory
requirements, until FCC pulled the plug a year ago. What's
happening now is fully consistent with what we said was
coming.

Regards,
Vince, WB2EZG

3454. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 20:24:39 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A8AE986.21D4FD9C@uci.edu>
Source record: 3654

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> Jim Kelley wrote:
> >
> > Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> > news:96ag6m$ps1$0@208.207.71.146...
> >
> > > Jim Kelley wrote:
> > >
> > > > My only point (the one I didn't miss) was I wondered whether you'd
> > > > actually taken any of these tests that you seem to be such an authority
> > > > on.
> > >
> > > Not for license creditsince I took the Extra over 30 years ago. I
> > > *have* administered a lot of them, as you probably recall. You have too.
> >
> > I recall, Dick. I also know that you don't have to be able to answer the
> > questions in order to check the test paper. Let me suggest that you
> > actually take a few tests to get a better feel for that of which you speak.
> > A lot of things change in 30 years time.

> You're years too late. I imagine I've probably taken more ham radio
> exams than most anyone around. I mean the question pool variety. Just to
> see what they amounted to and to detect any errors.

Before, you said that you administered them, then you said you read
through the pools, and now in the third round you're claiming to take
the exams more often than anyone around. Well, I don't know what to
believe, but what I do know is that the material on the exams is NOT
trivial, and it takes a goodly amount of study in order to be familiar
enough with it to pass the exams.

> > > Away from centers of technical education and expertise, out where the
> > > 'rubber meets the road' so to speak, and most ham radio aspriants have
> > > no technical background it's different.

> > I assume from your remarks that you had a technical background when you were
> > first licensed. Is that an accurate assumtion? Do you feel that should be
> > a prerequisite to obtaining an amateur radio license?

> No, I was a 14 year old high school freshman.

Okay, so you didn't have a technical background either. Just like the
folks you criticized above. That's hypocritical, Dick.

> > I'm also congnizent of the fact that this knowlege represents only the most
> > rudimentary aspects of amateur radio. But I feel that the balance is best
> > learned in practice - with experience.

> I suppose it was inevitable when they made the Extra class license
> available with no experience requirement and with a test system of given
> questions and answers, that inexperienced Novice type Extras would
> result. So there is really nothing extra about today's Extra class
> licensee.

Please elucidate these differences in greater detail. Give yourself as
an example of the 'good kind of Extra' if you like. And then contrast
that with say, me for example. One of the kind who didn't have to meet
the "experience requirement" you evidently did.

> No question that is probably the most important factor. With it one
> will learn what he needs to know, but he still misses much he should
> have gotten in study of material instead of just the pools. Sure, some
> applicants do study other things. Most have no need to. They can pass
> the tests, one at a time, by studying that element in the pools. You
> don't get much detailed information in the pools.

What kind of detailed information that's missing from the pools, should
be included in the pools? Since you're on top of this, it should be
simple for you to provide.
And, it would go a long way toward proving your point.

> > Since there were no cheet sheets brought into the exam, you can be confident
> > that the applicants had knowlege of the facts queried on the exam.

> You can if you think you should, based on your experiences. I never
> expected to come to the opposite conclusion, and it developed over
> several years time experience as a VE. I saw things that all finally
> summed up to it. All confirmed by the considerably lowered knowledge
> level demonstrated by so many new licensees.

It's an interesting point. Sure wish I could go back in time and see
how incredibly informed young Dick was as a 14 year old amateur radio
operator by comparison to todays new hams. From hearing you tell it,
you must have been a veritable electronics genious by comparison.

> These
> > facts are deemed to be those which are the most relevant to amateur radio
> > knowlege. If you feel the material covered by the question pools is
> > insufficient, then I'm sure everyone would be grateful if you were to offer
> > specific suggestions as to how that material should be supplemented.

> I imagine you're tired of hearing about it. Don't blame you, I'm tired
> of saying it, especially when I get accused of spreading falsehoods.

A more constructive change in tune would be welcome. If you're right,
then you should be able to recommend the specific necessary changes. If
you can't, well, it would seem more likely that you just like to hear
yourself complain about things.

> > Past tense. I think there are now roughly 1000 questions in the pool. Since
> > the question pool is a permanent reality, and since code proficiency is not
> > useful for demonstrating the kind of knowlege we're discussing here, your
> > efforts would be better focussed on ways of addressing your concerns within
> > the constraints of the current system.

> So, no whistleblowers allowed?

That's a non-sequitur.

> I did offer to Ed to use one of his new defective Handbooks to form
> some questions on new material, but he ignored me. I wasn't surprised.

You don't need Ed's permission to do anything, Dick. So that's not a
valid excuse.

> But I don't own a new handbook, though I started to buy one at a hamfest
> a month ago. But every copy each vendor had was shrinkwrapped in
> celophane. Not even a single sample was open for inspection. And I guess
> I'm just stubborn enough that I wouldn't buy one without being able to
> look it over first. There was another ham, an older fella there also
> looking at them. He turned to me and said, "That's like buying a pig in
> a poke", and we both walked away emptyhanded. I bought Moxon's "HF
> Antennas For All Locations" instead. ARRL would do well to send those
> "bent cover" issues out to vendors to use as samples if they have so
> much handling damage they have to shrinkwrap every copy. The new
> handbook must not be a very big seller.

So the reason you can't tell us about all the important technical
knowlege that should be on the exams but currently isn't; which results
in the hams of today not knowing as much as you were required to know
when you were first licensed, is contained in one book. And being that
you encountered some difficulty in purchasing this one book, you either
don't know what the material is, or cannot provide it for some other
reason.

Hmmm, sounds reasonable. Excuses being what they are.

Guess instead you could write 1000 or so of your own questions, based on
your own personal expertise on the subject of course, and then just have
somebody throw out the ones that are already in the pool.

> > Question for you: how did you first learn the resistor color code? Was it;
> > bad boys rape our young girls but violet gives willingly?

> That wasn't the way I first learned it as a ham, but it's how they
> taught it in military electronics school.

So when you first learned it, as a ham, you derived it from first
principles?
Or did you employ a word association method?

73, Jim AC6XG

3455. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 20:37:46 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A8AEC9A.C21AEDB1@uci.edu>
Source record: 3655

W1RFI wrote:
>
> >From: Jim Kelley jwkelley@uci.edu
>
> >We spoke in person at the SW Division Convention in San Diego - outside,
> >after the ARRL talk at the end of the day. I'll buy dinner if the
> >opportunity ever presents itself.
>
> Yes, I do remember that, Jim. As I recall, it was a nice old-hippie to
> old-hippie conversation. :-)

Yep. Now that you mention it, I think I was still wearing whats left of
my hair pretty long back then. :-)

> I may be in San Diego later this year, for an IEEE/ANSI C.63 "RFI" committee
> meeting. I will keep you posted. I will also be at Riverside this year, and
> possibly Pacificon.

I'll look for you at Riverside. Glad you'll be out here for that.

73, Jim AC6XG

> 73,
> Ed Hare, W1RFI

3456. Public Retraction (WAS: This is TOO FUNNY!)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 20:44:22 UTC
From: k8cpa@arrl.net
Message-ID: <3a79c92e.2121454@netnews.att.net>
Source record: 3656
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Okay folks,

here's the deal...

I made a bit of a boo boo and was sort of misinformed.

It turns out, you don't have to be a league member for 4 years, to be an OO. You just have to be a league member and at least a tech class License holder for at least 4 years to be a OO.

So....

I made a mistake. sorry to all offended by my posting... Thanks to Don N8NJE for calling me on the telephone to clear up the misunderstanding.

73

73

-Chuck K8CPA
http://www.qsl.net/k8cpa
k8cpa@arrl.net
k8cpa@qsl.net

3457. Re: Gay History should be taught by schools

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 20:48:53 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A8AEF35.5A493DCD@uci.edu>
Source record: 3657

Bruce W wrote:

> Well, guess what Duffy: Hams also have varying sexual orientations.

And so naturally, you feel that hams should discuss other hams sexual orientations in this public forum.

Sounds like a good way to start a shouting match over something that's everyones personal business, but by all means, have at it.

ac6xg

3458. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 20:58:15 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A8AF167.297A4B92@uci.edu>
Source record: 3658

Len Over 21 wrote:
> Newcomers to US amateur radio are going more to no-code.

Lessee, you gotta pass element 2 before you become a ham.
Or.....ummm
What were the newcomers other choices again, Len?

3459. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 21:05:00 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A8AF2FC.892F83E8@uci.edu>
Source record: 3659

Vincent Biancomano wrote:
>
> >If anyone can be accused of employing imaginative fantasies in
> >these discussions Vince, it is you. The FCC denied the
> >petition, essentially telling the petitioners to take a hike.
> >Doing so does not constitute telling the Amateur Radio Service
> >to take a hike. That allegation is ludicrous.

> You'd like to believe that Jim, but history is against you.

The facts I just stated are exactly according to the record, Vince.
That's the only history that relates to my comment.

> Many said
> "bull" to comments regarding easing of code AND theory
> requirements, until FCC pulled the plug a year ago.

What plug? You have a plug pulled last year, Vince?

> What's
> happening now is fully consistent with what we said was
> coming.

Whatever makes you happy, Vince. But when I turned on the radio this
morning, there it was - still there on 40 meters; amateur radio. You
must be thinking of something else.

ac6xg

3460. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 21:06:12 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A8AF344.964F6F61@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3660

Vincent Biancomano wrote:
> What's
> happening now is fully consistent with what we said was
> coming.

What's happening now? You figuratively said the sky was going
to fall. When is it going to fall?
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

3461. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 21:08:31 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A8AF3CF.6D923256@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3661

Jim Kelley wrote:
> What plug? You have a plug pulled last year, Vince?

The plug that was pulled was the plug on Vince's petition.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

3462. Re: This Should Be A Warning

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 21:15:47 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A8AF583.4026B7C4@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3662

Jon Bloom wrote:
>
> Cecil wrote:
> > I fail to see a substantial difference between "an administrative division"
> > and "a facility supplying some public demand".
>
> Wow.

If the "facility supplying some public demand" is provided by the government,
how is it going to be provided without "an administrative division"? The
different radio services are certainly divided into "adminstrative divisions".
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

3463. Re: I heard a CB'er on 20 meters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 21:15:53 UTC
From: Darren Shields <dshields@midsouth.rr.com>
Message-ID: <3A8B13BF.B3DD31CA@midsouth.rr.com>
Source record: 3666
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner

I'll bet the bastards
an ARRL member too. Probably got in on the League discount membership plan.
All this started me wondering, What make a ham a ham? Is a ham someone
that's working to improve their knowledge of radio theory, electronics and
operating skills?

Well guess what guy? All of us ham have different drives. Some of you might
obsess with code practice and technical details but surprisingly there are those
of us who just enjoy the friendly banter with folks just like us from around the
world. You did recall that part of being a ham was being able to do that right?
Yes, we do good work in times of disaster and we try to be upstanding citizens but
the bottom line is we are human with human needs. Relax my friend and enjoy the
hobby your way and others will enjoy it their way. A little tolerance goes a long
way.

Darren

3464. Re: Gay History should be taught by schools

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 21:31:11 UTC
From: 'Doc <w5lz@oio.net>
Message-ID: <3A8AF91F.60F05D25@oio.net>
Source record: 3665
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Bruce W,
I think I'm missing something here. I'm not the one who
has a problem with my sexual preference, I don't need your
acceptance of my sexual preferences, and I'm certainly not
demanding some mythical 'rights' concerning my sexual
preferences, but ~I'm~ the one who needs 'help'? Why does
that not make sense?
'Doc

3465. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 21:31:30 UTC
From: Vincent Biancomano <103520.355@CompuServe.COM>
Message-ID: <96etfilek1@sshuraac-i-1.production.compuserve.com>
Source record: 3663

>What's happening now? You figuratively said the sky was going
>to fall. When is it going to fall?

Frankly, Cecil, I don't believe you've ever
had a grasp of what I've been saying, nor
have you cared.

Regards,
Vince, WB2EZG

3466. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 21:33:25 UTC
From: Vincent Biancomano <103520.355@CompuServe.COM>
Message-ID: <96etj5lek2@sshuraac-i-1.production.compuserve.com>
Source record: 3664

>The plug that was pulled was the plug on Vince's petition.

Not mine, sorry to say. I would have liked to be a part of
it. Written with no way for the Commission to do anything
but avoid it.

Regards,
Vince, WB2EZG

3467. Re: Gay History should be taught by schools

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 21:35:52 UTC
From: George Jones <lightnin9@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <96eu9bbfe1@dagobah.blueriver.net>
Source record: 3669
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Hit the road faggot. We don't like your type of sodomite perverts running around teaching 13 year olds and younger that homosexuality is good. People are tired of the scum of your ilk trying to recruit young boys into your lifestyle. We can all see what a wicked pervert you really are.

"Bruce W" <ham22@lambda.org> wrote in message news:96dnig$b6m$0@pita.alt.net...
>
> On Tue, 13 Feb 2001 22:18:44 -0600, 'Doc <w5lz@oio.net> wrote:
>
> : PS - I can't care less about your sexual preferences. I DO care
>
> Sure you do.
>
> : when you get 'in my face' with them. You keep your preferences
>
> See there? You have a rationalization immediately handy. That is
> immediately followed by the prejudiced, homophobic statement below:
>
> : to your self, and I'll keep how I feel about your 'type' of
> : perversion to my self. Hows that?
>
> Your perversion is your complete dedication to preserving your
> own personal ignorance. You need help.

3468. Re: Gay History should be taught by schools

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 21:39:07 UTC
From: George Jones <lightnin9@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <96eufdbfg1@dagobah.blueriver.net>
Source record: 3668
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

And the facts are that despite your attempts to normalize your perversions, you are still a sodomite promoting unnatural sexual practices. You never will be able to have kids of your own making but rather promote adoption of children. One has to wonder why the selfish perverts want to adopt children, because perhaps they can recruit more fawning fags into their movement. Keep your perversions to yourself and your filthy friends. Sicko.

"Bruce W" <ham22@lambda.org> wrote in message
news:96dvmc$9k7$0@dosa.alt.net...
>
> On Wed, 14 Feb 2001 07:22:36 -0500, J. Duffy Beischel <duffyb01@fuse.net>
wrote:
> : Unless the discussion is how well an HT works stuck up some homosexual's
> : ass, I fail to see the relevance in discussing homosexualty, destroying
the
> : fine reputation of the Boy Scouts, etc., in a ham radio newsgroup.
> :
> : Let's discuss the hobby, communication methods, etc. The hobby is the
> : purpose of this newsgroup.
>
> Sorry, you don't get to decide for everyone just what is the purpose of
> "this" newsgroup (Which news group, BTW, since two are involved?)
>
> It has long ago been claimed by members of both news groups that hams
> are political, and therefore it's okay to discuss political issues like
> the last elections which were discussed ad naseum here.
>
> Well, guess what Duffy: Hams also have varying sexual orientations.
>
> Lambda has a ham club, for example, and homosexual issues are important
> to a subset of hams, just like packet radio is important to some subset
> of the larger population of amateurs.
>
> So take your thinly disguised homophobia and peddle it elsewhere.

3469. Re: Gay History should be taught by schools

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 21:41:32 UTC
From: George Jones <lightnin9@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <96eujubfj1@dagobah.blueriver.net>
Source record: 3667
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Roger, don't be picking on your friends like that. Thats why you voted Democratic this year isn't it. Because of the influence of your friends like Bruce W. Of course, we all know that you are a Matthew Shepard supporter.

"KC8JBO" <kc8jbo-no-spam@cotse.com> wrote in message news:982156129.3a8a8361df4f6@webmail.cotse.com...
> "J. Duffy Beischel" <duffyb01@fuse.net> wrote in message
> news:t8ku2j3ncfflb4@corp.supernews.com...
> > Unless the discussion is how well an HT works stuck up some homosexual's
> > ass,
>
> Bruce W. does that on a nightly basis.....
>
> > I fail to see the relevance in discussing homosexualty, destroying the
> > fine reputation of the Boy Scouts, etc., in a ham radio newsgroup.
> >
> > Let's discuss the hobby, communication methods, etc. The hobby is the
> > purpose of this newsgroup.
>
> Bruce W *has* no purpose.....I doubt if he is even a ham.
>
>
> >Sperm gargler "Bruce W" <ham22@lambda.org> wrote in message
> > news:96cteg$qo4$0@pita.alt.net...
> > >
> > > A good article to show your local principal:
> > >
> > >
> > > 'Gay History' Advocated for Public Schools
> > >
> > > NewsMax.com Wires
> > > February 12, 2001
> > >
> > > (CNSNews.com) - A leading homosexual rights advocacy group Friday called
> > > on the Boy Scouts of America to "end discrimination" against homosexuals
> > > and called for the teaching of "gay history" in schools.
> > >
> > > At a breakfast briefing in Los Angeles, Bruce W, part of a drag queen team
> from the
> > > Lambda Legal Defense and Education Fund outlined what they consider to

> > > be leading discrimination problems facing homosexuals. ...
> > >
> > > (read the full text at Newsmax.com)
>
> Maybe Bruce W. will end up like Freddie Mercury.....
>
>
> 73's de Roger/KC8JBO
> EM99 / ARRL /
> Yaesu FT-920/ Inverted vee @ 40 Feet
> Yaesu FT-90-R
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>

3470. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 21:59:31 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net>
Message-ID: <3A8AFFC3.2596024D@ovis.net>
Source record: 3670

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3A8A0514.C369D3AA@ovis.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net> writes:
>
> >Clerks at convenience stores sell cigarettes but not all of them smoke.
> >
> >Are you trying to gain a seat on the commission or would you like to be
> >a ham?
>
> Clerks at service meat counters in supermarkets sell hams but
> they don't have to be one.
>
> Dave, you make truly stupid analogies...sort of like your stated
> CW order-wire for RTTY which you say (now) was some kind of
> "State Department procedure." :-)

Well, Leonard H. Anderson, I think the analogy is a good one. It beats tipping scales which really aren't tipping by a mile. My story of the State Dept. CW order wire (which I never ever said I instituted) was not an analogy but a statement of fact in response to your guff about government no longer using CW (but you already knew that).

> No one has to be accountable to your judgement, certainly not
> all the newcomers to US amateur radio who chose non-code-test
> licenses over code-tested ones by a large margin. That will
> continue if past is prologue...and it does indeed look like that.

Everything in the present will be in the past in a second or so.

You've dodged the questions again. The licensing procedure has now been made much easier. Are you waiting for the modernization which you spoke of (apparently the recent modernization did not suit you) in order to deign amateur radio with your presence? Do you actually intend to obtain a license or are you a perpetual procrastinator? Do you have any real interest in amateur radio or does this newsgroup posting fetish of yours represent a means for you to pass the idle hours?

Dave K8MN

3471. Re: Gay History should be taught by schools

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 22:00:22 UTC
From: George Jones <lightnin9@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <96evn9bhj1@dagobah.blueriver.net>
Source record: 3673
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Yes it just shows that Bruce W is supporting and promoting his homosexual lifestyle on others. Perhaps he is also promoting his lifestyle to young men and very impressionable kids. Its not natural to be queer but rather it is a lifestyle choice. There is no gay gene even though the homosexual lobby desperately grasps for legitimacy.
That is why they have to get the politicians on their side so they can give homos special treatment

"George Jones" <lightnin9@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:96eu9bbfe1@dagobah.blueriver.net...
> Hit the road faggot. We don't like your type of sodomite perverts running
> around teaching 13 year olds and younger that homosexuality is good.
People
> are tired of the scum of your ilk trying to recruit young boys into your
> lifestyle. We can all see what a wicked pervert you really are.
>
> "Bruce W" <ham22@lambda.org> wrote in message
> news:96dnig$b6m$0@pita.alt.net...
> >
> > On Tue, 13 Feb 2001 22:18:44 -0600, 'Doc <w5lz@oio.net> wrote:
> >
> > : PS - I can't care less about your sexual preferences. I DO care
> >
> > Sure you do.
> >
> > : when you get 'in my face' with them. You keep your preferences
> >
> > See there? You have a rationalization immediately handy. That is
> > immediately followed by the prejudiced, homophobic statement below:
> >
> > : to your self, and I'll keep how I feel about your 'type' of
> > : perversion to my self. Hows that?
> >
> > Your perversion is your complete dedication to preserving your
> > own personal ignorance. You need help.
>
>

3472. Re: This Should Be A Warning

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 22:07:10 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <3A8B018E.96BB3F7F@arrl.org>
Source record: 3671

Cecil wrote:
>
> Jon Bloom wrote:
> >
> > Cecil wrote:
> > > I fail to see a substantial difference between "an administrative division"
> > > and "a facility supplying some public demand".
> >
> > Wow.
>
> If the "facility supplying some public demand" is provided by the government,

It is not.

> how is it going to be provided without "an administrative division"? The
> different radio services are certainly divided into "adminstrative divisions".

A "bus service" facility consists of the whole of the activities of the
bus line (busses, mechanics, drivers, etc) not just the administration
of it.

The "Amateur Radio Service" facility consists of the whole of the
activities of the amateurs that comprise it, not just the FCC
administration of it.

Jon

3473. Re: This is TOO funny!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 22:29:48 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010214172948.05812.00002359@ng-md1.aol.com>
Source record: 3672

>Subject: This is TOO funny!
>From: k8cpa@arrl.net (chuck)
>Date: 02/14/01 2:00 PM Eastern Standard Time

>WHY THE HECK SHOULD I BE A MEMBER OF A CLUB OR ORGANZATION TO BE A
>OO?????

Because you will be representing the ARRL as an official appointee. Don't
you think the ARRL has the right, as would any other organization, to be sure
that you meet certain criteria before letting you loose with a pad of OO forms?

>Subject: Re: This is TOO funny!
>From: Jon Bloom jbloom@arrl.org
>Date: 02/14/01 2:29 PM Eastern Standard Time
>Message-id: <3A8ADC96.4476F8C0@arrl.org>

>2.Must be an ARRL Full Member and have been a licensee of Technician
>Class or higher for at least four years.

Considering you threw this blaring rant out without investigating the
"REAL deal", (see Jon's post response above) I doubt that you are a viable
candidate to be an OO anyway.

An OO is a person who, technical qualifications notwithstanding, must be
able to demonstrate significant restraint and tact. Your use of the CAPS key
to holler at us and make a fool of yourself is sufficient evidence that you
don't have those traits.

>SIGNED,

>A SOON TO BE FORMER ARRL MEMBER!

You know where to not let the door hit, don't you?

Signed,

A Soon To be Life Member

Steve, K4YZ

3474. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 23:08:17 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <3A8B0FE1.9412EE0B@arrl.org>
Source record: 3674

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> Jon Bloom wrote:
> >
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > >
> > Did he happen to mention that only those hams who passed a "real" exam
> > -- not the ones given during the last two decades -- are contributing to
> > the success of the NWS activities? If not, maybe the NWS can't tell the
> > difference between the "real"
> > hams and the others. Maybe there is no difference.
>
> Hell no, man, a Real Ham® is one who has a piece of paper in his pocket
> and is smart enough to find an AC plug for the "radio" and, maybe, to
> plug a PL259 into it. Just don't ask him to solder on the PL259.

I can see why you dodged the question; a truthful answer would
demonstrate the absurdity of your oft-repeated claim that the current
testing system is destroying ham radio.

Jon

3475. Re: I heard a CB'er on 20 meters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 23:19:52 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <ApEi6.243$HH5.1313135@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 3675
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner

Darren Shields <dshields@midsouth.rr.com> wrote:

< Well guess what guy? All of us ham have different drives. Some of you might obsess with code practice and technical details but surprisingly there are those of us who just enjoy the friendly banter with folks just like us from around the world. You did recall that part of being a ham was being able to do that right? Yes, we do good work in times of disaster and we try to be upstanding citizens but the bottom line is we are human with human needs. Relax my friend and enjoy the hobby your way and others will enjoy it their way. A little tolerance goes a long way. >

Well said, Darren. My personal interests are technical, CW and QRP. That is what makes me a ham today, but who knows, my interests could change tomorrow. What makes the Amateur Radio Service GREAT is that we all are permitted to participate in our own way, but somehow, as a group, we meet the goals of the Service.

Gotta love it!

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3476. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 23:25:02 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <cv4m8tkbnr34ine76c0g29ekbjaf92gqq6@4ax.com>
Source record: 3676

"Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net> wrote:

>Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com> wrote:
>
>> I'm sure the FCC knows exactly what's going on. How could they not
>> know what's going on? These get your Technician license in one day
>> schools should be a clue...
>
>I could also have probably obtain the license I used to enter ham radio in
>one day of studying, too.

Are you saying that your 1963 Novice exam and today's Technician exam
are equivalent in technical material? No? Then memorization must
balance the scale to allow you to pass either in a day...

3477. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 23:25:04 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <bt4m8toojchcaes152pn3mbflfi6ksjlgf@4ax.com>
Source record: 3677

"Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net> wrote:
>If anyone ever says that a handful of hams memorize without understanding, I
>will agree that a handful of hams memorized without understanding.

If you say that *anybody* can pass the test without understanding the
material, how then can you deny that it is a bad test? A good test
would only allow people to pass who understand the material...

>I believe that most hams pass their tests the same way that I did...

But of course most people are not engineers. I believe that most
people do things the easiest way. For a layman the easiest way to go
is to memorize the questions and answers. The only other way to go is
to do months of study...

>That seems a lot more obvious to me than the alternative theories
>based on extremes.

There are no extremes in what I'm saying about the ham tests. It's a
simple truth. They can be passed without knowing the material...

>I guess we are each seeing the world through our own experiences.

Welcome back to the marble game... :-)

3478. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 23:25:06 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <cr4m8tkor5433dolhh489cj76qr4f1eatt@4ax.com>
Source record: 3678

tlbryant@my-deja.com (T. L. Bryant) wrote:

>Aaron wrote:
>>Nobody says that you *have* to go to college. And that's a good thing.
>>Who would pick up my garbage, clean my streets, and do my landscaping
>>if everybody were highly educated... :-)
>
>I'd almost be willing to bet that some of those people you've mentioned have
>college degrees.

They're engineers moonlighting for a few extra bucks... :-)

3479. Re: This is TOO funny!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 23:38:41 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <dHEi6.244$HH5.1314685@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 3679

Steve Robeson <k4yz@aol.com> wrote:

> >A SOON TO BE FORMER ARRL MEMBER!

> You know where to not let the door hit, don't you?

Actually, he does not need to know where to have the door hit him. Speaking as an ARRL HQ employee, I want to point out that his being displeased with something about ARRL does not mean that the ARRL will be better off without him. To the contrary, those who see things about ARRL that should be improved can be among its most valuable members, because those are the people whose ideas can improve the organization. If someone disagrees very strongly with one issue, I can understand why they might choose to leave, but in doing so, ARRL will not slam the door behind them. There are usually a lot more things to consider than one issue, and I usually consider a few of them myself after each ARRL Board meeting.

In this case, Chuck had made the very minor mistake of misreading a requirement. Jon Bloom corrected the info, and I see where Chuck acknowledged that correction in another post. I don't think that any of that is reason to hit him in his backside with a door.

I agree with Jon and you that those who want to operate within the ARRL's Field Organization need to be ARRL members. After all, the League spends the members' money when it funds those activities. People who volunteer as OOs are not doing more of a service for Amateur Radio than they are for the ARRL, a job that is very much appreciated by most members and non-members alike. The administrative support for an individual OO is not apt to be a fortune, but some cases that the OOs become involved in cost quite a bit of your money to resolve. The fact that ARRL has to consider how it will fund the things it sets out to do should be important to us all. I can tell you exactly what the bottom line is, it is $0.00. In the long run, revenue and expenditures are exactly balanced. This year, it is actually a bit less; the League is funding some new initiatives that it believes are important to the long-term health of Amateur Radio and to the long-term goal of continuing to keep dues increases at a level below inflation.

At any rate, Chuck, I am glad that you were able to work things out. For future reference, you can address ARRL policy matters directly with your ARRL Division Director. See http://www.arrl.org/divisions. As an aside, for those who may not know, the bottom line for the ARRL Directors, Vice Directors, President, Vice Presidents and Treasurer are exactly zero every year. Those that set ARRL policy are, by its bylaws, not permitted to have any financial interest in Amateur Radio. That's why I can't run for Director. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3480. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 23:49:14 UTC
From: tlbryant@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <96f5hq02iaf@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 3686

In article <cr4m8tkor5433dolhh489cj76qr4f1eatt@4ax.com>, nomail@nomail.com says...
>
>tlbryant@my-deja.com (T. L. Bryant) wrote:
>
>>Aaron wrote:
>>>Nobody says that you *have* to go to college. And that's a good thing.
>>>Who would pick up my garbage, clean my streets, and do my landscaping
>>>if everybody were highly educated... :-)
>>
>>I'd almost be willing to bet that some of those people you've mentioned have
>>college degrees.
>
>They're engineers moonlighting for a few extra bucks... :-)

That just goes to show how much their chosen field of study pays if they have to moonlight.

3481. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 23:54:55 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <sWEi6.246$HH5.1316177@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 3680

Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

> > The number of topics that SHOULD be known (not by individual amateurs, Dick --
> > by the Service as a whole) is greater than nearly any individual would be
> > expected to accomplish. The depth of knowledge that could be known (Dick, this
> > is not forcing you to have to learn anything, I promise) is greater than most
> > hams would ever learn across the board.

> Aw, shucks...no opportunity for a comeback?

I am not sure what that means. Can you explain? If you are asking if you have an opportunity to respond to my post, the answer is yes. I would like to see your answer.

> IMHO, once hams have met the
> > requirements of our licensing structure, they are free to learn, or not learn,
> > as they will. Look at the reaction here by one individual just because I said
> > that hams should (not must) learn modern radio technology.

> Thats what you think you said, but youi forgot that you incoirporated
> the output of two FCC officials on the same subject, and that was
> included with your opinion.

Yes, I did include the comments of two FCC staffers one one or two occasions when I stated my opinion. I felt that doing so better explained some of the reasons I hold my opinion. I guess I didn't expect that anyone would feel that the words of another would change the meaning of my words.

> You already know, if you want to recognize it, my beliefs on hte subjects
of what hams should know.

I think that you and I are not nearly as far apart on that as you might think. If you are able to let go of your belief that I am adovocating that hams must stop what they are doing in ham radio and must take up new technologies instead, would you agree with my premise that it is important that Amateur Radio, as a whole, continue to learn about modern communications technologies in use in many other radio Services?

> Which makes the validity and quality of the tests even more imppotant.

I agree, Dick; I believe that improvements can and should be made in the tests. I don't believe that the method used to test hams is so flawed, though, that such improvements cannot be made.

> It does no good to have all these high flown beliefs if the
> implementation of testing is inadequately poor. I believe it is. You say
> you don't. The knowledge level of the "average ham", or lack of it, is
> the proof.

I don't see that the knowledge level of today's average ham is significantly different than it was when I was a General in 1963, at least not the knowledge that I used to pass that test. ALL I studied for the General was the ARRL study guide -- 16 pages of operating, rules and technical material. What IS different is the RELATIVE knowledge level of the hams of today wrt the significant changes in technology that have taken place since 1963. And that difference is not due to the fact that we now require hams to study over 1200 questions that take up over 100 pages to print instead of asking them to study 16 pages of material. The difference is there because technology has changed and it may no longer be likely that any one ham will know it all. But I bet the average ham of today knows more about RFI than I knew as a General. He or she knows more about digital electronics than I knew as a General. The number of Web pages on technical topics are legion; the ARRL Technical Information Service pages get tens of thousands of hits. These things don't happen because hams don't want to learn things.

All of the available evidence I have tells me that ham radio is not lacking in technical learning. I see only a handful of people who say they memorized the tests without learning, and, frankly, I think it likely that they learned more than they think they did. When I compare that handful to the people who I see who read web pages and articles and who are generally interested in learning things, I just can't let my opinion about what "vast hordes" of people must be doing be made from that handful.

I think, Dick, that the biggest difference between us is that I still believe in the present, and the future, of ham radio and want to take positive steps to make it happen the way I see it.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3482. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 23:57:59 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <kZEi6.247$HH5.1316020@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 3681

Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote:

> > The Commission will do what
> > it wants, say what it wants,

> > I'm on the record not only on the point that
> > they gave us 20 years notice, but that the decision was based on
> > economics, as hams just abdicated their position as a technical
> > learning ground.

> So they will do what they want, but 20 years after deciding to eliminate
> the amateur service they have yet to get it eliminated? That makes no
> sense at all.

But they are going to, any moment now. The Time of the End In Near! And
the proof is that they said they won't. Anyone knows that. :-), of course.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

>
> Jon

3483. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 23:58:00 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A8B1B88.60101EC9@uci.edu>
Source record: 3682

Dave Heil wrote:
> Are you waiting for the modernization which you spoke
> of (apparently the recent modernization did not suit you) in order to
> deign amateur radio with your presence? Do you actually intend to
> obtain a license or are you a perpetual procrastinator?

He's probably afraid that if he got on the air, nobody would want to talk to him. Actually, he'd probably be a real interesting guy on the air if he'd ever get off his amateur radio defamation binge.

ac6xg

3484. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-14 23:59:36 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <S_Ei6.248$HH5.1316560@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 3683

Vincent Biancomano <103520.355@CompuServe.COM> wrote:

> >So they will do what they want, but 20 years after deciding to
> >eliminate the amateur service they have yet to get it
> >eliminated? That makes no sense at all.

> After the Commission's R&O, I'm not in agreement we have an
> amateur service, Jon. Just a personal radio service.

I am still able to do 100% of what I was able to do before the restructuring Report and Order. I do exactly that. What did the Commission take away from you that makes you feel like it is no longer the Amateur Radio Service?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3485. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-15 00:03:28 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <t2Fi6.249$HH5.1316773@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 3684

Vincent Biancomano <103520.355@CompuServe.COM> wrote:

> >So they will do what they want, but 20 years after deciding to
> >eliminate the amateur service they have yet to get it
> >eliminated? That makes no sense at all.

> After the Commission's R&O, I'm not in agreement we have an
> amateur service, Jon. Just a personal radio service.

Are you now operating on Amateur frequencies using all of the provisions and rules of the personal radio services or are you using amateur power levels, amateur modes, amateur frequencies, amateur rules and amateur call signs?

If the former, I expect that you will, sooner or later, get to find out just what the FCC intends to accomplish within the Amateur Radio Service.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3486. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-15 00:24:18 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <1mFi6.250$HH5.1318144@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 3685

Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com> wrote:

> >I believe that most hams pass their tests the same way that I did...

> But of course most people are not engineers.

I was 14 years old at the time.

> I believe that most people do things the easiest way.

I did. I studied the ARRL 16-page General study guide for about a month part time before I took my General.

> For a layman the easiest way to go is to memorize the questions and answers. The only other way to go is
> to do months of study...

It would take me more than months to memorize all of those questions without understanding. The most time consuming part would be avoiding the understanding.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3487. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-15 02:00:28 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010214210028.16594.00007025@nso-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 3687

In article <3A86E265.E414650A@IEEE.org>, Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Nocoders have no code experience so their opinions about Morse code don't
>matter.

True.

>Non-Extras are not fast enough at Morse code to have a valid opinion.

At least not when it comes to code testing at speeds beyond the
minimum (5 WPM) level.

>Post April 15 Extras didn't prove their Morse code skill so they also have no
>right to post their personal opinions.

They have a right to post their opinions, but those opinions do not
carry any weight among those of us who met the Pre-April 15
requirements.

>Members of NCI shouldn't post their
>personal opinions. ARRL employees shouldn't post their personal opinions. See
>the pattern? Anyone who disagrees with Larry on the subject of Morse code
>testing should not post their personal opinions. :-)

Cecil, I don't recall ever stating that anyone who may disagree with
me should not post their opinions. Show me where I've done so, and
I will offer an immediate retraction and apology. If you can't, then keep
your damn opinions about me to yourself!

73 de Larry, K3LT

3488. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-15 02:00:29 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010214210029.16594.00007027@nso-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 3688

In article <3A874502.810B6040@IEEE.org>, Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>"T. L. Bryant" wrote:
>> So how many more contradictions can we expect to see from you?
>
>Another one today. Larry previously said that I was annoying.
>Today he said no way could I do anything that would annoy him.

Cecil:

Let's just say that I recognize people who are trying to be annoying,
but my own tolerance for annoyance is unusually high. Therefore,
I can recognize you as being annoying, without actually feeling the
annoyance and experiencing the physical and emotional symptoms
of the annoyance. So, go ahead, and be just as annoying as you
care to be. Don't change a hair for me, not if you care for me!

73 de Larry, K3LT

3489. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-15 02:00:29 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010214210029.16594.00007026@nso-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 3689

In article <20010211195834.17629.00000404@ng-da1.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>
>>From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
>
>>I would think that a 23db power advantage to the other mode might do
>>it. (5 watts vs 1500).
>
>I agree, Dick. Larry was saying that if a CW signal goes up against an SSB
>signal, the CW signal will lose. I believe he is incorrect.

Ed:

Keep in mind, I was assuming a QRP-level CW signal in the presence of QRO-level SSB signals. When power levels are equalized, then CW signals will predominate. However, my experience has been that multiple high-power SSB signals will tend to overwhelm weak CW signals under most circumstances.

>The 23 dB might be a bit optimistic, though, unless the CW receiver really is
>using minimum necessary bandwidth. Although in wider bandwidths, some CW ops
>have a decent "mental" filter that can gain back some of what a measurement
>would say isn't there.

My mental CW filter is responsible for my completing many CW QSO's under very adverse conditions, but those conditions involved atmospheric noise and other QRN, not the deliberate QRM of multiple, closely-spaced SSB signals.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3490. Re: Who is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-15 02:00:30 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010214210030.16594.00007028@nso-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 3691

In article <ptdg8tg7rh5i1jjhbv35ptadujp05sur4l@4ax.com>, Aaron Jones
<nomail@nomail.com> writes:

>
>Well let's spot check the content of your last ten posts:
>
>1- Posting Ed's views on code testing
>2- Calling Ed a biased hypocrite
>3-Newsgroup hams are bad hams
>4-Dick is an extremist
>5-Commenting on Dick's "diatribe"
>6-Criticism of Brian's post to Ed
>7-"Lazy ass?" Hmmm, should we replace QLF with QLC(heek)?"
>8-"They had doors way back then? :-)"
>9-Dick is biased on what hams think
>10-A list making fun of Larry's views
>
>>Some I find worth coming back for, some not.
>
>Your posts don't seem any more high brow than the
> rest of us Jon... :-)

Aaron:

I think you just wasted your time. I don't think anyone expects
particularly "high brow" posts from ARRL HQ employees! At
least, that's not been my experience! Admittedly, Ed does better
than most at holding his fingertips, but Jon's posts are right in
line with what I've come to expect. Too bad we can't get K1ZZ
to post here -- it would be fun to be riduculed in public by
the Executive V.P. of the ARRL -- just like I was in private
correspondence from him! Of course, the worst abuse I took
was from a former ARRL HQ employee who is now a silent
key, so I don't think it would be right to give the details in the
NG. However, if anyone's interested, E-mail me and I'll fill you
in -- naming names and all!

73 de Larry, K3LT

3491. Re: Engineers, Technicians, and Appliance Operators

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-15 02:00:31 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010214210031.16594.00007029@nso-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 3690

In article <3A882409.21A61D16@arrl.org>, Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org> writes:

>"Ed Hare, W1RFI" wrote:
>>
>> (gotta' have that capitalization, Jon)
>
>So you really ARE a biased hypocrite. You attack Len for using
>capitalization and then attack others for not using it. It's perfectly
>clear that you are anti-Capitals. (I know you sometimes use capitals in
>your postings but that is OBVIOUSLY just Politically Correct
>wishy-washiness and doesn't reflect your true anti-Capitals Agenda.) I'm
>tired of you folks in Newington trying to tell the rest of us how to use
>our SHIFT keys.
>
>Jon

I hereby propose a capitalization test be given to any individual
wishing to have the privilege of posting to this newsgripe. I also
believe that in order to incentivize proper capitalization, that these
tests be given in at least three levels of difficulty, with the
incentive being a higher limit of messages that can be posted
per day for each successive level. I believe that capitalization
is a uniquely practical, effective, efficient, and universal method
of inferring the relative importance of a word, in addition to the
required use with proper nouns, words that begin a sentence,
and acronyms. Obviously, anyone who doesn't use capitals
correctly is a knuckle-dragging, slack-jawed, drooling, toothless
client of the welfare state.

BTW -- anyone who doesn't believe in the use of capitalization
can leave now...but don't let the door hit you in the ass on the
way out!

73 de Larry, K3LT

3492. Re: I heard a CB'er on 20 meters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-15 02:03:15 UTC
From: * <*@*.*>
Message-ID: <DNGi6.978$v01.341053@dfiatx1-snr1.gtei.net>
Source record: 3692
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner

I don't think HAM requires us to be upstanding citizens, just that we are
available for emergencies
and might possibly add a little international good will.
I suggest all upstanding citizens get in the slow lane and get out of my way
or I'll run you into a ditch
on the freeway. :)

"Darren Shields" <dshields@midsouth.rr.com> wrote in message
news:3A8B13BF.B3DD31CA@midsouth.rr.com...
> I'll bet the bastards
> an ARRL member too. Probably got in on the League discount membership
plan.
> All this started me wondering, What make a ham a ham? Is a ham someone
> that's working to improve their knowledge of radio theory, electronics and
> operating skills?
>
> Well guess what guy? All of us ham have different drives. Some of you
might
> obsess with code practice and technical details but surprisingly there are
those
> of us who just enjoy the friendly banter with folks just like us from
around the
> world. You did recall that part of being a ham was being able to do that
right?
> Yes, we do good work in times of disaster and we try to be upstanding
citizens but
> the bottom line is we are human with human needs. Relax my friend and
enjoy the
> hobby your way and others will enjoy it their way. A little tolerance
goes a long
> way.
>
> Darren
>

3493. Re: This is TOO funny!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-15 02:08:40 UTC
From: Gary McAdams <g.m.mcadams@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <ISGi6.7462$Pg3.595750@bgtnsc06-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 3693

Ed,

Possibly you might want to do a quick
Deja-news search on Chuck. Especially
his numerous postings to rec.radio.cb.

That might help explain the reaction that
some had to Chuck's post.

73

Gary WG7X

Ed Hare, W1RFI <w1rfi@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:dHEi6.244$HH5.1314685@news.ntplx.net...
>
> In this case, Chuck had made the very minor mistake of
misreading a
> requirement. Jon Bloom corrected the info, and I see where
Chuck
> acknowledged that correction in another post. I don't think
that any of
> that is reason to hit him in his backside with a door.
>
>

3494. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-15 02:20:36 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <3A8B3CF4.DDA9A29A@arrl.org>
Source record: 3694

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> In article <3A86E265.E414650A@IEEE.org>, Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>
> >Post April 15 Extras didn't prove their Morse code skill so they also have no
> >right to post their personal opinions.
>
> They have a right to post their opinions, but those opinions do not
> carry any weight among those of us who met the Pre-April 15
> requirements.

Some of us who met the pre-April 15 requirements disagree.

Jon

3495. Re: Code Requirement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-15 02:31:28 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010214213128.16594.00007032@nso-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 3696

In article <20010213063302.02903.00000761@ng-fy1.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>
>>Because the wood stove is a practical, effective, efficient, and universal
>>backup to your oil-fired furnace! However, only those who have learned
>>and gained useful proficiency at splitting logs can effectively employ
>>a wood stove.
>
>Not true, Larry; there are people who will sell wood cut, split and ready to
>go. Those who want to split wood will do so.

Ahhh, I see. Welfare for the slackers who couldn't be bothered to pick up a chainsaw and an axe. I should have known you'd come rushing to their defense, Ed!

73 de Larry, K3LT

3496. Re: Code Requirement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-15 02:31:28 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010214213128.16594.00007031@nso-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 3697

In article <20010213184722.02997.00002304@nso-mg.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) writes:

>
>
>PS: When I was young we whittled our own ICs out of wood!
>

I carved mine out of a bar of Kirk's Hardwater Castile. We called them "soap chips."

73 de Larry, K3LT

3497. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-15 02:31:29 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010214213129.16594.00007033@nso-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 3695

In article <20010213062751.02903.00000758@ng-fy1.aol.com>, w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) writes:

>
>>When I state that it takes time, effort, and motivation
>>to learn the Morse code, all I'm doing is simply stating the truth.
>
>Part of the truth, Larry. I don't think I have ever seen you tell people how
>much fun it is to use. Your technique as an ambassador of good will for the
>use of the mode leaves a lot to be desired.

Ed:

Of course it's fun -- but the fun part doesn't commence until the determination to put forth the effort to master the skill of Morse code is made, along with a committment to stick with it. The problem is, most people don't get past their fear of failure or their antipathy once they see for themselves that it *does* require a dedicated effort on their part.

>> they can simply set
>>it aside, since they'll already have their HF phone privileges handed
>>over on a silver platter at the meager 5 WPM level.
>
>Are these words intended to encourage people to try their code priveleges, or
>to discourage them to prove that you are right after all?

It isn't intended to encourage or discourage anyone, Ed. I'm simply stating the truth about the reality of learning to use the code. What part of this reality is untrue?

>>Restructuring will,
>>indeed, cause a decline in the total numbers of CW operators -- and
>>no amount of "positive thinking" will blow enough sunshine up the
>>asses of ham radio operators to make the numbers of CW operators
>>hold steady -- it won't even slow down the rate of decline!
>
>Our ambassador of "can't do."

The "can't do" part is largely because a great many people who failed at meeting the previous code requirements simply decided that they "wouldn't do" since it was easier to whine and complain until the requirement was finally reduced/eliminated. Again, I ask -- where have I lied?

73 de Larry, K3LT

3498. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-15 02:47:11 UTC
From: tlbryant@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <96ffvf02ll8@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 3699

In article <20010214210029.16594.00007027@nso-cg.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam says...
>
>In article <3A874502.810B6040@IEEE.org>, Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>
>>
>>"T. L. Bryant" wrote:
>>> So how many more contradictions can we expect to see from you?
>>
>>Another one today. Larry previously said that I was annoying.
>>Today he said no way could I do anything that would annoy him.
>
>Cecil:
>
>Let's just say that I recognize people who are trying to be annoying,
>but my own tolerance for annoyance is unusually high. Therefore,
>I can recognize you as being annoying, without actually feeling the
>annoyance and experiencing the physical and emotional symptoms
>of the annoyance. So, go ahead, and be just as annoying as you
>care to be. Don't change a hair for me, not if you care for me!
>
>73 de Larry, K3LT

Does that mean we won't hear anything from you anymore on this subject?
Probably not.

3499. Re: Gay History should be taught by schools

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-15 03:20:56 UTC
From: "J. Duffy Beischel" <duffyb01@fuse.net>
Message-ID: <t8mimvr5rlb12@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 3698
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Typical homosexual/Lambda response. Anybody that says anything about homosexuals that does not support there choice in life is automatically a "homophobe". Does that then make every homosexual a "heterophobe"? Homosexuals try to take every opportunity to shove their choice on everyone else with the purpose of trying to get everyone to accept the choice as natural. It's not. And the discussion of it does not belong here. You're right Bruce, this is not my choice, but it is the decision of the folks that started the newsgroup and I can find nothing that says this newsgroup is for the discussion of anything but amateur radio, not people's political beliefs or their sexual preferences or choices.

Furthermore, you criticize me for making proclamations, then you make a proclamation "it has been long claimed by members of both news groups that hams are political....yada, yada, yada. Well it has been long claimed by these same hams that discussions on homosexuality and other sexual choices do not belong here.

Taking your absurd position, any topic should be discussed in the ham newsgroup. Because hams have pets, we should discuss pets. Because hams drives cars, we should discuss cars here. Keep the homosexual discussions in homosexual newsgroups where it belongs. Keep the radio discussions here.

"Bruce W" <ham22@lambda.org> wrote in message
news:96dvmc$9k7$0@dosa.alt.net...
>
> On Wed, 14 Feb 2001 07:22:36 -0500, J. Duffy Beischel <duffyb01@fuse.net>
wrote:
> : Unless the discussion is how well an HT works stuck up some homosexual's
> : ass, I fail to see the relevance in discussing homosexualty, destroying
the
> : fine reputation of the Boy Scouts, etc., in a ham radio newsgroup.
> :
> : Let's discuss the hobby, communication methods, etc. The hobby is the
> : purpose of this newsgroup.
>
> Sorry, you don't get to decide for everyone just what is the purpose of
> "this" newsgroup (Which news group, BTW, since two are involved?)
>
> It has long ago been claimed by members of both news groups that hams
> are political, and therefore it's okay to discuss political issues like
> the last elections which were discussed ad naseum here.
>
> Well, guess what Duffy: Hams also have varying sexual orientations
(choices, you mean).

>
> Lambda has a ham club, for example, and homosexual issues are important
> to a subset of hams, just like packet radio is important to some subset
> of the larger population of amateurs.
>
> So take your thinly disguised homophobia and peddle it elsewhere.

3500. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-15 04:00:53 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <B6B0BEA5.2253%stewartx@sccoast.net>
Source record: 3700

Brian Kelly, w3rv wrote:

> The U.S. Unhindered have been on the
> air for a decade. Where are their
> "altenative technologies"?? The
> only "alternative technologies
> (modes)" I've seen in the past
> decade are the plethora of new and
> rapidly emerging HF digital modes
> cobbled together by a multinational
> collection of 12/13/20 wpm code-
> tested "dinosaurs".

Stop thinking in such limited terms. These contributions, that you seem to find so necessary, does not have to be limited to just ham radio. My interest in ham radio came from my interests outside of ham radio, and much of my experience gained through ham radio is used outside this service.

However, having said that, I will go back to what I said once before - no person has ever been judged worthy, or not worthy, of being a ham based on his or her ability to produce "alternative technologies." If that is the primary requirement, than I dare say that 99 percent of current hams would have to turn in their license (including me and most likely you).

Furthermore, you're not trying to rush things, are you? It took ham radio almost 90 years to produce the "alternative technologies" it has been credited with so far. The no-code hams have had less than 10 years, and you're already ready to throw them out because they haven't produced to the level you desire.

> You run EME with packet or what?

The last time I messed with EME (at a friend's station in Italy), it was limited to SSB voice. I don't have EME capabilities at the moment (no place to put the antennas), but when I do it will be SSB voice.

> Tune 14.000-14.050 Mhz this coming
> Sat/Sun mornings, stand back, then
> and get back to me about the "death"
> of HF and CW. Heh-heh . . !

I have never said a thing about the "death" of HF or CW. Emphasis on one part of the radio spectrum does not mean the "death" of another.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net

3501. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-15 04:09:46 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <B6B0C0B9.2254%stewartx@sccoast.net>
Source record: 3701

T. L. Bryant wrote:

> stewartx@sccoast.net says...
>>
>> T. L. Bryant wrote:
>>
>>> To some, ham radio is a religion, and
>>> religious fanatics will never quit
>>> perpetuating a myth.
>>
>> You're probably right, but every so often
>> the heretic has to come along
>> and shake things up a bit. :-)
>>
> Too bad for some of them that burning at
> the stake was outlawed 200 years ago.

Ah, its never too late to bring back those wonderful traditions. ;-)

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net

3502. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-15 04:15:48 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <B6B0C224.2255%stewartx@sccoast.net>
Source record: 3702

T. L. Bryant wrote:

> WA8ULX should pay more attention to
> the rules and regulations part of the
> exams. He lived and operated from his
> current QTH for roughly two years before
> changing his address with the FCC.

I can't criticise him too much for that - I've done it myself (though not for two years). When you move 7 times in a three year period, it gets to be a real pain to constantly file change of address data with the FCC. After that, I've become almost an "expert" on the FCC's online system.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net

3503. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-15 04:20:55 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <96flf7$710$0@208.206.142.91>
Source record: 3703

Aaron Jones wrote:
>
> w1rfi@aol.com (W1RFI) wrote:
> >It is easier to learn a few simple formulas and apply
> >grammar-school math to solve them
>
> Agreed. Learning formulas is easier than memorization...
>
> >than it is to memorize over 1000 questions without understanding.
>
> Disagree, unless you're already an engineer. Electronics questions
> that would take months to learn are easier to pass by using
> memorization. And you really don't have to memorize a 1000 questions
> word for word like a school play. You just have to be able to
> recognize the correct answers, a much easier thing to do...

Not only that, the tests are taken one at a time. That means a third of the pool is studied for each. BIG difference

I guess I'm gonna have to go get a question and show in detail how they go about doing the word association bit, explain it in lurid detail for all the world to see, right here on rrap, before he gets the point. I didn't want to do that, but.....
It was years into my VE career before I realized how they do it. I say again, the less one knows about the subject matter, the easier it is to pair the question and its answer, since some knowledge of details will only confuse the memorization of the question and it's answer. When one reads the question with ONLY the correct answer, as pairs, (you discard all distractors before you ever begin) several times over, your memory naturally pairs them so that when you take the test, the answer you have repeatedly read in conjunction with that question literally leaps out at you. It is the only one of the choices given that you've seen before and it is easily recognized. The *less* you know about the subject, the easier it is!

3504. Re: This Should Be A Warning

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-15 04:35:09 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <B6B0C6AC.2256%stewartx@sccoast.net>
Source record: 3704

Steve Robeson wrote:

> Ham radio in the United States is a
> SERVICE that is ALSO a hobby. [snip]

No, it is a hobby that is also a service. The hobby part comes first, because without the people engaged in this hobby, there would be no service.

Of course, before you (or someone else) go crazy, I didn't say this is "just" a hobby. For more on this, see my comments in another current thread ("Pride").

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net

3505. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-15 04:39:26 UTC
From: billsohl@mindspring.com
Message-ID: <3a8b5cf4.1418918@news.mindspring.com>
Source record: 3705

On 13 Feb 2001 12:48:10 GMT, Vincent Biancomano
<103520.355@CompuServe.COM> wrote:

>
>>Do you agree with them? In saying that, they restructured the
>>service in a way that they feel it is fundamentally technical.
>
>No they didn't, Ed. What they engaged in was governmental double
>speak as they deregulated the Service further.

So sayeth that great knower of all FCC dealings and
behind the scenes goings on.

>That's why there
>was a petition for reconsideration that basically picked the
>Commission apart, like a John Unitas two-minute drill.

And the current status of that petition is what?

>That's
>also why ARRL instituted their idea for a technical competence
>program, even before FCC's decision came down the pike. They knew
>exactly what was going on.

The cause/effect relationship here being what?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3506. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-15 04:40:36 UTC
From: billsohl@mindspring.com
Message-ID: <3a8b5da1.1592585@news.mindspring.com>
Source record: 3707

On Tue, 13 Feb 2001 09:32:59 -0500, Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote:

>Vincent Biancomano wrote:
>>
>> >Vince, I didn't say that the FCC restructured the Amateur Radio
>> >Service in a way that you and I felt was fundamentally
>> >technical; I said that they restructured it in the way that the
>> >FCC felt was fundamentally technical.
>>
>> No they didn't, Ed. They engaged in governmental double speak to
>> wash their hands of the Service. Trivializing the Service was
>> the way to go, an economic decision.
>
>No doubt the FCC is just doing as they were ordered to by the Bilderberg
>Group. Or was it the Trilateral Commission?
>
>Jon

Probably the one world government conspiracy.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3507. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-15 04:41:32 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <96fmlsagq0@208.206.142.91>
Source record: 3706

Jon Bloom wrote:
>
> But do all those who think there may be a place for HF SS have the
> intention of ridding the world of CW? Unless you agree with that, you
> and Dick are not coming from the same place at all.
>

Which means you don't know where Dick was coming from. When you consider the entire "modernize" movement, you see little support for CW and what there is is lukewarm at best. It is pretty clear that most of them would dump CW entirely if the opportunity presented. As it did to NCI when ARRL sat on its hands the last time round. I still wonder if the FCC isn't still pissed because of the lawsuit ARRL filed against it years ago. That caused me to drop my membership for a couple years. The reason they sued I don't remember, it was so trivial, but the whole scheme was ridiculous. What did they hope to gain by suing the FCC?

The BOD voted last month to "Not change its policy of supporting a CW qualification *at this time*", on a voice vote, then voted down a motion to poll the BOD for individual votes. Why? Rather simple. No one, member or not, can find out how any BOD member voted, either for or against the motion, thus no individual member can be held accountable by either side of the code test issue for his vote. Since the entire BOD is not voted on, only as individuals, they're ALL safe! That's straddling the fence if ever it happened!

3508. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-15 04:43:21 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A8B5E69.B6E4851@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3714

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> It isn't intended to encourage or discourage anyone, Ed. I'm simply
> stating the truth about the reality of learning to use the code. What
> part of this reality is untrue?

The part where you assume that everyone is like you. Everyone is NOT
like you, Larry.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

3509. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-15 04:45:39 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <96fmtjagq1@208.206.142.91>
Source record: 3708

"Ed Hare, W1RFI" wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>
> > Hell no, man, a Real Hamï¿½ is one who has a piece of paper in his pocket
> > and is smart enough to find an AC plug for the "radio" and, maybe, to
> > plug a PL259 into it. Just don't ask him to solder on the PL259.
>
> If you had your way, would that "can't do" philosophy be the driving force
> behind Amateur Radio?

Don't you think anyone reading here besides me realizes that you are
accusing me of the very thing I am speaking out against?

3510. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-15 04:46:01 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A8B5F09.BF21368F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3713

Vincent Biancomano wrote:
>
> >What's happening now? You figuratively said the sky was going
> >to fall. When is it going to fall?
>
> Frankly, Cecil, I don't believe you've ever
> had a grasp of what I've been saying, nor
> have you cared.

You have figuratively said the sky is falling on the ARS. I haven't
seen it falling. When is it going to fall?
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

3511. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-15 04:46:19 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <96fmuragq2@208.206.142.91>
Source record: 3709

"Ed Hare, W1RFI" wrote:
>
> Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
> news:3A8A9F03.4DF20037@IEEE.org...
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> > > Just like incorporating a reference then denying that you meant to use
> > > it?
>
> > I have no idea on earth what this means, Dick.
>
> I don't either, Dick. Could you repost the post where someone denied that
> they meant to use a reference, whatever that means?
>
> Thanks.

Try Hatfield and Hollingsworth

3512. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-15 04:46:22 UTC
From: billsohl@mindspring.com
Message-ID: <3a8b5ee2.1913371@news.mindspring.com>
Source record: 3710

On Wed, 14 Feb 2001 19:03:28 -0500, "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
wrote:

>Vincent Biancomano <103520.355@CompuServe.COM> wrote:
>
>> >So they will do what they want, but 20 years after deciding to
>> >eliminate the amateur service they have yet to get it
>> >eliminated? That makes no sense at all.
>
>> After the Commission's R&O, I'm not in agreement we have an
>> amateur service, Jon. Just a personal radio service.
>
>Are you now operating on Amateur frequencies using all of the provisions and
>rules of the personal radio services or are you using amateur power levels,
>amateur modes, amateur frequencies, amateur rules and amateur call signs?

Now Ed, there you go and bring facts into the picture.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3513. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-15 04:48:27 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <96fn2ragq3@208.206.142.91>
Source record: 3711

"Ed Hare, W1RFI" wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>
> > You err if you believe I deliberately misrepressnted anything you said.
>
> In several cases, Dick, you have mispresented what I have said, then after I
> clarified what I meant, you later repeated the same misrepresentation. Was
> that not deliberate?
>
> > I assumed that your use of the references of FCC officials statements
> > meant the same thing to you they did to me.
>
> I explained what they meant to me. You explained what they meant to you.

Yes, *after* you had already accused me of misrepresnting your
statements.
As I said before, your mention of Hatfield and Hollingworth's comments
was taken to mean that I understood their meaning to be as you did.
Evidently you just threw them in for fun.

3514. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-15 04:49:40 UTC
From: billsohl@mindspring.com
Message-ID: <3a8b5fb3.2121995@news.mindspring.com>
Source record: 3712

On 14 Feb 2001 21:31:30 GMT, Vincent Biancomano
<103520.355@CompuServe.COM> wrote:

>>What's happening now? You figuratively said the sky was going
>>to fall. When is it going to fall?
>
>Frankly, Cecil, I don't believe you've ever
>had a grasp of what I've been saying, nor
>have you cared.

If there is ANYONE out there that has any idea
or grasp about what Vince is saying, please let us
know.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3515. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-15 05:10:21 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <3A8B64BD.C804B4F5@arrl.org>
Source record: 3715

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> Jon Bloom wrote:
> >
> > But do all those who think there may be a place for HF SS have the
> > intention of ridding the world of CW? Unless you agree with that, you
> > and Dick are not coming from the same place at all.
> >
>
> Which means you don't know where Dick was coming from. When you
> consider the entire "modernize" movement, you see little support for CW
> and what there is is lukewarm at best. It is pretty clear that most of
> them would dump CW entirely if the opportunity presented.

Sounds to me like you're coming from exactly where I said.

Jon

3516. Re: Who Is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-15 05:16:25 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net>
Message-ID: <3A8B6629.6BBF4307@ovis.net>
Source record: 3716

Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > Are you waiting for the modernization which you spoke
> > of (apparently the recent modernization did not suit you) in order to
> > deign amateur radio with your presence? Do you actually intend to
> > obtain a license or are you a perpetual procrastinator?
>
> He's probably afraid that if he got on the air, nobody would want to
> talk to him. Actually, he'd probably be a real interesting guy on the
> air if he'd ever get off his amateur radio defamation binge.
>
> ac6xg

He might be interesting save for the pontificating and the sour grapes attitude. You'd think that a guy who is interested enough in amateur radio to haunt a newsgroup for years would make some attempt to obtain a license of any class. If he did that he wouldn't be able to make statements about not being given entrance to the lodge hall.

Until he obtains a license from the FCC (the only agency to grant amateur radio licenses), he is an SWL.

Dave K8MN

3517. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-15 05:16:51 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A8B6643.D2D5860D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3717

Dick Carroll wrote:
> I guess I'm gonna have to go get a question and show in detail how
> they go about doing the word association bit, explain it in lurid detail
> for all the world to see, right here on rrap, before he gets the point.

Don't bother, Dick. That's exactly how I got my Conditional license
50 years ago.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

3518. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-15 05:24:25 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A8B6809.9E150CB2@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3718

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> Cecil, I don't recall ever stating that anyone who may disagree with
> me should not post their opinions.

You don't have to state it, Larry. Everytime someone disagrees with you,
you tell them their opinion doesn't count, i.e. carry any weight, for one
reason or another.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

3519. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-15 05:43:09 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <96fq9djjp0@208.206.142.91>
Source record: 3719

Jim Kelley wrote:
>
You're years too late. I imagine I've probably taken more ham radio
> > exams than most anyone around. I mean the question pool variety. Just to
> > see what they amounted to and to detect any errors.
>
> Before, you said that you administered them, then you said you read
> through the pools, and now in the third round you're claiming to take
> the exams more often than anyone around. Well, I don't know what to
> believe,

So you want me to make full disclosure each and every time?
Yes, I - 1.) administered tests, 2.) took each new test as a practice
exam as new ones arrived to screen them for accuracy and also to see
what was on them. That means a took a lot of test, unofficially of
course since I had long held an Extra class. Clear now?

but what I do know is that the material on the exams is NOT
> trivial, and it takes a goodly amount of study in order to be familiar
> enough with it to pass the exams.

IF and only if one studies to learn the material, and not just to be
able to match a certain answser with it's matching question, which can
be done without learning the subject material, and often is done.

> > > I assume from your remarks that you had a technical background when you were
> > > first licensed. Is that an accurate assumtion? Do you feel that should be
> > > a prerequisite to obtaining an amateur radio license?
>
> > No, I was a 14 year old high school freshman.
>
> Okay, so you didn't have a technical background either. Just like the
> folks you criticized above. That's hypocritical, Dick.

What is it with you guys anyway? Your understanding has evaporated.
NO, I had no technical background when I becaeme a Novice. And not a
whole lot more a few months later when I became a General, though I had
learned considerably. But 13 years later when I took all the tests for
Extra, I had been through five years of military electronics including a
6 month comprehensive course where were started at the beginning and
went through color Television, transmitters and microwave. Even spent a
couple weeks on solid state, back in the transition days when most gear
still used tubes.
And I had studied for, taken and passed the Second class radiotelepone,
first class radiotelephone operators licenses, plus the Ship Radar
endorsement.

So, Yes, I did have a technical background when I took the Extra exam.
Clear now?

Besudes that, damn it, how many times do I have to say it?

***IT IS NOT THE FAULT OF THE ASPPLICANTS THAT THEY CAN PASS THE TESTS
WITHOUT KNOWING ANYTHING ABOUT THE MATERIAL, RATHER IT IS THE FAULT OF
THE TESTING SYSTEM**

Clear now?

> > > I'm also congnizent of the fact that this knowlege represents only the most
> > > rudimentary aspects of amateur radio. But I feel that the balance is best
> > > learned in practice - with experience.
>
> > I suppose it was inevitable when they made the Extra class license
> > available with no experience requirement and with a test system of given
> > questions and answers, that inexperienced Novice type Extras would
> > result. So there is really nothing extra about today's Extra class
> > licensee.
>
> Please elucidate these differences in greater detail. Give yourself as
> an example of the 'good kind of Extra' if you like. And then contrast
> that with say, me for example. One of the kind who didn't have to meet
> the "experience requirement" you evidently did.

Simple enough. When someone with no technical knowledge can use the
question pools to pass the license tests through Extra class, while
learning nothing oif consequence about the technical material involved,
there is nothing
extra about the Extra class license.

>
> > No question that is probably the most important factor. With it one
> > will learn what he needs to know, but he still misses much he should
> > have gotten in study of material instead of just the pools. Sure, some
> > applicants do study other things. Most have no need to. They can pass
> > the tests, one at a time, by studying that element in the pools. You
> > don't get much detailed information in the pools.
>
> What kind of detailed information that's missing from the pools, should
> be included in the pools? Since you're on top of this, it should be
> simple for you to provide.

You bet it is. You prpobably remember that Ed Hare posted four or five
questisons and answers from the new pools a week or so ago, questions
which were constructed such that associating a particular word pattern
set with the question without actually knowing the material, as is
normally done, would be very difficult, and it would indeed be much
easier to learn how to work the problem. THAT is the answer, to have
most of the questions constructed in that manner. Simply make it
impossible to do what has been done since 1985 by people who found it

easier to study testing techniques instead of the material.

> And, it would go a long way toward proving your point.
>
> > > Since there were no cheet sheets brought into the exam, you can be confident
> > > that the applicants had knowlege of the facts queried on the exam.
>
> > You can if you think you should, based on your experiences. I never
> > expected to come to the opposite conclusion, and it developed over
> > several years time experience as a VE. I saw things that all finally
> > summed up to it. All confirmed by the considerably lowered knowledge
> > level demonstrated by so many new licensees.
>
> It's an interesting point. Sure wish I could go back in time and see
> how incredibly informed young Dick was as a 14 year old amateur radio
> operator by comparison to todays new hams. From hearing you tell it,
> you must have been a veritable electronics genious by comparison.
>

Would you be kind enough to let us know what you read that led you to
form that opinion?

> > These
> > > facts are deemed to be those which are the most relevant to amateur radio
> > > knowlege. If you feel the material covered by the question pools is
> > > insufficient, then I'm sure everyone would be grateful if you were to offer
> > > specific suggestions as to how that material should be supplemented.

It isn't a matter of sufficiency, rather of question construction as
noted above.

> > I imagine you're tired of hearing about it. Don't blame you, I'm tired
> > of saying it, especially when I get accused of spreading falsehoods.
>
> A more constructive change in tune would be welcome. If you're right,
> then you should be able to recommend the specific necessary changes. If
> you can't, well, it would seem more likely that you just like to hear
> yourself complain about things.

Done, above.

>
> > I did offer to Ed to use one of his new defective Handbooks to form
> > some questions on new material, but he ignored me. I wasn't surprised.
>
> You don't need Ed's permission to do anything, Dick. So that's not a
> valid excuse.

No excuse involved. I don't own a new copy of the Handbook, as noted
earlier, and thenew modes aren't coivered in my 96 edition. Ed offered
Aaron Jones a defective copy from the scrap bin if he would give his
mailing address, an obvious ploy to draw out the anonymous Jones. Of
course it was denied, and I decided to let Ed put his money where his

mouth was- I would use one of the damgaged Handbooks to make up 10 questions on the new material if he would send it to me. I really didn't expect him to do it, of course, but it was a chance for him to show how serious he was about promoting hams to construct new questions. But I don't worry about the new modes, what I want is for the tests to correctly evaluate the applicants learning level at test time. I don't believe that the tests should be hard, if the material already covered was tested accurately it would cover more than enough material. But as it is, you as an engineeer or whatever might make no better score than one who knows nothing whatever about electronics. That's what you want in a testing system?

> So the reason you can't tell us about all the important technical
> knowlege that should be on the exams but currently isn't; which results
> in the hams of today not knowing as much as you were required to know
> when you were first licensed, is contained in one book. And being that
> you encountered some difficulty in purchasing this one book, you either
> don't know what the material is, or cannot provide it for some other
> reason.
>
> Hmmm, sounds reasonable. Excuses being what they are.
>

I assume you have it straightened out in your mind now.

> > > Question for you: how did you first learn the resistor color code? Was it;
> > > bad boys rape our young girls but violet gives willingly?
>
> > That wasn't the way I first learned it as a ham, but it's how they
> > taught it in military electronics school.
>
> So when you first learned it, as a ham, you derived it from first
> principles?
> Or did you employ a word association method?

BIG difference. When I word associated the color codes, it was for the purpose of relating them to something that I UNDERSTOOD. As done for the tests, with the question pools, the applicant does it merely to match two things accurately, neither of which he has any understanding.

Ed is wrong. People DO get ham radio licenses to "Not learn". Mostly they get them to talk on radios. And then they learn what they find they must learn as they go, if they can. Frequently that learning is embarassinly inadequate.

No case covers anywhere nearly all, of course. But the point is that far too many licensees have made it to Extra class with far too little knowledge. That has seriously degraded the license, and it shows. Ed evidently doesn't, but I hear about it all the time on the air, Extras who know virtually nothing technical.

3520. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-15 05:50:16 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <96fqji$g7a$1@news.service.uci.edu>
Source record: 3720

Ed Hare, W1RFI <w1rfi@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:S_Ei6.248$HH5.1316560@news.ntplx.net...
> Vincent Biancomano <103520.355@CompuServe.COM> wrote:
> > After the Commission's R&O, I'm not in agreement we have an
> > amateur service, Jon. Just a personal radio service.

> I am still able to do 100% of what I was able to do before the
restructuring
> Report and Order. I do exactly that. What did the Commission take away
> from you that makes you feel like it is no longer the Amateur Radio
Service?

No, that's not what Vince is saying at all. He's saying that you don't know Ohms law any more - nor does anyone else in amateur radio. Everyone forgot it 20 years ago. Or was it on April 15th last year. Anyway, remember when that happened? ;-)

de ac6xg

3521. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-15 05:54:00 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <96fqto$l3s$0@208.206.142.91>
Source record: 3721

Jon Bloom wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > Jon Bloom wrote:
> > >
> > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Did he happen to mention that only those hams who passed a "real" exam
> > > > -- not the ones given during the last two decades -- are contributing to
> > > > the success of the NWS activities? If not, maybe the NWS can't tell the
> > > > difference between the "real"
> > > > hams and the others. Maybe there is no difference.
> > >
> > > Hell no, man, a Real Hamï¿½ is one who has a piece of paper in his pocket
> > > and is smart enough to find an AC plug for the "radio" and, maybe, to
> > > plug a PL259 into it. Just don't ask him to solder on the PL259.
> >
> > I can see why you dodged the question; a truthful answer would
> > demonstrate the absurdity of your oft-repeated claim that the current
> > testing system is destroying ham radio.

So you believe it doesn't matter at all that many Extra class
licensees
became licensed on the question pools without learning anything
meaningful in the process - that doesn't damage ham radio? Somehow I
don't think your answer will surprise me.

3522. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-15 06:15:18 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <96fs5m$oc2$0@208.206.142.91>
Source record: 3722

"Ed Hare, W1RFI" wrote:
>
> I think that you and I are not nearly as far apart on that as you might
> think. If you are able to let go of your belief that I am adovocating that
> hams must stop what they are doing in ham radio and must take up new
> technologies instead, would you agree with my premise that it is important
> that Amateur Radio, as a whole, continue to learn about modern
> communications technologies in use in many other radio Services?
>

Yes indeed. But it must be understood that we force no abandonment of
our older modes, even unintentionally, in the process. I think we agree
on that.

> > Which makes the validity and quality of the tests even more imppotant.
>
> I agree, Dick; I believe that improvements can and should be made in the
> tests. I don't believe that the method used to test hams is so flawed,
> though, that such improvements cannot be made.

I can even agree here, given the few questions you posted last week. If
most of the test questions were configured as those were, there'd be no
proble and my dissatisfaction with the tests would completely evaporate.

>
> I don't see that the knowledge level of today's average ham is significantly
> different than it was when I was a General in 1963, at least not the
> knowledge that I used to pass that test.

The most glaring examples are Extras, I'm afraid. They are expected to
be at least modestly knowledgable, and far too many are not.

ALL I studied for the General was
> the ARRL study guide -- 16 pages of operating, rules and technical material.
> What IS different is the RELATIVE knowledge level of the hams of today wrt
> the significant changes in technology that have taken place since 1963. And
> that difference is not due to the fact that we now require hams to study
> over 1200 questions that take up over 100 pages to print instead of asking
> them to study 16 pages of material. The difference is there because
> technology has changed and it may no longer be likely that any one ham will
> know it all. But I bet the average ham of today knows more about RFI than I
> knew as a General. He or she knows more about digital electronics than I
> knew as a General. The number of Web pages on technical topics are legion;
> the ARRL Technical Information Service pages get tens of thousands of hits.
> These things don't happen because hams don't want to learn things.
>

> All of the available evidence I have tells me that ham radio is not lacking
> in technical learning. I see only a handful of people who say they memorized
> the tests without learning, and, frankly, I think it likely that they
> learned more than they think they did. When I compare that handful to the
> people who I see who read web pages and articles and who are generally
> interested in learning things, I just can't let my opinion about what "vast
> hordes" of people must be doing be made from that handful.
>
> I think, Dick, that the biggest difference between us is that I still
> believe in the present, and the future, of ham radio and want to take
> positive steps to make it happen the way I see it.

We're not that far apart, although I believe I've seen things in the field,as a VE, and on the air, that you have missed. (I do work and listen to quite a lot of SSB on HF as well as CW). And the years as a VE was an eye opener.
I know that no one is expected to be schooled in electronics just to get a ham radio license, but it should be at least moderately difficult to get to the Extra class, if it is to mean anything more than lip service. Fifteen years of question pool exams have about trashed it. With the pool situation as it has been it isn't. I think that can be improved, not by adding material necessarily, but by rewriting many questions so as to make them more difficult to pair answers without learning, as noted earlier.

3523. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-15 06:18:16 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <m2tm8tco8iiqc6r82s2b6sjfolob7objhd@4ax.com>
Source record: 3726

"Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net> wrote:

>Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com> wrote:
>
>> >I believe that most hams pass their tests the same way that I did...
>
>> But of course most people are not engineers.
>
>I was 14 years old at the time.

You were an *engineer* when you got your Extra, were you not? Didn't
that 4 years of technical schooling help you a bit with the test...
:-)

>I did. I studied the ARRL 16-page General study guide for about a month
>part time before I took my General.

That was then, this is now. I'm talking about today's ham test. The
one with the exact questions and answers published and available for
memorization...

>It would take me more than months to memorize all of those questions without
>understanding. The most time consuming part would be avoiding the
>understanding.

It would take a layman a year or more of technical school to really
learn the electronics on the Extra test. He can memorize it in a
week...

3524. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-15 06:18:18 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <71tm8tsjuba2gl48rnftu2mmo12g4g5rbu@4ax.com>
Source record: 3725

Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net> wrote:
>When you move 7 times in a three year period, it gets to be
>a real pain to constantly file change of address data with the FCC. After
>that, I've become almost an "expert" on the FCC's online system.

Not to worry Dwight because it apparently does no good. I changed my address last September when I moved and it took because the FCC database was updated within a few weeks. However when I got official correspondence from the FCC a couple of days ago (about my password notification for CORES) it was, you guessed it, sent to my old address... :-)

3525. Re: Who is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-15 06:18:20 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <p4tm8tcbhjqr1345ulnjpm36qhipk6losi@4ax.com>
Source record: 3723

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote:
>Jon's posts are right in line with what I've come to expect.

I was just trying to point out that after Jon kind of smirked at the
rrap group's antics, he was doing the same kind of antics... :-)

>I don't think anyone expects particularly "high brow"
>posts from ARRL HQ employees!

I think that both Ed and Jon add a lot of interesting info to the
group. I would be sorry to see either go, and don't blame them for
reacting to some inflammatory posts as most normal human beings would.
I have always found the antics of this group interesting. If everybody
was a perfect gentleman here it would be somewhat boring... :-)

>the worst abuse I took was from a former ARRL HQ
>employee who is now a silent key..

So why don't you let your animosity for this person die as well...

3526. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-15 06:18:45 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <96fsc5$oc2$1@208.206.142.91>
Source record: 3727

"Ed Hare, W1RFI" wrote:
>
> It would take me more than months to memorize all of those questions without
> understanding. The most time consuming part would be avoiding the
> understanding.

Ed, It IS much easier to do when you know nothing about the subject
matter.
These are things I learned from the years as a VE. Rewriting questions
can fix that.

3527. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-15 06:19:45 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <96fse1$oc2$2@208.206.142.91>
Source record: 3724

"T. L. Bryant" wrote:
>
> In article <cr4m8tkor5433dolhh489cj76qr4f1eatt@4ax.com>, nomail@nomail.com
> says...
> >
> >tlbryant@my-deja.com (T. L. Bryant) wrote:
> >
> >>Aaron wrote:
> >>>Nobody says that you *have* to go to college. And that's a good thing.
> >>>Who would pick up my garbage, clean my streets, and do my landscaping
> >>>if everybody were highly educated... :-)
> >>
> >>I'd almost be willing to bet that some of those people you've mentioned have
> >>college degrees.
> >
> >They're engineers moonlighting for a few extra bucks... :-)
>
> That just goes to show how much their chosen field of study pays if they have
> to moonlight.

Actually they're just puting to good use skills they learned when they
were working their way through college

3528. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-15 06:32:40 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <96ft68$qs7$0@208.206.142.91>
Source record: 3728

Cecil wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > I guess I'm gonna have to go get a question and show in detail how
> > they go about doing the word association bit, explain it in lurid detail
> > for all the world to see, right here on rrap, before he gets the point.
>
> Don't bother, Dick. That's exactly how I got my Conditional license
> 50 years ago.

Impossible. There were no exact question/answer pairs to study.

3529. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-15 06:41:18 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <96ftjahnu1@news.service.uci.edu>
Source record: 3729

Vincent Biancomano <103520.355@CompuServe.COM> wrote in message
news:96ek33jrj2@sshuraaa-i-1.production.compuserve.com...
> "Have to keep quiet" does not mean "know enough
> to keep quiet." Context changed. Kindly desist
> trolling.

Oh now I get it. They "know enough to keep quiet" so as to keep from getting "nailed" because Congress has a "history" of wanting to "dumb down" amateur radio operators until they can no longer fix or even use their radios. And by then they'll be so stupid that the radio fairies can come right down and take away all the radios. And the FCC can finally sell the spectrum to Kenwood. And Vince can finish smoking the rope the FCC supplied.

The End.

So let it be written, so let it be done, thus spoke Biancomano.

3530. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-15 06:44:46 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <96ftsu$s56$0@208.206.142.91>
Source record: 3730

W1RFI wrote:
>
> >From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com
>
> >They can pass
> >the tests, one at a time, by studying that element in the pools. You
> >don't get much detailed information in the pools.
>
> There are more correct answers in the General pool than there were sentences in
> the 16-page General study guide I read to get my General license.

Many of which are on non-technical subjects.

3531. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-15 06:48:45 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <3A8B7BCD.43FB185E@arrl.org>
Source record: 3731

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> So you believe it doesn't matter at all that many Extra class
> licensees
> became licensed on the question pools without learning anything
> meaningful in the process

I don't accept your premise.

> - that doesn't damage ham radio?

I want to see specific examples of the damage, Dick. What can you no longer do in ham radio due to the damage caused by recent licensees? Are these licensees keeping ham radio from fulfilling its public service role? Are they inhibiting interested people from learning radio technology and technique? In short, in what specific ways are these licensees diminishing ham radio? Mind you, I'm not looking for vague assertions that they don't know enough, I'm looking for specific information about what they are doing that is causing damage. If you can provide such specifics, it will help make your case. If you cannot, then your belief that ham radio is being damaged is mere speculation.

> Somehow I
> don't think your answer will surprise me.

Somehow, I don't think yours will surprise me, either. But I'd be delighted to be proven wrong about that.

Jon

3532. Re: Who is What?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-15 06:54:38 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <3A8B7D2E.286BD448@arrl.org>
Source record: 3732

Aaron Jones wrote:
>
> I think that both Ed and Jon add a lot of interesting info to the
> group.

"Interesting info"? Careful, Aaron, you're in danger of violating your principles by taking some of this seriously! :-)

Jon

3533. Faggots, Homos, & Queers was: Re: Gay History should be taught by schools

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-15 07:03:56 UTC
From: vlfiscus@mcn.net
Message-ID: <t8mvqsmm4jlaa5@news.supernews.com>
Source record: 3733
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

I don't believe we need to discuss Fudge Packers & Colon Cappers in this newgroup, they're off-topic. We should be discussing the decline of the ARRL and why they don't want to petition the FCC to help improve amateur radio operators and their operating practices.

Just a thought.

KB7ADL

joxendi@bellsouth.net (Jerry Oxendine) wrote in
<3A8ABF84.47A1@bellsouth.net>:

>Homophobia?
>

3534. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-15 07:52:36 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <96g1tl$k29$1@news.service.uci.edu>
Source record: 3734

Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:96fq9djjp0@208.206.142.91...
> So you want me to make full disclosure each and every time?
> Yes, I - 1.) administered tests, 2.) took each new test as a practice
> exam as new ones arrived to screen them for accuracy and also to see
> what was on them. That means a took a lot of test, unofficially of
> course since I had long held an Extra class. Clear now?

Do you think you would have passed many them? ;-)

> *IF and only if* one studies to learn the material, and not just to be
> able to match a certain answser with it's matching question, which can
> be done without learning the subject material, and often is done.

The answer contains the words which are the correct answer to the words
contained in the question. I wonder how somebody could know the words to
the question and the words to the answer, know that the two correspond to
each other, and not know anything about subject of the sentences. Doesn't
make a lot of sense, Dick. Certainly isn't worth losing any sleep over.

> > > No, I was a 14 year old high school freshman.
> >
> > Okay, so you didn't have a technical background either. Just like the
> > folks you criticized above. That's hypocritical, Dick.
>
> What is it with you guys anyway?

What guys? Have I been using the royal "we" again? :-)

> NO, I had no technical background when I becaeme a Novice. And not a
> whole lot more a few months later when I became a General, though I had
> learned considerably.

But that would be impossible for anyone to do nowadays, right? I'd like to
suggest that you were probably just as "stupid" then as you claim so many of
your applicants are today.

> So, Yes, I did have a technical background when I took the Extra exam.
> Clear now?

I had more than 25 years of electronics background when I took my Extra
exam.

> ***IT IS NOT THE FAULT OF THE ASPPLICANTS THAT THEY CAN PASS THE TESTS
> WITHOUT KNOWING ANYTHING ABOUT THE MATERIAL, RATHER IT IS THE FAULT OF
> THE TESTING SYSTEM**

Error. Error. Error. What proof do you have that the applicants don't know any of the material? I claim their CSCE is proof they know the material. If you don't, why the heck did you sign them?

> Simple enough. When someone with no technical knowledge can use the
> question pools to pass the license tests through Extra class, while
> learning nothing oif consequence about the technical material involved,
> there is nothing
> extra about the Extra class license.

What it really sounds like to me, is that you need that piece of paper to prove something about you. Well, that's fine. If it took a great deal of effort for you, then you can be proud of your accomplishment. What somebody else does has no affect on that. I've noticed that once I've accomplished something, and then years later I go back and look at my work, it doesn't seem as significant a task. It seems to me that you're judging the amount of work required for Extra now in kind of the same way. Now it would be easy for you, but when you first did it, it was quite an accomplishment. Ya oughta give the young fellers more of a break there, Dick.

> > What kind of detailed information that's missing from the pools, should
> > be included in the pools? Since you're on top of this, it should be
> > simple for you to provide.

> You bet it is.

You mean it's easy as long as somebody else (like Ed) does it.

> > From hearing you tell it,
> > you must have been a veritable electronics genious by comparison.

> Would you be kind enough to let us know what you read that led you to
> form that opinion?

Like I said, I read your opinion that nobody learns anything anymore - not like you did when you were just starting. Your evidence was based on your observations of these folks. I claim that you would have probably sounded just as dumb back then. By the time you got your Extra, you were a trained electronics something or other. That's an advantage over guys who aren't. But no one is required to have that kind of background. I'd claim that a guy who gets his Extra without that has accomplished more.

> It isn't a matter of sufficiency, rather of question construction as
> noted above.

Well then, since you know exactly how to fix things, what's stopping you?

> > A more constructive change in tune would be welcome. If you're right,
> > then you should be able to recommend the specific necessary changes.

> Done, above.

Searching.......

> > You don't need Ed's permission to do anything, Dick. So that's not a
> > valid excuse.

> No excuse involved.

You provided nothing but a list of excuses for why you couldn't write exam questions.

> I don't own a new copy of the Handbook, as noted
> earlier, and thenew modes aren't coivered in my 96 edition.

I thought you said the problem was with the way the questions were written. Why not just go through and edit the question pool? Too much work, maybe? Easier to just blast the QPC here on the newsgroup? I'm sure those guys have other things they could be doing as well, Dick. But please, leave the questions about the new modes to someone with more experience with that. ;-)

> But as
> it is, you as an engineeer or whatever might make no better score than
> one who knows nothing whatever about electronics. That's what you want
> in a testing system?

Hey, if I don't know more of the answers than somebody else, then I think that's the way it's supposed to work. As you've said, being an engineer doesn't necessarily make one an amateur radio operator. Passing the FCC exams does however.

> > So when you first learned it, as a ham, you derived it from first
> > principles?
> > Or did you employ a word association method?

> BIG difference. When I word associated the color codes, it was for the
> purpose of relating them to something that I UNDERSTOOD.

What's there to understand about a color code? bad=black boys=brown, rape=red, our=orange.....

>As done for the
> tests, with the question pools, the applicant does it merely to match
> two things accurately, neither of which he has any understanding.

You mean like matching the words '20 meter amateur band limits' to '14.000 MHz - 14.350 MHz'?

> Ed is wrong. People DO get ham radio licenses to "Not learn". Mostly
> they get them to talk on radios.

You need an amateur radio license to talk on amateur radios. Isn't that what most hams do with theirs?

>And then they learn what they find
> they must learn as they go, if they can. Frequently that learning is
> embarassinly inadequate.

Who's they? Those guys who just got their license? Yes, we all know that you were an electronics genious when you first got your ticket, Dick.

> No case covers anywhere nearly all, of course. But the point is that
> far too many licensees have made it to Extra class with far too little

> knowledge. That has seriously degraded the license, and it shows. Ed
> evidently doesn't, but I hear about it all the time on the air, Extras
> who know virtually nothing technical.

I think you overstate things a bit. But I'll give you one thing. Chances are a guy who gets his Extra after 4 years (or 2, like I did), is not going to know as much amateur radio as a guy who gets it after 20 years of operating. On the other hand, what took him so long? ;-)

73, Jim AC6XG

3535. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-15 10:08:09 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010215050809.21862.00001226@ng-cr1.aol.com>
Source record: 3735

>From: Dwight Stewart stewartx@sccoast.net

>I don't have EME capabilities at the moment (no place
>to put the antennas), but when I do it will be SSB voice.

Why not use a digital mode? With a slow data rate, FEC and some long-term integration and similar processing techniques, it should be possible to do 2X EME with modest stations.

>I have never said a thing about the "death" of HF or CW. Emphasis on one
>part of the radio spectrum does not mean the "death" of another.

Especially when there is nothing about the rules changes that takes away any personal emphasis any individual ham may have been placing on mode or spectrum.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3536. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-15 10:19:50 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010215051950.21862.00001227@ng-cr1.aol.com>
Source record: 3736

>From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

>It wouldn't exactly be a huge project for some good writer who is well
>familiar with the modes in question to put together a clear, basic
>tutorial with good graphics which would clearly describe to laymen,
>which evidently will constitute a vast majority of ham radio in the
>future, can at least get some basic exposure without the haphazard,
>peacemeal approach thus far.

What is wrong with the several tutorials in the URLs I posted earlier?

>The subuect of course should be both SS techniques and DSP. But no, all
>the techies want to do is insist that "everyone should know it."

Other than write the tutorials at the URLs I posted earlier, of course.

>

> So when did FCC change their minds? As late as the Dec 99 R&O they
>stated that they consider the AR to be a "fundamentally technical
>service". The classes of licensing are theirs, with graduated ascending
>technical requirements. Have you ran your opinions past the FCC? OR is
>this just another method of easing us all out of a *real* ham radio into
>a purely hobby-CB sort of "service", as Dwigbt Stewart so clearly
>described a few posts back? Is that the actual goal of ARRL? It doesn't
>surprise me in the least.

You asked a question, then were suprised at the answer before it was given?
Odd.

To answer your question, no, that is not the goal and Dwight's posts on rrap
don't set ARRL policy either. I know you know this.

> What you have just said is that nothing is important so long as no one rocks
> the boat for any reason.

That is not what Jon said; you are twisting his words again into the most
extreme possible interpretation. It is not useful.

> We MUST license anyone who shows the mildest interest.

Your opinion, if you say so, but I strongly disagree.

> Quantithy, never mind any concern of quality.

Your opinion, if you say so, but I strongly disagree.

> And tests just get in the way.

Your opinion if I say so, but I strongly disagree.

>
>

>> No, I suppose no such thing. But one thing I *am* sure of is that ham
>> radio can embrace a wider variety of interests than those of any one
>> individual.

> That's news??? It's been that way since long before I came along.

Then you believe it is also true of those who take tests today? If so, I
agree.

> Nonsense, and you know it. The difference is in bottom line
>qualifications. The drift, which has turned into a fulscale slide, is
>toward NO basic qualifications at all. And it is very close to it at
>this writing.

I disagree. The qualifications of hams today are greater than they were when I
studied a 16-page study guide to get my General and all amateur privileges.

> Damn it, ham radio was never meant to be an all-inclusive passtime.

Why would you want to damn ham radio?

> It has always been for the technically ivolved.

At least those technically involved enough to learn/memorize/guess on a test
covered by a 16-page study guide.

>So now you advocate that all be as one, the LEAST qualified one. I don't
>think you could have made it more clear.

Jon did not say that, you did, so that makes it your opinion. I strongly
disagree.

> They sure do, and when they happen to be code haters anything they say
>is accepted as command, and the beliefs of OTs are cast aside.

Jon didn't say that either. You did, so it is your opinion. I strongly
disagree.

It is very difficult to discuss things with you when you make things up from
your own opinion and then take issue with others for saying them.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3537. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-15 10:22:28 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010215052228.21862.00001228@ng-cr1.aol.com>
Source record: 3737

>From: kelly@dvol (Brian Kelly, w3rv)

>And if you
>>search the NG archives (once Google brings Deja back online with the
>>full 1995-and-later archive), you'll find that both Ed and I have
>>repeatedly challenged Carl's views on just that point.

>Ed is in here supporting HF spread spectrum ops.

Ed made a statement that it should be possible to accomodate some HF SS, to enable amateur experimentation to determine what value HF SS could have to the Amateur Radio Service. Jon offered a suggestion on how you could refresh your memory on the scope of my disagreement with Carl that SS should be given absolute free reign on HF or other.

Your statement is inaccurate in that context.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI
>>
>>Dick's mistake,
>>yours too, I guess, is to think that just because we want to see new
>>technology brought into Amateur Radio that we buy the rest of Carl's
>>agenda. We don't.
>>
>I didn't state that Jon, I said that there is a well-defined
>multi-point agenda out there which is spearheaded by Stevenson. We all
>know what those points are and those are my squawks.
>>
>>Nor is Carl's agenda an inevitable consequence of
>>adopting new technology. Carl and a few others want to give wideband
>>modes carte blanche; I don't think that's necessary in order to make use
>>of those technologies,
>>
>I'm having a very difficult time believing that a mode which scatters
>bits and bytes all over some significant HF bandwidth is not gonna
>materially degrade the noise level for other users of that bandwidth.
>That's my whole and only problem with HF wideband modes.
>>
>>and I think that existing narrowband modes should
>>have some protection from wideband (as they do). That's particularly
>>true on HF.
>>
>Good.
>>
>>> One of The Agenda's favorite hype points for justifying the abolition

>>> of the code tests was and is to permit all the technical geniuses who
>>> were gonna flood the bands with new technologies to get on the air
>>> without being "hindered" by the code tests.
>>
>>But did I say that? Did Ed?
>>
>No, but Squiggy and plenty of others certainly have used that line
>which was my point.
>>
>>
>>I agree that most hams aren't chomping at the bit to see SS implemented.
>>But do you think most hams are *against* it ever being implemented?
>>
>First off some huge percentage of all hams have no idea what ss is let
>alone it's potential upsides and downsides. I'm quite convinced that
>if they did understand ss and there was a proposal on the table to
>implement HF ss there would be a major uproar in opposition.
>>
>Second, I'm not opposed to ss as a mode if used in appropriate chunks
>of ham spectrum space. Which does NOT include 7.000-7.300 Mhz . .
>>
>>Also, do you think that those who are interested in bringing modern
>>technologies into ham radio are necessarily anti-CW and thus need to be
>>suppressed?
>>
>Of course not. I'm out here applauding the work being done in the
>field of HF narrowband digital modes. This work is gonna lead to
>something very big one of these days. Note that for the most part
>those contributers are not playing the lame old "catch up with the
>commercials" game ss proponents are playing.
>>
>>I agree that the historical model of amateur adoption of technology
>>probably continues to be the best path. I see no reason why FHSS or any
>>other technology that confers real benefits should not follow that path.
>>I don't think the HF amateur bands are best suited to that particular
>>technology, nor that the potential benefits of that technology are
>>maximized at HF. But I think there are real potential benefits at VHF
>>and UHF, I think those benefits can begin to be realized without unduly
>>bothering existing narrowband users,
>>
>We're 100% agreed here. There's plenty of absolutely dead VHF/UHF ham
>spectrum space, use it or lose it, go for it. Or make it happen or
>quit babbling about it.
>>
>>and I'm disappointed that we
>>haven't made more progress along those lines.
>>
>The question is "Why hasn't more progress been made?". I suspect the
>answer lies in the realities of Marketing 101. "I already have a 56.6
>kbs connection", etc. My own bottom line is that if ss stays above 30

>Mhz where it belongs I have no problem with or particular interest in
>ss.
>>
>>I don't perceive one iota
>>of anti-CW agenda in that.
>>
>My comments were aimed at Squiggy's agenda which is a rabid anti-cw
>stance from top to bottom.
>>
>>Jon
>>
>w3rv
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>

3538. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-15 10:25:33 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010215052533.21862.00001229@ng-cr1.aol.com>
Source record: 3738

>From: kelly@dvol (Brian Kelly, w3rv)

>>I don't perceive one iota
>>of anti-CW agenda in that.

>My comments were aimed at Squiggy's agenda which is a rabid anti-cw
>stance from top to bottom.

I think Jon got a bit confused when you disagreed with Carl's point of view by responding to what I had said. A natural error, considering you kept quoting me and disagreeing with Carl without actually naming him until later in the thread.

At least it is not as bad as others who disagree with themselves in response to my posts. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3539. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-15 10:34:33 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010215053433.21862.00001230@ng-cr1.aol.com>
Source record: 3739

>From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

>>I agree, Dick. Larry was saying that if a CW signal goes up against an SSB
>>signal, the CW signal will lose. I believe he is incorrect.

>Keep in mind, I was assuming a QRP-level CW signal in the presence
>of QRO-level SSB signals.

Did you stack the deck to help make your point? The point will be diminished by those who note that you stacked the deck.

>However, my experience has been that
>multiple high-power SSB signals will tend to overwhelm weak CW
>signals under most circumstances.

It is my experience that multiple high-power SSB signal will tend to overwhelm other high-power SSB signals. I would say that 90% of the time, there is one SSB signal per 2500 Hz bandwidth. If there are "dozens," no one is communicating.

>My mental CW filter is responsible for my completing many CW QSO's
>under very adverse conditions, but those conditions involved atmospheric
>noise and other QRN, not the deliberate QRM of multiple, closely-spaced
>SSB signals.

I would imagine not. I have never been deliberately QRM'ed by multiple, closely-spaced SSB signals in the CW portion of the band. A few Canadian ops have caused my 5 W CW signal some grief on 40 M, but I expect that they heard me very weakly, so just assumed they would be weak to me, too.

On how many occasions have you been deliberately QRMed on your CW QSOs by multiple closely spaced SSB signals? What percentage of your CW QSOs have been subject to such QRM?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3540. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-15 10:36:12 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010215053612.21862.00001231@ng-cr1.aol.com>
Source record: 3740

>From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

>> Post April 15 Extras didn't prove their Morse code skill so they also have
>> no right to post their personal opinions.

>They have a right to post their opinions, but those opinions do not
>carry any weight among those of us who met the Pre-April 15
>requirements.

On what basis do you feel you can speak for "those of us?"

What could post-4/15 Extras do that would make you take their opinions carry
weight?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3541. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-15 10:37:14 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010215053714.21862.00001232@ng-cr1.aol.com>
Source record: 3741

>From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

>Show me where I've done so, and
>I will offer an immediate retraction and apology. If you can't, then keep
>your damn opinions about me to yourself!

A smiley would have helped. If it wasn't a joke, you should offer a retraction
and an apology. :-)

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3542. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-15 10:38:49 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010215053849.21862.00001233@ng-cr1.aol.com>
Source record: 3742

>From: Cecil Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org

>You don't have to state it, Larry. Everytime someone disagrees with you,
>you tell them their opinion doesn't count, i.e. carry any weight, for one
>reason or another.

Or he tells them to keep their opinion to themselves. That must be Larry's
cute way of telling them that he is not saying that they should not post it.
:-)

A bundle of self-contradiction, eh?

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3543. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-15 10:45:32 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010215054532.21862.00001234@ng-cr1.aol.com>
Source record: 3743

>From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

>> I don't either, Dick. Could you repost the post where someone denied that
>> they meant to use a reference, whatever that means?

> Try Hatfield and Hollingsworth

I did a search on Hatfield and Hollingsworth and didn't find that they had done
any posts to rrap.

Could you repost the post where someone denied that they meant to use a
reference, whatever that means?

Thanks.

73,
Ed, W1RFI

3544. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-15 10:47:27 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010215054727.21862.00001235@ng-cr1.aol.com>
Source record: 3745

>From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

>As I said before, your mention of Hatfield and Hollingworth's comments
>was taken to mean that I understood their meaning to be as you did.
>Evidently you just threw them in for fun.

I didn't say what I believed their meaning to be. I asked you what you thought
it was. Your answer is "what you said?"

This is getting really hard to follow.

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3545. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-15 10:48:43 UTC
From: w1rfi@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010215054843.21862.00001236@ng-cr1.aol.com>
Source record: 3744

>From: Dick Carroll dixie@townsqr.com

>> I can see why you dodged the question; a truthful answer would
>> demonstrate the absurdity of your oft-repeated claim that the current
>> testing system is destroying ham radio.

> So you believe it doesn't matter at all that many Extra class
>licensees
>became licensed on the question pools without learning anything
>meaningful in the process - that doesn't damage ham radio? Somehow I
>don't think your answer will surprise me.

Jon didn't say that; you did. If what you say is your opinion, I strongly
disagree.

Ed Hare, W1RFI

3546. Texas HB 1148 Will Totally Regulate Antenna Towers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-15 11:08:29 UTC
From: David Feustel <dfeustel@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <NMOi6.127453$P5.2768744@news1.rdc1.il.home.com>
Source record: 3746
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.policy

HB 1148 as introduced in Texas Legislature:

http://www.capitol.state.tx.us/cgi-bin/tlo/textframe.cmd?LEG=77&SESS=R&CHAMB
ER=H&BILLTYPE=B&BILLSUFFIX=01148&VERSION=1&TYPE=B

3547. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-15 12:27:39 UTC
From: Vincent Biancomano <103520.355@CompuServe.COM>
Message-ID: <96ghvrkpb1@sshuraac-i-1.production.compuserve.com>
Source record: 3747

>Are you now operating on Amateur frequencies using all of the
>provisions and rules of the personal radio services or are you
>using amateur power levels, amateur modes, amateur frequencies,
>amateur rules and amateur call signs?

You've missed the point entirely. Conversing on 'amateur frequencies' within an 'amateur service' does not an Amateur Service make. Without a technical learning infrastructure (and we no longer have that), we no longer have Amateur Radio, as defined. That's what the petition for reconsideration is about. And FCC is still frozen in place with it, not knowing how to handle it.

Regards,
Vince, WB2EZG

3548. Re: I heard a CB'er on 20 meters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-15 12:29:22 UTC
From: "Mr. Roboto" <663jlm@vei.net>
Message-ID: <t8nipdc7lvo7a8@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 3748
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.scanner

Who are you talking to, Darren?
--
Mr. Roboto
delete663jlm@vei.net

"Darren Shields" <dshields@midsouth.rr.com> wrote in message
news:3A8B13BF.B3DD31CA@midsouth.rr.com...
> I'll bet the bastards
> an ARRL member too. Probably got in on the League discount
membership plan.
> All this started me wondering, What make a ham a ham? Is
a ham someone
> that's working to improve their knowledge of radio theory,
electronics and
> operating skills?
>
> Well guess what guy? All of us ham have different drives.
Some of you might
> obsess with code practice and technical details but
surprisingly there are those
> of us who just enjoy the friendly banter with folks just
like us from around the
> world. You did recall that part of being a ham was being
able to do that right?
> Yes, we do good work in times of disaster and we try to be
upstanding citizens but
> the bottom line is we are human with human needs. Relax
my friend and enjoy the
> hobby your way and others will enjoy it their way. A
little tolerance goes a long
> way.
>
> Darren
>

3549. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-15 12:33:15 UTC
From: Vincent Biancomano <103520.355@CompuServe.COM>
Message-ID: <96giabkpb2@sshuraac-i-1.production.compuserve.com>
Source record: 3749

>The End.

For the Amateur Service, unfortunately.
It could take two decades to restore it.
The fact that the Commission still has the
petition for reconsideration in hand a
year after filed, still trying to figure out
how to address it, is proof positive they've
created a monster of their own making.

Regards,
Vince, WB2EZG

3550. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-15 12:35:05 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <3A8BCCF9.D879225@arrl.org>
Source record: 3750

Vincent Biancomano wrote:
>
> You've missed the point entirely. Conversing on 'amateur
> frequencies' within an 'amateur service' does not an Amateur
> Service make. Without a technical learning infrastructure (and we
> no longer have that), we no longer have Amateur Radio, as
> defined. That's what the petition for reconsideration is about.
> And FCC is still frozen in place with it, not knowing how to
> handle it.

The world according to Vince: The FCC has no allegiance to anyone, is on a 20-year mission to destroy ham radio, and is unable to figure out how to write a response that says: "Nothing new here. Dismissed."

Jon

3551. 28.085 New channel 19 ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-21 22:04:28 UTC
From: Ken Diaz <kenjd@email.msn.com>
Message-ID: <#yahnTFnAHA.341@cpmsnbbsa09>
Source record: 3950

Truckers from "back east" are S-7 to S-9 here in Southern California. Hope Reilly knows about this. This posting is so we can assist in trying to locate these guys (Texas?). These guys are now appearing daily.
Thanks, Ken, WB9YCJ/6

3552. FBI spy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-22 12:36:09 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <3A9507B9.C1FD3DC6@arrl.org>
Source record: 3951

Here's something interesting:

HANSSEN, ROBERT P, K9QVL (General)
9414 TALISMAN DR
VIENNA, VA 22182
Issue Date: Sep 15, 1997
Expire Date: Sep 15, 2007
Date of last Change: Sep 15, 1997

Same name and address as the FBI agent arrested for spying. See:
http://news.findlaw.com/cnn/docs/hanssen/hanssenaff022001.pdf (600+ kB).

Jon

3553. Re: Open Source Trusted E-QSL System proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-22 12:43:59 UTC
From: lak <lak@radioland.net>
Message-ID: <#GJWuzMnAHA.269@cpmsnbbsa07>
Source record: 3801
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc

I agree with Darryl on this, in fact my correspondance with the ARRL regarding E-QSL revealed they are looking into this method. What is needed is actually an organization rather than individual. Historically, individuals will eventually quit or pass-on thus leaving the system "dead-in-the-water".

On the topic of actual "wall paper" nothing should prevent the use of these cards. In fact, if modeled after the currency systems of the world paper QSLs equate to paper money and E-QSLs equate to wire transfers. I like to collect paper QSLs but right now I have several countries on E-QSL that are worthless toward DXCC (the initial 100) that are badly nedded. In fact, one overseas ham was not aware of the ARRL stand and had actually sent me an E-QSL plus one through the slow and antiquated QSL Bureau System. (On that topic I have at least 3 envelopes on file - one for each postage change but nothing comes out. In fact the Bureau assistant manager for my call group will not respond to email inquires.)

The cavet for the organization accepting this responsibility is they cannot require membership to access. They could charge a fee for registration maintenance to recover costs.

kal

"Darryl Wagoner - WA1GON" <darryl_NOSPAM@shecora.com> wrote in message news:904F5E29CdarrylNOSPAMshecorac@207.126.101.100...
> Greetings,
>
> I believe in E-QSL, but nothing I have seen so fair fills the bill.
>
> I think the solution should be open source so that we don't get
> locked in to one provider of trusted E-QSLs.
>

3554. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-22 12:44:32 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net>
Message-ID: <3A9509B0.63EB3038@ovis.net>
Source record: 3953

Aaron Jones wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net> wrote:
> >I don't know of any contests which require an *accurate* signal
> >report be given.
>
> Do you agree that it's kind of silly to have a signal report
> requirement for a contest if it means nothing?

Call it semantics again if you like, I'd use the word "pointless" rather
than "silly". Since you've told us that you're not a contester, it's
really no skin off your nose.

> >My Sunday evenings were always reserved for my several hour chats with
> >my QSL manager and some pals. DXers, as a general rule, observed our
> >desire to rag chew during those times.
>
> When you are the DX, you make your own ragchewing rules... :-)

Exactly!

Dave K8MN

3555. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-22 12:46:49 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net>
Message-ID: <3A950A39.85B16C36@ovis.net>
Source record: 3952

Cecil wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > Nowhere did I disagree with Webster. I disagree with the improper use
> > of the word "forced" and I disagree with your use of the improper
> > definition in an effort to make a word what you'd like it to mean.
>
> I don't have any choice in the matter. A word means what the dictionary
> says it means, not what you or I would like for it to mean.

Sure you do. Several times you've given a dictionary definition chosen from one of several meanings. Several times you've chosen the wrong definition to suit the situation. I say that you HAVE chosen definitions which suit your purpose and ignore definitions which do not.

Dave K8MN

3556. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-22 12:48:07 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net>
Message-ID: <3A950A87.D77996E6@ovis.net>
Source record: 3954

Cecil wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > I don't know about its being more neutral but it is correct. One of the
> > requirements for an HF ticket is the passage of a morse exam.
>
> And, according to the dictionary, in order to meet the requirements
> for an HF ticket, one is forced to learn Morse code (if one doesn't
> already know it).

You were wrong the last time you trotted out this crap and you're wrong
now.

Dave K8MN

3557. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-22 12:52:10 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net>
Message-ID: <3A950B7A.48864340@ovis.net>
Source record: 3956

Cecil wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > Nobody in the history of the world has ever been forced to obtain an
> > amateur radio license. If one can't be forced to obtain a license, then
> > one cannot be forced to learn morse in order to obtain one.
>
> You obviously do not understand the definition of "forced", Dave.
> From Webster's: "forced - done or produced with effort, ...". In
> order to obtain an HF ham license, one is forced to learn Morse
> code, if one doesn't already know it.

I understand the definition to be applied to the situation, Cecil.
Learning morse is not "compulsory" or "forced". Either you are unable to
properly use a dictionary or you are trolling. There can be no other
explanation.

> > My state requires a motorcycle endorsement in order to ride a motorcyle.
> > That includes a written exam and a driving exam. I'm not tickled about
> > taking either but I want to drive a motorcycle. I don't feel forced at
> > all.
>
> Your feelings are irrelevant. To be able to legally ride a motorcycle,
> one is forced to take the motorcycle exams. That's completely consistent
> with the definition of "forced". Your argument is with the dictionary,
> not with me.

I have no argument with the dictionary definition. I am not forced to
obtain a motorcycle endorsement. It is my choice to obtain one. Riding
a motorcycle is no more mandatory than obtaining an amateur radio
license. No force is involved.

Dave K8MN

3558. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-22 12:53:15 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net>
Message-ID: <3A950BBB.70C44680@ovis.net>
Source record: 3957

Cecil wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > Cecil wrote:
> > > Hams who want to legally operate a
> > > transmitter on HF ham frequencies are forced to learn Morse code.
> > >
> > Which is just fine so long as they have the option of declining to get a
> > ham license. Ham radio is just not a suitable hobby for everyone, you
> > now...Don't you?
>
> I never said otherwise. This argument is over the definition of the
> word "forced". Either you accept the dictionary or you don't. If you
> don't accept the dictionary then we cannot communicate.

We obviously cannot communicate, Cecil, even if we accept the
dictionary.

Dave K8MN

3559. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-22 12:54:45 UTC
From: kelly@dvol
Message-ID: <3a950c0f.98992112@news2.dvol.com>
Source record: 3955

On Wed, 21 Feb 2001 17:40:41 GMT, Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
wrote:

>kelly@dvol (Brian Kelly, w3rv) wrote:
>>There is no such thing as an "honest signal report".
>
>I give honest signal reports with *every* QSO...
>
When was it that you last calibrated yer s-meter against traceable
standards? Having done that who cares??
>
>>Giving everybody a 599 saves messing with bookeeping details
>>nobody actually cares about.
>
>So why not get rid of the apparently worthless piece of info...
>
(1) It's in the rules, part of the game.
(2) There's a lot more than just the signal report in the exchange.
Make a few percent copying errors and the sponser's computers will
bounce you out of the contest.
>
>>You only have to program one channel in the memory keyer or one
>>function key on the keyboard to ship the whole exchange.
>
>No much manual skill involved anymore is there...
>
Any idiot, even you can send 45wpm with a computer or a memory keyer.
Try copying 45wpm in a contest with a computer.
>
>>[Aaron: I think I could "dredge" up a QSO just about anytime.]
>>I sed dx qso.
>
>I know, but I don't do DX.
>
No surprise there. You yak with Burke all day all night or what?
>
>>The boat got bigger, 3 bands bigger, they're spread around more, lotta
>>of 'em doing PSK31, etc.
>
>Ok, I'll modify my original statement. Contesters go back to their
>mikes *and* PSK31 after the contests...
>
Name one.
>

>>Yeah, activity is down a bit from 25 years ago. At the rate cw is
>>"dying" it looks like it'll take another 25 years to drop down another
>>noticeable increment. Hold yer breath.
>
>Yep, I hope that I can keep my breath for
>at least another 25 years... :-)
>
. . . duhhhh
>
w3rv

3560. Re: FBI spy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-22 13:01:02 UTC
From: Keith Wood <kw@bctv.com>
Message-ID: <3A950D8E.48FCE8F3@bctv.com>
Source record: 3958

Espionage at 13WPM?

Jon Bloom wrote:
>
> Here's something interesting:
>
> HANSSEN, ROBERT P, K9QVL (General)
> 9414 TALISMAN DR
> VIENNA, VA 22182
> Issue Date: Sep 15, 1997
> Expire Date: Sep 15, 2007
> Date of last Change: Sep 15, 1997
>
> Same name and address as the FBI agent arrested for spying. See:
> http://news.findlaw.com/cnn/docs/hanssen/hanssenaff022001.pdf (600+ kB).
>
> Jon

3561. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-22 13:05:52 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net>
Message-ID: <3A950EB0.589992FD@ovis.net>
Source record: 3959

Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> On Thu, 22 Feb 2001 05:31:09 +0000, Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net> wrote:
>
> >Cecil wrote:
> >> If someone has to expend unwanted effort to achieve a requirement,
> >> they have, by definition, been forced to do so by the requirement.
> >> That's one of the Webster's definitions of "forced". There's nothing
> >> said or implied one way or another about the social value of being
> >> forced. People who want to legally operate a vehicle are forced to
> >> obtain a driver's license. Hams who want to legally operate a
> >> transmitter on HF ham frequencies are forced to learn Morse code.
> >>
> >Nobody in the history of the world has ever been forced to obtain an
> >amateur radio license. If one can't be forced to obtain a license, then
> >one cannot be forced to learn morse in order to obtain one.
>
> That is true of the license itself, but once anyone decides to
> obtain a license, the requirements become mandatory. THAT
> is the issue...the reuirements of government imposed on individuals
> to obtain ANY license MUST bear relavence and justification to
> the license being obtained. Those of us on the No Code Test side
> believe (as does the FCC IMHO) that a code test is NO LONGER
> a valid requirement to get a ham license. The ONLY rational that
> sustained even a 5 wpm test for HF was and still is the international
> treaty agreement.

"Once one decides" is a really important clause, Bill. It certainly
implies choice. Obtaining a ham ticket is not mandatory. If one
decides for himself to obtain one, he meets the requirements for
obtaining it.

I know what your side believes and you know that I do not agree with
your premise, IMNSHO. Now what do we do about that darned "forced"
written test? Think we should take out all of those pesky technical
questions? After all, if we simply know the regs and a few safety
rules, we can always send our equipment back for factory service.

> >My state requires a motorcycle endorsement in order to ride a motorcyle.
> >That includes a written exam and a driving exam. I'm not tickled about
> >taking either but I want to drive a motorcycle. I don't feel forced at
> >all.
>
> That is because those requirements are VALID in relation to the
> license you will be issued by the state. Would you have such

> a generous viewpoint if one of those requirements was
> to pass a CPR or first aid test to get the motorcycle license?

CPR relates to motorcycle as morse code relates to ham radio? I'm not buying.

> >Riding a motorcycle is not mandatory in West Virginia.
> >Your argument is as invalid now as it was the last time this went
> >around.
>
> Actually, the argument IS valid because that is the perspective
> that the FCC clearly has with regard to ALL the requirements.
> The individual requirements for any license ARE mandatory
> to get that license and it has been and still is the FCC's job
> to JUSTIFY any such license requirements.

...and it would be a state's "job" in ensure that motor vehicle regs for licensing are justifiable. I'm still not forced to obtain an amateur license or a motorcycle endorsement. I'm not willing to assist you in creating a new class of victim.

It is my observation that things which are deregulated or less regulated seldom work as well as they did under regulation.

Dave K8MN

3562. Bootleg Operators on 10 Meters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-22 13:12:16 UTC
From: qrm2000@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010222081216.12258.00002240@ng-fz1.aol.com>
Source record: 3960

>From: Gary Danaher

>I vote for
>sending all those crappy import radios to a smelter in Pennylvania.
>

Amen!

I recently reinstalled my 10 meter rig in the car and I have been monitoring 28.085 (AM mode) while driving around. It is astounding to hear how many truckers are using this as a "company" channel.

I hear RTTY and voice announcements being made, but it appears that the truck drivers are chatting while going down the road within one mile of each other. Therefore, it is difficult to jam them or to get their attention. They probably have their radios at full squelch.

The latest QST addresses this issue in a 2-page article. If hams are interested in defending 10 meters against intruders (and want to do it "by the book" as the ARRL recommends), it will take a lot of stations monitoring to document illegal activity and help locate it.

A couple of years ago, I nearly had two of the truckers in sight. They were coming toward me and the signals were getting quite strong. They stopped transmitting just before reaching my location. I was going to get the names of the company and write the president. (This has worked occasionally in the past. Typically, the company president confers with his legal department and then sends the supervisors into the yards to check for FCC Type Approval on the radios).

Now, a question.....do we need a central clearing house for information so it can be tabulated by computer to look for patterns?

QRM

3563. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-22 13:51:24 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9735gsjok0@208.207.71.146>
Source record: 3961

Cecil wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > Nowhere did I disagree with Webster. I disagree with the improper use
> > of the word "forced" and I disagree with your use of the improper
> > definition in an effort to make a word what you'd like it to mean.
>
> I don't have any choice in the matter. A word means what the dictionary
> says it means, not what you or I would like for it to mean.

Dave, don't blame Cecil because he can't stay on subject and in
context.

3564. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-22 13:55:47 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9735p3$ki5$0@208.207.71.146>
Source record: 3962

Bill Sohl wrote:
>

once anyone decides to
> obtain a license, the requirements become mandatory.

And that is the point at which one must decide whether or not he will
FORCE HIMSELF to comply with the requirements.

3565. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-22 13:57:32 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A951ACC.13DB3275@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3964

Dave Heil wrote:
> Learning morse is not "compulsory" or "forced".

Yes, it is if one wants to operate legally on the HF ham frequencies.
From Webster's: "forced - enforced or compulsory - required by
circumstances" The FCC enforces the Morse code requirement for HF hams.

> I have no argument with the dictionary definition.

Of course you do, Dave. That's the only argument you have.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

3566. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-22 14:03:39 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A951C3B.EB16584F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3965

Dave Heil wrote:
> Obtaining a ham ticket is not mandatory.

That's a straw man argument because no one said a ham ticket is
mandatory. Morse code *is* mandatory for an HF ham ticket. It is
"required by circumstances" which is the definition of "forced".

> Now what do we do about that darned "forced" written test?

Nothing. Some forced tests are reasonable, e.g. a driver's test.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

3567. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-22 14:05:09 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A951C95.7F454572@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3966

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> Bill Sohl wrote:
> > once anyone decides to
> > obtain a license, the requirements become mandatory.
>
> And that is the point at which one must decide whether or not he will
> FORCE HIMSELF to comply with the requirements.

If he wants an HF ham license, he is forced to learn Morse code. From
Webster's: "forced - required by circumstances".
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

3568. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-22 14:06:45 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A951CF5.36AD78EF@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3967

Dave Heil wrote:
> We obviously cannot communicate, Cecil, even if we accept the
> dictionary.

We cannot communicate because you and Dick will not accept the
Webster's dictionary definition of "forced - required by
circumstances".
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

3569. Re: FBI spy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-22 14:07:28 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9736f0$ln0$0@208.207.71.146>
Source record: 3963

Keith Wood wrote:
>
> Espionage at 13WPM?
>

Why not? Wouldn't be the first time, you know.

3570. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-22 14:11:38 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A951E1A.1114CA48@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3968

Dave Heil wrote:
> You were wrong the last time you trotted out this crap and you're wrong
> now.

So you assert the Webster's dictionary definition of "forced - required by circumstances", is incorrect. Take it up with the publishers. I, for one, will continue to honor the conventions of the English language. To do otherwise is to try to confound the language for ulterior purposes.

The *fact* remains - in order to gain legal access to the HF ham bands, one is forced to learn Morse code, if one doesn't already know it.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

3571. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-22 14:19:32 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A951FF4.1121C82E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3970

Dave Heil wrote:
> Several times you've given a dictionary definition chosen
> from one of several meanings. Several times you've chosen the wrong
> definition to suit the situation. I say that you HAVE chosen
> definitions which suit your purpose and ignore definitions which do not.

Of course, Dave, that's what people do. Does a computer bus have wheels?
Of course not. When I choose the word "bus" for something inside a
computer, do you object to that usage because it doesn't have wheels?
Who died and made you the great white father of definitions? When I
use the word "forced", I am using it correctly and in context. I chose
the usage of the word. Trying to dictate the contextual definition of
another person's statement is just the despicable act of a bully.

The fact remains: In order to gain legal access to the HF ham bands,
one is forced (required by circumstances) to learn Morse code, if one
doesn't already know it.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

3572. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-22 14:28:31 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <3A95220F.638C513B@arrl.org>
Source record: 3969

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> I would have expected you or Ed to catch that Jones exposed a flaw in
> the
> "hand in pocket" safety theme...it doesn't always work. But what newbie
> could be expected to know it?

I see you're again reading things that weren't written.

Jon

3573. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-22 15:24:21 UTC
From: K0HB@arrl.org
Message-ID: <973av5alk1@news.netmar.com>
Source record: 3971

Aaron Jones said:

>Do you agree that it's kind of silly to have a signal report
>requirement for a contest if it means nothing?

No.

>When you are the DX, you make your own ragchewing rules... :-)

Everybody makes their own ragchewing rules. (Unless they're some
sort of sheep following what "everyone else" does.)

73, de Hans, K0HB

----- Posted via NewsOne.Net: Free (anonymous) Usenet News via the Web -----
http://newsone.net/ -- Free reading and anonymous posting to 60,000+ groups
NewsOne.Net prohibits users from posting spam. If this or other posts
made through NewsOne.Net violate posting guidelines, email abuse@newsone.net

3574. Re: Bootleg Operators on 10 Meters

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-22 15:38:51 UTC
From: Keith <kewyatt@apexmail.com>
Message-ID: <pbca9ts2f3kckfthdpej8qpsq1r6og128t@news>
Source record: 3972

On 22 Feb 2001 13:12:16 GMT, Qrm2000
<20010222081216.12258.00002240@ng-fz1.aol.com> wrote:

>I hear RTTY and voice announcements being made, but it appears that the truck
>drivers are chatting while going down the road within one mile of each other.
>Therefore, it is difficult to jam them or to get their attention. They
>probably have their radios at full squelch.

One of the ways to combat this is to find out who the driver works for. If it is an independent driver there isn't much you can do, but if it is a UPS or other company driver a prompt letter to the company headquarters about the use of their equipment in the commission in a federal crime will certainly get their attention. Make sure you send a copy to Hollingsworth.

--
Best Regards,

Keith (Use Reply-to for email)

Where do you discover free software for Windows? Strongsignals DOT COM is a great place to start: http://Strongsignals.com "Where would Christianity be if Jesus got eight to fifteen years with time off for good behavior?" NY State Senator James Donovan, speaking in support of capital punishment.

3575. Re: Open Source Trusted E-QSL System proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-22 18:33:34 UTC
From: "radiosigs@mindspring.com" <radiosigs@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <973pifbnf1@nntp9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 3977
Cross-posted to:
alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Oy vey, what bullsnot! You are definitely on the right track concerning e-QSLs but all this damn bureaucratic rigamarole red tape nonsense over them is preposterous.

You work a guy and he sends a plain and simple e-mail conformation. "This is to acknowledge my SSB contact with WX56Fink on 14.279 at 0046 UTC, Feb.20,2001. Ur sig 5/7 and so forth and so on." You then print it out and if need be send it to the ARRL for your WAS or WAC or whatever. If they accept it,fine. If not, they're cutting off their nose to spite their face. Why my cavalier attitude?

One has to be just plain stupid not to know that computers are overwhelming ham radio in interest/popularity. The ARRL wants to do everything possible to keep their own tuchuses afloat so why would they reject such down to earth e-QSLs? You think they're out to make it tougher on Joe Ham? And besides, we are a cut above the rest, aren't we?

By nature, QSL collectors are Boy Scouts except of course if they nowadays lean toward homosexuality which is taboo. At any rate this whole concept of e-QSLs is excellent. The price of postage keeps rising and so do QSL cards. Naturally if the ARRL goes along with the idea, their QSL printer advertisers will go crazy and try to convince them of the fact that every e-one will be bogus. But in the long run they'll shut up because it's a losing battle for them.

"Wags" you're a flaming genius but enough with all this pomp and circumstance regarding the formalization and authenticity of those cards. Want to work the country of "Goochaboola." Nowadays one can either listen for it on the bands and send a signal at 186,000 miles per second to snag it or look for a newsgroup, alt.goochaboola.politics and work it that way. Want to keep ham radio alive? INCORPORATE computer QSLs into it instead of scoffing at the idea. How about an autograph, "Wags?" You're a mover and shaker.
Doc,AF2Y

In article <tZcl6.117$oX3.6293@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>, "cotter pins" <thisiscream@aol.com> wrote:

> "Darryl Wagoner - WA1GON" <darryl_NOSPAM@shecora.com> wrote in message
> news:904F5E29CdarrylNOSPAMshecorac@207.126.101.100...
>> Greetings,
>>
>> I believe in E-QSL, but nothing I have seen so fair fills the bill.

>>
>> I think the solution should be open source so that we don't get
>> locked in to one provider of trusted E-QSLs.
>>
>> Here is the idea:
>>
>> The system would use digital signatures based upon the RSA
>> encryption standard. The public key would be signed by a
>> trusted third party. Once the key has been signed, it can
>> be transmitted with the E-QSL or looked up in a trusted public
>> key server. The details is a little hard to explain, but
>> the jest is once a amateur has a signed public key, anyone
>> can validate their e-qsl information without using a active
>> protocol with a third part. This means that my log program
>> can email a qsl information almost in real time.
>>
>> Everything needed to do this is public and free to use. We
>> will need the following functions:
>>
>> 1. Certification Authority software and libraries.
>> 2. Signing libraries.
>> 3. validation libraires.
>>
>> The goal is to create a set of libraries and software which
>> will be licensed using LGPL (Lessier Gnu Public Licenses) or
>> open software licenses. This will allow trusted groups such
>> as ARRL to have a revenue on create certifications (signing
>> public keys) but no one will have a lock on the software.
>> This we allow logging software authors to incorporate digital
>> signature functions into their logging program without having
>> to pay a license fee.
>>
>> I can do most of the design and some of the program, but I
>> can't do it by myself. Most important I DO NOT want to OWN IT.
>> For this to work it must be a free standard, with no strings
>> attached.
>>
>> TQSL to be:
>>
>> 1. A trusted system
>> 2. Free and open standards
>> 3. Easy to use and implement. ie: Users pushs a button on
>> his/her logging program and a TQSL is created. This eqsl
>> could be sent via email, to a e-buro, etc. The important
>> thing is once created it can be authenicated at any point
>> by anyone, just by point software at it.
>>
>> Any takers?
>>
>> Darryl Wagoner WA1GON

3576. Re: Open Source Trusted E-QSL System proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-22 18:35:05 UTC
From: cotter pins <thisiscream@aol.com>
Message-ID: <tZcl6.117$oX3.6293@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 3973
Cross-posted to:
alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Now let me get this straight Darryl....

We now need a system of "E-QSL's" because (really) hams are
too stinking *cheap* to spend 34 cents postage to put their QSL
in a envelope..??

This is the root cause (above) which is REALLY driving this issue!
Is it no? Be honest now. What a bunch of tightwads you
hams are. When's the last time GW saw sunlight opening up your moldy
wallets? And I thought all these guys were tighter than a crab's asshole
at hamfests - hoy.

"Darryl Wagoner - WA1GON" <darryl_NOSPAM@shecora.com> wrote in message
news:904F5E29CdarrylNOSPAMshecorac@207.126.101.100...
> Greetings,
>
> I believe in E-QSL, but nothing I have seen so fair fills the bill.
>
> I think the solution should be open source so that we don't get
> locked in to one provider of trusted E-QSLs.
>
> Here is the idea:
>
> The system would use digital signatures based upon the RSA
> encryption standard. The public key would be signed by a
> trusted third party. Once the key has been signed, it can
> be transmitted with the E-QSL or looked up in a trusted public
> key server. The details is a little hard to explain, but
> the jest is once a amateur has a signed public key, anyone
> can validate their e-qsl information without using a active
> protocol with a third part. This means that my log program
> can email a qsl information almost in real time.
>
> Everything needed to do this is public and free to use. We
> will need the following functions:
>
> 1. Certification Authority software and libraries.
> 2. Signing libraries.
> 3. validation libraires.
>
> The goal is to create a set of libraries and software which
> will be licensed using LGPL (Lessier Gnu Public Licenses) or
> open software licenses. This will allow trusted groups such

> as ARRL to have a revenue on create certifications (signing
> public keys) but no one will have a lock on the software.
> This we allow logging software authors to incorporate digital
> signature functions into their logging program without having
> to pay a license fee.
>
> I can do most of the design and some of the program, but I
> can't do it by myself. Most important I DO NOT want to OWN IT.
> For this to work it must be a free standard, with no strings
> attached.
>
> TQSL to be:
>
> 1. A trusted system
> 2. Free and open standards
> 3. Easy to use and implement. ie: Users pushs a button on
> his/her logging program and a TQSL is created. This eqsl
> could be sent via email, to a e-buro, etc. The important
> thing is once created it can be authenicated at any point
> by anyone, just by point software at it.
>
> Any takers?
>
> Darryl Wagoner WA1GON
> darryl@shecora.com

3577. Re: Don`t say you haven`t been warned . 1590

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-22 18:42:51 UTC
From: kb9tmp@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <973mjb$73g$1@news.netmar.com>
Source record: 3974
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew

In article <3a8f8f7f$33_1@plato.netscapeonline.co.uk>,
<diywbt@safesurfers.org> writes:
>Watch out you, are YOU being checked.............
>
>Have you viewed illegal pictures
>
>You're in Serious Trouble - It's a Proven Fact!
>
>Deleting "Internet Cache and History" will NOT protect you
>because any of the Web Pages, Pictures, Movies, Videos, Sounds,
>E-mail, Chat Logs and Everything Else you see or do could easily be
recovered
>
>This is the answer...................
http://www.evidence-eliminator.com/go.shtml?A653704
>
>Surf safely folks!
>sfphhefrzpkrotspiusnwlgvnxpjlehntbpbbczmbkgk
>

Or you could go to http://www.completelyfreesoftware.com/ and download
Eraser version 4.1 for FREE and save the $74.95(US) to spend on something
else like maybe radio equipment ;)

----- Posted via NewsOne.Net: Free (anonymous) Usenet News via the Web -----
http://newsone.net/ -- Free reading and anonymous posting to 60,000+ groups
NewsOne.Net prohibits users from posting spam. If this or other posts
made through NewsOne.Net violate posting guidelines, email abuse@newsone.net

3578. Re: Open Source Trusted E-QSL System proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-22 19:04:56 UTC
From: Darryl Wagoner <dwagoner@shecora.com>
Message-ID: <3A9562D8.760DD83A@shecora.com>
Source record: 3975
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

cotter pins wrote:

> Now let me get this straight Darryl....
>
> We now need a system of "E-QSL's" because (really) hams are
> too stinking *cheap* to spend 34 cents postage to put their QSL
> in a envelope..??
>
> This is the root cause (above) which is REALLY driving this issue!
> Is it no? Be honest now. What a bunch of tightwads you
> hams are. When's the last time GW saw sunlight opening up your moldy
> wallets? And I thought all these guys were tighter than a crab's asshole
> at hamfests - hoy.

I really think cost is a secondary factor. The main factor is that e-QSLs
are
easy and fast. I known hams who have waited over a year for a QSL card.
Cost is important as well. There is the cost of printing and the cost
of mailing. $0.34 isn't much until you have to mail out 30,000 cards, then
we are talking real money. Even someone like me who only makes
a few thousand contacts per year it still adds up.

The other issue is Trusted E-QSLs will help streamline the awards process.
Not only in the amount of time it takes to process the award, but in
the time required to collect the QSL cards.

I have been getting a lot of interest in email about this concept.

Later
Darryl WA1GON

3579. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-22 19:10:22 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <ocha9tgcuqlecgeer2ali0sn8je6qfc84k@4ax.com>
Source record: 3976

Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net> wrote:
> I'd use the word "pointless" rather than "silly".
>Since you've told us that you're not a contester, it's
>really no skin off your nose.

Actually if they did away with all of ham radio except ragchewing on CW it would be no skin off my nose. But I guess what you're really saying is why should I care about false signal reports in a contest if I'm not a contester. I don't. I was just interested to see if there was any logical explanation for this "pointless" practice. Apparently not, and judging from some of the abrasive responses (by others) it is a rather sensitive subject... :-)

3580. Re: Open Source Trusted E-QSL System proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-22 20:02:41 UTC
From: K0HB@arrl.org
Message-ID: <973r91$g7d$1@news.netmar.com>
Source record: 3979
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave

In article <3A9562D8.760DD83A@shecora.com>, Darryl Wagoner
<dwagoner@shecora.com> writes:
>cotter pins wrote:
>
>> Now let me get this straight Darryl....
>>
>> We now need a system of "E-QSL's" because (really) hams are
>> too stinking *cheap* to spend 34 cents postage to put their QSL
>> in a envelope..??
>>
>> This is the root cause (above) which is REALLY driving this issue!
>> Is it no? Be honest now. What a bunch of tightwads you
>> hams are. When's the last time GW saw sunlight opening up your moldy
>> wallets? And I thought all these guys were tighter than a crab's asshole
>> at hamfests - hoy.
>
>I really think cost is a secondary factor. The main factor is that e-QSLs
>are
>easy and fast. I known hams who have waited over a year for a QSL card.
>Cost is important as well. There is the cost of printing and the cost
>of mailing. $0.34 isn't much until you have to mail out 30,000 cards, then
>we are talking real money. Even someone like me who only makes
>a few thousand contacts per year it still adds up.
>
>The other issue is Trusted E-QSLs will help streamline the awards process.
>Not only in the amount of time it takes to process the award, but in
>the time required to collect the QSL cards.
>
>I have been getting a lot of interest in email about this concept.
>
>Later
>Darryl WA1GON
>
>

----- Posted via NewsOne.Net: Free (anonymous) Usenet News via the Web -----
http://newsone.net/ -- Free reading and anonymous posting to 60,000+ groups
NewsOne.Net prohibits users from posting spam. If this or other posts
made through NewsOne.Net violate posting guidelines, email abuse@newsone.net

3581. Re: 11meters, freebanding, and the no-code tech ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-22 20:09:05 UTC
From: "Leland C. Scott" <no-spam@junk-mail.net>
Message-ID: <t9asejie0o3p6b@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 3978

"RMoretta" <rmoretta@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20010221223210.26080.00002145@ng-mo1.aol.com...
> Don't like a
> service paralleling the amateur service?(As meritless an arguement as
that
> is!)...let the ITU agreement handle it, NOT the ARRL!

If I remember reading the FCC's reasons for denying the petition correctly, it was the FCC that made the comment, about not creating a service paralleling the Amateur service, not the ARRL. The ARRL's concern, again from what I remember reading, was allowing CBers to legally work DX would only encourage further use of amplifiers, a practice already out of control on 11m as it is among other things.

--
Leland C. Scott
KC8LDO

3582. Re: Open Source Trusted E-QSL System proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-22 20:13:37 UTC
From: K0HB@qwest.net
Message-ID: <973rthhgo1@news.netmar.com>
Source record: 3980
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave

In article <3A9562D8.760DD83A@shecora.com>, Darryl Wagoner
<dwagoner@shecora.com> writes:

>The other issue is Trusted E-QSLs will help streamline the awards process.
>Not only in the amount of time it takes to process the award, but in
>the time required to collect the QSL cards.

I've already been notified I'd be a pariah if I opposed this idea, so my
continued opposition can't hurt me anymore, I guess.

There are four reasons (at least) why this idea will not be widely adopted.

#1) Traditionalists (like me) who place high value on paper QSLs will not
participate in an eQSL scheme.

#2) Most major DXpeditions derive much of their funding from donations
received in the QSL process. They are unlikely to participate in scheme
which diminishes that funding channel.

#3) Perhaps less than 50% of the DXCC 'entities' have the required telecom
infrastructure to support routine participation by the average resident.

#4) ARRL is well down the path of deploying LOTW which will become the DXCC
"eLog", and thus the 'solution of choice' among serious DX players. Any
other scheme is second-tier right out of the box.

73, Pariah, K0HB

Good luck on this one now!

----- Posted via NewsOne.Net: Free (anonymous) Usenet News via the Web -----
http://newsone.net/ -- Free reading and anonymous posting to 60,000+ groups
NewsOne.Net prohibits users from posting spam. If this or other posts
made through NewsOne.Net violate posting guidelines, email abuse@newsone.net

3583. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-22 20:16:52 UTC
From: tlbryant@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <973s3k0sqq@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 3982

In article <972088$84g$1@news.service.uci.edu>, jwkelley@uci.edu says...
>
>
>T. L. Bryant <tlbryant@my-deja.com> wrote in message
>news:971po402m88@enews2.newsguy.com...
>> I can follow discussion when a relative and logical comparison is made.
>It's
>> not so easy when you pull something out of your colon that supposed to
>make me
>> understand what you're talking about.
>
>Did you force yourself to write your reply, or do you write on autopilot?

Like an umpire, I call 'em as I see 'em.

3584. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-22 20:28:07 UTC
From: tlbryant@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <973son1sqq@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 3983

In article <971u7t$7bk$1@208.207.71.169>, dixie@townsqr.com says...

>> It's not a question of whether or not certain criteria are met. It's of
whethe
>r
>> that criteria has relevance when it serves nothing more than having a
>> recreational value as a communications mode. You can sit and argue symantics
>> and word definitions as much as you want, but many perceived the high-speed
>> morse testing of the past as being a hazing ritual that they were "forced"
to
>> take in order to have HF phone privileges. An applicant may have meet all
othe
>r
>> criteria, but most definately *is* penalized if that all-mighty code test is
>> not passed.
>
>
>Gee, TL I'm sure sorry you couldn't "force" yourself to do it. Maybe you
>should exercise a little better control over yourself?

If that's intended to mean that I haven't passed any amateur licensing exams, I suggest you learn how to use an archive service, such as deja.com. You'll find my callsign postings I've made within the past year. When you do find it, you'll also find that I have been licensed as an Extra since 1997, well before the current re-structuring was put into place. I quit posting my callsign to prove a point, and that is that no matter what your opinion is, it seems that if no one posts a callsign that shows you've passed a hazing ritual of high-speed morse code testing, some people think that you're opinion doesn't mean jack shit. Thanks for proving my point.

3585. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-22 20:31:20 UTC
From: tlbryant@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <973suo2sqq@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 3984

In article <atv89tckqr1mncr687pv1tnpr72ilaaqc3@4ax.com>, nomail@nomail.com says...
>
>Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote:
>>And I'm still wondering.
>
> That apology doesn't sound very heartfelt... :-)
>
>BTW is there a "hand in the pocket" safety
> question on any of the ham tests?

Yes. It's called safe sex for hams.

3586. Re: Open Source Trusted E-QSL System proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-22 20:46:11 UTC
From: "Ed Hare, W1RFI" <w1rfi@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <2Wel6.319$HH5.1784906@news.ntplx.net>
Source record: 3981

<K0HB@qwest.net> wrote:

> #4) ARRL is well down the path of deploying LOTW which will become the
DXCC
> "eLog", and thus the 'solution of choice' among serious DX players. Any
> other scheme is second-tier right out of the box.

http://www.arrl.org/announce/reports-01/msd.html

73,
Ed Hare, W1RFI

3587. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-22 20:49:09 UTC
From: tlbryant@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <973u053sqq@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 3990

In article <3A94A4C5.5C7FEF4B@ovis.net>, k8mn@ovis.net says...
>
>Jim Kelley wrote:
>>
>> Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com> wrote in message
>> news:3eu79t4btpp6dagemdorlkmd3skcegqok4@4ax.com...
>>
>> > You are right Dave. I was using the word "forced" for editorial
>> > purposes (smokescreen?) but I will stop. However I think you would
>> > have to agree that if you want to be a HF ham you are *required* to
>> > learn the code...
>>
>> TL says that somebody had to blackmail him to get him to learn the code.
>> Must have been some photos of him caught in a compromising situation or
>> something.
>
>...hand in pocket, not working around high voltage.
>
>Dave K8MN

Freud said that people who resort to sexual inuendo, for lack of an argument,
do so to compensate for their own shortcomings. (Pun intended)

3588. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-22 21:02:04 UTC
From: tlbryant@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <973uoc4sqq@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 3989

In article <3A949DED.97503BF6@ovis.net>, k8mn@ovis.net says...

>
>
>I don't think buggy whips or buggies are much used anymore. Morse is in
>current use. That you don't care for it doesn't mean it ceases to
>exist.
>
>Dave K8MN

I guess you don't live close to a large Amish community, do you? Such items are still very much in use there.

But since you want examples that are a little more up to date, I might also point out that there is nothing on a driver's license test that requires you to know how to drive a standard shift vehicle in order to obtain a standard driver's license. This is a matter of choice.

All that matters to you and certain others in this newsgroup, is that you'd rather argue semantics over the usage of the word "forced" in a sentence, than the reasons why high-speed code testing should have been retained for access to HF phone portions.

3589. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-22 21:11:48 UTC
From: tlbryant@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <973vak5sqq@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 3991

In article <3A94A29B.6A9C8F35@ovis.net>, k8mn@ovis.net says...
>

>> It's not a question of whether or not certain criteria are met. It's of
whethe
>r
>> that criteria has relevance when it serves nothing more than having a
>> recreational value as a communications mode. You can sit and argue symantics
>> and word definitions as much as you want, but many perceived the high-speed
>> morse testing of the past as being a hazing ritual that they were "forced"
to
>> take in order to have HF phone privileges. An applicant may have meet all
othe
>r
>> criteria, but most definately *is* penalized if that all-mighty code test is
>> not passed.
>
>Please don't start that "hazing ritual" crap again. The same penalty is
>imposed if someone blows the almighty written exam: no license.
>Don't you just hate that written "hazing ritual"?
>
>Dave K8MN

Go back and read the part where I talked about criteria having relevance, and
stop twisting my words to suit your own bias.

3590. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-22 21:19:55 UTC
From: tlbryant@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <973vpr6sqq@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 3992

In article <3A94A41D.A32E6E38@ovis.net>, k8mn@ovis.net says...

>Nobody in the history of the world has ever been forced to obtain an
>amateur radio license. If one can't be forced to obtain a license, then
>one cannot be forced to learn morse in order to obtain one.
>
>My state requires a motorcycle endorsement in order to ride a motorcyle.
>That includes a written exam and a driving exam. I'm not tickled about
>taking either but I want to drive a motorcycle. I don't feel forced at
>all. Riding a motorcycle is not mandatory in West Virginia.
>
>Your argument is as invalid now as it was the last time this went
>around.
>
>Dave K8MN

Does your state require you to have a motorcycle endorsement if have no
intention of ever owning or riding one?

3591. Re: Open Source Trusted E-QSL System proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-22 21:22:56 UTC
From: Darryl Wagoner <dwagoner@shecora.com>
Message-ID: <3A958330.E328B297@shecora.com>
Source record: 3985

K0HB@qwest.net wrote:

>
> #1) Traditionalists (like me) who place high value on paper QSLs will not
> participate in an eQSL scheme.

I like paper as well. That is one of the reasons I don't want to send my
paper QSL cards off. They do not exclude each other. In fact paper
QSL can also be trustedQSL with a bar code signature.

> #2) Most major DXpeditions derive much of their funding from donations
> received in the QSL process. They are unlikely to participate in scheme
> which diminishes that funding channel.

There may be a funding source from e-QSLs. Then again they maybe
paper only for DXpeditions and even if not paper only I think
people will still donate.

> #3) Perhaps less than 50% of the DXCC 'entities' have the required telecom
> infrastructure to support routine participation by the average resident.

Hmmm? This is where a system like LOTW and eQSL.cc breaks down. It
requires a connection. Trusted QSLs do not, it only requires a computer.
We could even set up e-buros which would collect Trusted Eqsl and send
them via snail mail to an upload point. That would still be faster and cheaper
than standard paper buros. Thanks for the idea!

Or how about this packet networks to send Trusted QSL? Is this legal?
It would be signing the plain text data, so there would be no information hiding.

> #4) ARRL is well down the path of deploying LOTW which will become the DXCC
> "eLog", and thus the 'solution of choice' among serious DX players. Any
> other scheme is second-tier right out of the box.

In the ARRL report the HQ staff was only task with doing it in Jan 01. They
are still review options. I hope one of those options will be a PK Trusted
QSL system. The problem with having a hugh database is that the
person sending and validating the QSL has to be connected. Trusted
QSL that isn't the case. They can be validate at anytime. Of course
what will happen is LOTW will start off as a free service then they
will charge $5.00 then $10.00, $15.00, etc. But now you are locked in
and they have you right where they want you. With a Trusted Open
Source/Standard system no one group will have total control. Which
is the way I like it.

I had thought of an idea to have instantQSL, where the sending would
give you a 6 or 7 character signature, but it turns out it would be

to easy to fake, but it was a great idea while it lasted!

Happy DXings and 73
Darryl WA1GON

3592. Re: Intruder Alert - 29.260 A.M. 2230 Z - 2400 Z

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-22 21:32:57 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010222163257.01736.00000450@nso-bd.aol.com>
Source record: 3986

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.g94ruq0.pminews@ca.news.verio.net>, "Phil Kane"
<Phil.Kane@nospam.spam> writes:

>On 22 Feb 2001 01:33:03 GMT, N2EY wrote:
>
>>A hundred of us swearing on a stack of Bibles that we heard
>>these guys on 29.260 won't do as much as one tape of them. I
>>don't know why, but that's how the FCC works these things today.
>
> That's how it worked 30 years ago as well.....no tape, no cite.
>
> It's called "probative evidence".

Thanks, Phil. I didn't know that term or the history before.

I wonder how many complaints of "I reported it to the FCC but they never did a
thing" can be traced to lack of evidence.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3593. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-22 21:32:57 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010222163257.01736.00000449@nso-bd.aol.com>
Source record: 3987

In article <B6AE2877.1F05%stewartx@sccoast.net>, Dwight Stewart
<stewartx@sccoast.net> writes:

>> Can anyone logically go from being
>> a beginner ham to being an expert
>> ham (who is progressive and abreast
>> with modern science and technology)
>> by passing only THREE multiple
>> choice exams?
>
>
> Good grief! It this myth ever going to go away?

Which myth?
>
> 1. There is no expert ham.

Sure there are - lots of them, on many different subjects. Usually they don't
go around claiming to be experts, though.

I think what you're saying is that the tests don't make one an expert, and
never have. That I can agree with.

>By definition, this is a hobby radio service for amateurs.

Nope. Nowhere in the definition (Part 97) does the word "hobby" appear. What
makes ham radio "amateur" is the prohibition against "pecuniary interest".
>
> 2. The license exam is an entrance exam, not a final exam.

I agree 100%. The exams are by no means comprehensive - and never were.

>It is after
>you get the license that one begins to really learn about radio.

I'm surprised that nobody has challenged this with the "friend who has a Ph.D
in EE" claims!

>The
>license exam is designed ONLY to introduce the basics.

Actually, there's a bit more to it. See below.
>
> 3. The license is a permit to learn about radio, not a graduation diploma
>granted because one passes the license exams.

It's a permit to USE radio. That's important - our licenses are for operating.
Learning is one of the goals, of course.

>
> 4. The various license classes were not designed to endorse skill or
>knowledge. Instead, the license class only shows that the person has
>demonstrated to the FCC that he/she has learned the basic skills necessary
>to operate properly and safely in the frequencies used by that license
>class.

Close, but again there's more to it. The license classes were meant to
incentivize learning - give hams a reward for learning more.
>
> 5. License class is not a gauge of knowledge or skill. A Novice could be
>very knowledgable when it comes to communications technology and electronics
>(complete with an engineering degree to back it up), and the Expert, by
>license class, could be a total idiot when it comes to both of these.

Then you are saying that the tests do not measure radio knowledge at all.
>
> 6. All of the above was as true twenty years ago as it is today.

I disagree. 20 years ago the tests were not the same, and neither was the
license structure nor the exam procedures.

> In fact,
>the recent changes in the license exam structure only emphasizes these
>truths even more.

To an extent, yes.
>
> 7. Recent changes in radio emphasis has reduced the desire for license
>upgrades.

I think it has more to do with saving the FCC a pile of administrative work.

> For example, those only interested in VHF/UHF technology (because
>of employment or whatever), will see little gain from the license classes
>above Technician.

Agree 100%. The Tech was created for just this purpose 50 years ago.

>This further reduces the claim that higher license
>classes yields higher knowledge (different knowledge, yes, but not higher
>knowledge).
>
> Lets put this "expert" ham through license exam, and license class, myth
>to rest, people. It has never been true, and it is even less true today.

Ever see the study guide for the Extra of 1963? I have - it required a bit of
knowledge to pass.

--

Testing actually serves several purposes to the FCC.

The first, as you have correctly noted, is to determine that the licensee knows the basics. How well the tests do this is another question, of course.

The second purpose is to address problems in the ARS. For example, in the old days (>30 years ago), the exams were full of questions about the band edges, frequency measurement, accuracy of various methods of determining frequency, how to order a crystal, etc. The reason for this focus was that there had been problems with hams straying outside the bands, usually because of ignorance of the limits of the technology they used. Today you see less emphasis on such things because they are not much of a problem anymore, and more emphasis on other areas which are perceived problems.

The third purpose is to promote learning by rewarding it with more privileges. ("Incentives")

The fourth purpose is to promote certain technologies by introducing them to hams. That's why the questions on things like spread spectrum and EME, whcih are used by a tiny minority of hams but which are a significant part of the written tests.

There are other purposes, too, but those are the ones I can think of right now.

It is important to note that before 1953 there was an "incentive system" by which hams got more phone privileges by passing a more advanced written exam. This system was reduced in scope in 1953, when the FCC gave Generals and above all amateur privileges. But by 1958 the FCC was talking about reviving this system because they were unhappy about the perceived lack of technical knowledge of many hams of that time. It took ten years of proposals and counter-proposals before the changes known as "incentive licensing" were instituted.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3594. Re: Jim - Off topic - Interesting info on the Titanic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-22 21:51:07 UTC
From: "Leland C. Scott" <no-spam@junk-mail.net>
Message-ID: <t9b2du5nt6ar97@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 3988

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20010222003248.05358.00000061@nso-mh.aol.com...
> But the main point remains that the Titanic disaster was the result of a
whole
> series of mistakes.

No doubt about that. The issue with the steel quality only came about once the wreck was located a few years ago, and some samples were retrieved for analysis.

> It did not have a single cause. The list of things that
> could have prevented the disaster is a long one.

Now everyone can have fun debating which "cause" was the most significant single one, other than not hitting the iceberg, which could have prevent the ship from going down. This sure beats debating the CW testing, and exam issues, at least for a while. 8-)) Take care.

--
Leland C. Scott
KC8LDO

3595. Re: 11meters, freebanding, and the no-code tech ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-22 23:16:05 UTC
From: Martin John Hallsworth <Martin@g1gyc.demon.co.uk>
Message-ID: <982884603.29584.2.nnrp-09.9e98acde@news.demon.co.uk>
Source record: 3993

What is FREEBANDING ?
I am not familiar with this term.

JohnnieWalker wrote in message ...
>I have decided to join the ARRL as a licensed no code tech.
>I want a voice in Washington too....and the American Radio Relay League is
>my new voice.
>
>Death to the old guard and long live the "new" ham radio!
>
>ps- all disgruntled ARRL members are free to cancel their memberships now.
>:-)
>
>

3596. Re: Intruder Alert - 29.260 A.M. 2230 Z - 2400 Z

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-22 23:57:46 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nospam.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.g96fhe0.pminews@ca.news.verio.net>
Source record: 3994

On 22 Feb 2001 21:32:57 GMT, N2EY wrote:

>>>A hundred of us swearing on a stack of Bibles that we heard
>>>these guys on 29.260 won't do as much as one tape of them. I
>>>don't know why, but that's how the FCC works these things today.
>>
>> That's how it worked 30 years ago as well.....no tape, no cite.
>>
>> It's called "probative evidence".
>
>Thanks, Phil. I didn't know that term or the history before.
>
>I wonder how many complaints of "I reported it to the FCC but they never did a
>thing" can be traced to lack of evidence.

In all fairness to the complainants, a lot had to be put on the
back burner over the years because "lack of manpower" was real
(one of the negative supports which led to many of us retiring).

If the "hot topic of the month" was cable leakage, 2-m carrier
throwing took a back seat. When the "throwing" progressed to
cross-banding into the Public Safety channels, the priority was
put into the foreground. I was one of several "pendulum
disturbers" who wanted my investigators to work ham radio cases
despite regional and headquarters policy, and I took my lumps
because of that in the early 90s.

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

3597. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 00:28:20 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A95AEA4.4D64CEA9@uci.edu>
Source record: 3995

"T. L. Bryant" wrote:
> All that matters to you and certain others in this newsgroup, is that you'd
> rather argue semantics over the usage of the word "forced" in a sentence, than
> the reasons why high-speed code testing should have been retained for access to
> HF phone portions.

Seems like six of one, half a dozen of the other to me.

3598. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 00:31:31 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A95AF63.8F41EE4E@uci.edu>
Source record: 3996

"T. L. Bryant" wrote:
> Does your state require you to have a motorcycle endorsement if have no
> intention of ever owning or riding one?

Probably not. Not doubt they are more firm about requiring a motorcycle
test if you want a motorcycle license however.

3599. Re: 11meters, freebanding, and the no-code tech ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 00:52:39 UTC
From: tlbryant@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <974c8n02f2o@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 4000

In article <982884603.29584.2.nnrp-09.9e98acde@news.demon.co.uk>,
Martin@g1gyc.demon.co.uk says...
>
>What is FREEBANDING ?
>I am not familiar with this term.

"Freebanding" is a colloquialism. It is actually unauthorized, 2-way transmissions on frequencies that are reserved for other radio services. These transmissions usually take place above the upper portion of the U.S. citizens band, and often in the 10 meter amateur band.

3600. Re: 11meters, freebanding, and the no-code tech ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 01:06:12 UTC
From: rmoretta@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010222200612.26108.00002409@ng-mo1.aol.com>
Source record: 3997

I think we can safely assume that YOU do NOT operate on 6 meters. Guess where the first harmonic of some high powered CB transmissions fall? Do your homework before posting...please.

P.S. The guy your referring to holds a FCC GROL, is an avionics tech, and a licensed amateur. So much for your "assumptions." 73.

3601. Re: FBI spy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 01:06:52 UTC
From: kelly@dvol
Message-ID: <3a95b710.6229250@news2.dvol.com>
Source record: 3998

On Thu, 22 Feb 2001 07:36:09 -0500, Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote:

>Here's something interesting:
>
>HANSSEN, ROBERT P, K9QVL (General)

>
>Same name and address as the FBI agent arrested for spying.
>
. . . we don't need that kinda "PR".
>
>Jon
>
w3rv

3602. Re: No-code kills

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 01:32:51 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010222203251.01617.00000480@nso-fr.aol.com>
Source record: 3999

In article <970rt52u0e@enews1.newsguy.com>, tlbryant@my-deja.com (T. L. Bryant) writes:

>>>How 'bout Mastaka Noda? Where is Masa these days?
>>>
>>
>>I dunno. But I'm waiting for April 1, 2003 because of what he promised to do
>>then if the number of hams was great enough.
>>
>>73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>The only thing I remember him promising is that he would "crap his hands".
>
BINGO!! That was back on April 1 - 1998, I think. I remember something about how if the number of hams was greater 5 years from that date, he would...you know the rest.

Shades of Hashafisti Scratchi.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3603. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 02:20:50 UTC
From: tlbryant@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <974he202k5g@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 3907

In article <3A95AF63.8F41EE4E@uci.edu>, jwkelley@uci.edu says...
>
>"T. L. Bryant" wrote:
>> Does your state require you to have a motorcycle endorsement if have no
>> intention of ever owning or riding one?
>
>Probably not. Not doubt they are more firm about requiring a motorcycle
>test if you want a motorcycle license however.

This is true, and it also shows how ridiculous Dave's "endorsement" argument
is.

3604. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 02:39:36 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <974ih8jhf0@208.206.142.104>
Source record: 3901

Cecil wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > Cecil wrote:
> > > Hams who want to legally operate a
> > > transmitter on HF ham frequencies are forced to learn Morse code.
> >
> > Which is just fine so long as they have the option of declining to get a
> > ham license. Ham radio is just not a suitable hobby for everyone, you
> > now...Don't you?
>
> I never said otherwise. This argument is over the definition of the
> word "forced". Either you accept the dictionary or you don't. If you
> don't accept the dictionary then we cannot communicate.

Evidently you don't accept that dictionaries have multiple definitions
of many words because they apply differently in different circumstances.
I do.
I also know from years of experience that one of your favorite ploys is
to choose one that is totally inappropriate for the circumstances in
attempting to make a ppoint that is totally wrong. Just as you are
trying to do here. Won't work.

3605. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 02:42:12 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <974im4jhf1@208.206.142.104>
Source record: 3903

Cecil wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > Obtaining a ham ticket is not mandatory.
>
> That's a straw man argument because no one said a ham ticket is
> mandatory. Morse code *is* mandatory for an HF ham ticket. It is
> "required by circumstances" which is the definition of "forced".
>
> > Now what do we do about that darned "forced" written test?
>
> Nothing. Some forced tests are reasonable, e.g. a driver's test.

Oh. So you know what is reasonable and no one else, including the FCC nor governments who make treaties, does. We see. Right.

3606. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 02:43:48 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <974ip4jhf2@208.206.142.104>
Source record: 3902

Cecil wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > We obviously cannot communicate, Cecil, even if we accept the
> > dictionary.
>
> We cannot communicate because you and Dick will not accept the
> Webster's dictionary definition of "forced - required by
> circumstances".

Which means he was NOT forced. Circumstances do not force him go get a ham radio license. Some people decide that exactly and don't get one. So your point (that you are wearing on hour head) is moot.

3607. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 02:45:17 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <974irtjhf3@208.206.142.104>
Source record: 3904

Cecil wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > You were wrong the last time you trotted out this crap and you're wrong
> > now.
>
> So you assert the Webster's dictionary definition of "forced - required
> by circumstances", is incorrect.

Not at all. We KNOW that you routinely misuse such dictionary
definitions incorrectly to suit your own purposes.

3608. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 02:50:47 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <974j67$l6u$0@208.206.142.104>
Source record: 3905

Jon Bloom wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > I would have expected you or Ed to catch that Jones exposed a flaw in
> > the
> > "hand in pocket" safety theme...it doesn't always work. But what newbie
> > could be expected to know it?
>
> I see you're again reading things that weren't written.

Sometime, when you finally realize that all knowledge isn't between your ears, you will understand that everything pertaining to most subjects isn't required to be recorded in each post. When Jones said "when you touch the anode contact of a TV picture tube it doesm't matter where your other hand is" that is an excellent example. It DOESN'T matter, yet it was YOU who read something into that statement that wasn't there, and now you blame me for knowing what he was talking about.

Is there anything the you and Newington doesn't know all about?
FRhetorical question, of course, since we already know the answer.

3609. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 02:56:07 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <974jg7$l6u$1@208.206.142.104>
Source record: 3906

"T. L. Bryant" wrote:
>
>
> Like an umpire, I call 'em as I see 'em.

Be glad yer not. The player's wud toss you outta the game.

3610. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 03:30:21 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A95D94D.9A683FA4@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3908

```
Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> Cecil wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > You were wrong the last time you trotted out this crap and you're wrong
> > > now.
> >
> > So you assert the Webster's dictionary definition of "forced - required
> > by circumstances", is incorrect.
>
> Not at all. We KNOW that you routinely misuse such dictionary
> definitions incorrectly to suit your own purposes.

How can I possibly misuse something that is down in black and white
in the dictionary? Seems your ignorance is showing.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----
```

3611. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 03:37:48 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A95DB0C.30C70C1D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3909

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> Cecil wrote:
> > Nothing. Some forced tests are reasonable, e.g. a driver's test.
>
> Oh. So you know what is reasonable and no one else, including the FCC
> nor governments who make treaties, does. We see. Right.

Some forced tests are obviously reasonable, e.g. pilot's tests.
Some forced tests are obviously unreasonable, e.g. the requirement
for a deaf person to copy Morse code by ear per S25.5. Some forced
tests are debatable, e.g. Morse code tests for all HF hams.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3612. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 03:38:56 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A95DB50.402CA417@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3910

Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> "T. L. Bryant" wrote:
> > Does your state require you to have a motorcycle endorsement if have no
> > intention of ever owning or riding one?
>
> Probably not. Not doubt they are more firm about requiring a motorcycle
> test if you want a motorcycle license however.

Why can't the Morse code requirement be handled the same way?
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3613. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 03:44:37 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A95DCA5.B5B039BB@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3912

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> Cecil wrote:
> > We cannot communicate because you and Dick will not accept the
> > Webster's dictionary definition of "forced - required by
> > circumstances".
>
> Which means he was NOT forced. Circumstances do not force him go get a
> ham radio license.

Nobody has ever said he was forced to get a ham radio license so your statement is just a strawman diversionary argument. What was said was: In order to obtain legal HF ham privileges, he is forced to pass a Morse code exam. Whine all you want about it, that statement is true and is correct English.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3614. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 03:49:57 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A95DDE5.184449E4@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3913

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Evidently you don't accept that dictionaries have multiple definitions
> of many words because they apply differently in different circumstances.

Evidently you don't comprehend that the person who makes the statement
gets to choose the definition of the words he uses. Rail and whine all
you wish. The following is a fact: In order to obtain HF ham privileges,
a ham is forced to pass a Morse code exam, i.e. it is "required by the
circumstances" (the FCC rules). "forced - required by circumstances"
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3615. Re: 11meters, freebanding, and the no-code tech ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 03:52:08 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <974mp8$21a$0@208.206.142.104>
Source record: 3911

RMoretta wrote:
>
> I think we can safely assume that YOU do NOT operate on 6 meters. Guess where
> the first harmonic of some high powered CB transmissions fall?

Like I said, you evidently are not informed on the subject of
harmonics. The FIRST harmonic is the fundamental frequency. It's the
second harmonic that is twice the fundamental. And twice 27 mHz is 54
mHz. Exactly the Top End of the 6 meter band. Neither I nor any other
ham hangs out up there.
And why is it the first anyone hears of harmonic problems on 6 meters
from high powered CB comes from a freebander?

> Do your homework
> before posting...please.

yuk yuk

>
> P.S. The guy your referring to holds a FCC GROL, is an avionics tech, and a
> licensed amateur. So much for your "assumptions." 73.

So, then he is deliberately a very willing renegade, an absolute radio
outlaw, and has no desire nor intent to change his stripes. We see.
And we also see that the FCC is not particularily interested, and is
MORE interested in giving him a freebee ham radio license or upgrade,
and ARRL is salivating to sign him up. Neat.

3616. Re: 11meters, freebanding, and the no-code tech ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 03:55:04 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A95DF18.34DF107E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3915

Dick Carroll wrote:
> The FIRST harmonic is the fundamental frequency.

What's the FIRST overtone?
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3617. Re: 11meters, freebanding, and the no-code tech ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 04:01:16 UTC
From: mailfrmpa@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010222230116.04527.00001322@ng-cc1.aol.com>
Source record: 3914

> The FIRST harmonic is the fundamental frequency.

BZZZZZZZZ! Wrong Answer.
The fundamental is not a "harmonic" of any kind!

3618. Re: Learning Stuff (Was: 11 meters...)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 04:21:37 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <974ogh$6vq$0@208.206.142.104>
Source record: 3916

Jim Weir wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
> shared these priceless pearls of wisdom:
>
> ->RMoretta wrote:
> There is a really nice
> ->> feature on www.QRZ.com called practice exams. It creates a 35 question exam
> ->> from the exact test pool, so there are no surprises.
> ->
> ->Yeah, and yuo *learn* the stuff, too. Right.
>
> Most professional educators will tell you that there is as much "learning" going
> on during a non-stressed quiz or sample test as there is during a regular
> classroom structured learning period of the same length. This is especially
> true when the student is given the correct answer

So "sound byte" learning is as effective as detailed reading on the
subject? That *is* news, and I majored in education.

> and the reason for the correc answer.

Which of course is NOT included on the question pools.

> I don't know about the QRZ site exams, but the NuTest exams do give you
> lengthy explanations why one answer or the other is correct. I find that my
> students that use one of these "sample test" programs on a regular basis do far,
> far better than students who try and get it through classroom regimen alone.
> This is true for my engineering students as well as my amateur classes.

Sure, a well designed and written test can be a very effective learning
tool, assuming that it is designed to TEACH, not just to provide a
method of licensing with little or no intent of anything else.

Nowhere I know is merely passing a test in itself indicative of
anything more than passing a test, with no further detailed description
of how it was done. Ham radio is the most glaring example with which I
currently am familiar.

3619. Re: 11meters, freebanding, and the no-code tech ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 04:22:41 UTC
From: Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <3A95E591.AE6F8C2A@arrl.org>
Source record: 3917

MailfrmPA wrote:
>
> > The FIRST harmonic is the fundamental frequency.
>
> BZZZZZZZZ! Wrong Answer.
> The fundamental is not a "harmonic" of any kind!

BZZZZZZ yourself. The fundamental is the first harmonic both by
definition and by common usage.

Jon

3620. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 04:24:21 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <974oll$6vq$1@208.206.142.104>
Source record: 3918

"T. L. Bryant" wrote:
> Gee, TL I'm sure sorry you couldn't "force" yourself to do it. Maybe you
> >should exercise a little better control over yourself?
>
> If that's intended to mean that I haven't passed any amateur licensing exams, I
> suggest you learn how to use an archive service, such as deja.com.

I'm not concerned about you, TL. You is what you is. And if you walk
talk and squawk like a .... then one must assume that is what you
are.

3621. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 04:24:27 UTC
From: billsohl@mindspring.com
Message-ID: <3a95e375.4444517@news.mindspring.com>
Source record: 3919

On Thu, 22 Feb 2001 13:05:52 +0000, Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net> wrote:

>Bill Sohl wrote:
>>
>> On Thu, 22 Feb 2001 05:31:09 +0000, Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net> wrote:
>>
>> >Cecil wrote:
>> >> If someone has to expend unwanted effort to achieve a requirement,
>> >> they have, by definition, been forced to do so by the requirement.
>> >> That's one of the Webster's definitions of "forced". There's nothing
>> >> said or implied one way or another about the social value of being
>> >> forced. People who want to legally operate a vehicle are forced to
>> >> obtain a driver's license. Hams who want to legally operate a
>> >> transmitter on HF ham frequencies are forced to learn Morse code.
>> >
>> >Nobody in the history of the world has ever been forced to obtain an
>> >amateur radio license. If one can't be forced to obtain a license, then
>> >one cannot be forced to learn morse in order to obtain one.
>>
>> That is true of the license itself, but once anyone decides to
>> obtain a license, the requirements become mandatory. THAT
>> is the issue...the reuirements of government imposed on individuals
>> to obtain ANY license MUST bear relavence and justification to
>> the license being obtained. Those of us on the No Code Test side
>> believe (as does the FCC IMHO) that a code test is NO LONGER
>> a valid requirement to get a ham license. The ONLY rational that
>> sustained even a 5 wpm test for HF was and still is the international
>> treaty agreement.
>
>"Once one decides" is a really important clause, Bill. It certainly
>implies choice. Obtaining a ham ticket is not mandatory. If one
>*decides* for himself to obtain one, he meets the requirements for
>obtaining it.
>
>I know what your side believes and you know that I do not agree with
>your premise, IMNSHO.

Lucky then that the FCC does see it as an unjustifiable
requirement. The issue of forced, mandatory, etc. is just
a semantics diversion anyway since I dare say no one has
ever raised that arguement in the FCC responses. I'm
sure the FCC wouldn't give much, if any, consideration to a
commentor that argued...No one is forced to get a ham license
so if they don't like a requirment they have the choice not to be
a ham.

>Now what do we do about that darned "forced"
>written test? Think we should take out all of those pesky technical
>questions? After all, if we simply know the regs and a few safety
>rules, we can always send our equipment back for factory service.

YOU are the one saying that..NOT me. Anyone can make whatever
argument or comment they want...BUT it is always the pro-code test
folks like yourself that run the No theory up the flagpole.

>> >My state requires a motorcycle endorsement in order to ride a motorcyle.
>> >That includes a written exam and a driving exam. I'm not tickled about
>> >taking either but I want to drive a motorcycle. I don't feel forced at
>> >all.
>>
>> That is because those requirements are VALID in relation to the
>> license you will be issued by the state. Would you have such
>> a generous viewpoint if one of those requirements was
>> to pass a CPR or first aid test to get the motorcycle license?
>
>CPR relates to motorcycle as morse code relates to ham radio? I'm not
>buying.

The point is that neither is a valid requirement for the license
in question. You may disagree regarding code for HF ham
licenses, but I don't see your position being supported by
the FCC.

>> >Riding a motorcycle is not mandatory in West Virginia.
>> >Your argument is as invalid now as it was the last time this went
>> >around.
>>
>> Actually, the argument IS valid because that is the perspective
>> that the FCC clearly has with regard to ALL the requirements.
>> The individual requirements for any license ARE mandatory
>> to get that license and it has been and still is the FCC's job
>> to JUSTIFY any such license requirements.
>
>...and it would be a state's "job" in ensure that motor vehicle regs for
>licensing are justifiable. I'm still not forced to obtain an amateur
>license or a motorcycle endorsement. I'm not willing to assist you in
>creating a new class of victim.

No victim needed, no help needed to make the point
with the FCC that code is passed its prime. The FCC knows
it is and only the treaty is keeping the code test requirement
going now.

>It is my observation that things which are deregulated or less regulated
>seldom work as well as they did under regulation.

A liberal mindset to be sure. Only the government can be trusted
to know what everyone should be doing.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3622. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 04:26:44 UTC
From: billsohl@mindspring.com
Message-ID: <3a95e613.5114480@news.mindspring.com>
Source record: 3920

On 23 Feb 2001 02:42:12 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

>Cecil wrote:
>>
>> Dave Heil wrote:
>> > Obtaining a ham ticket is not mandatory.
>>
>> That's a straw man argument because no one said a ham ticket is
>> mandatory. Morse code *is* mandatory for an HF ham ticket. It is
>> "required by circumstances" which is the definition of "forced".
>>
>> > Now what do we do about that darned "forced" written test?
>>
>> Nothing. Some forced tests are reasonable, e.g. a driver's test.
>
> Oh. So you know what is reasonable and no one else, including the FCC
>nor governments who make treaties, does. We see. Right.

Everyone is free to offer their opinion and arguments as
to what is reasonable. The FCC ends up making the decision
in the end based on their analysis. Do you have any doubt
as to the position that the FCC has regarding the value or
need for continued code testing?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3623. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 04:29:49 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <974ovt$6vq$2@208.206.142.104>
Source record: 3921

Cecil wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > Cecil wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > > You were wrong the last time you trotted out this crap and you're wrong
> > > > now.
> > >
> > > So you assert the Webster's dictionary definition of "forced - required
> > > by circumstances", is incorrect.
> >
> > Not at all. We KNOW that you routinely misuse such dictionary
> > definitions incorrectly to suit your own purposes.
>
> How can I possibly misuse something that is down in black and white
> in the dictionary?

Could it be that you deliberately chose a definition that didn't fit
the context?

>Seems your ignorance is showing.

What else can you say when you're so far off base?

3624. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 04:30:14 UTC
From: billsohl@mindspring.com
Message-ID: <3a95e69f.5254787@news.mindspring.com>
Source record: 3922

On 22 Feb 2001 13:55:47 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

>Bill Sohl wrote:
> once anyone decides to
>> obtain a license, the requirements become mandatory.
>
> And that is the point at which one must decide whether or not he will
>FORCE HIMSELF to comply with the requirements.

True at that point in time. It does not, however, forclose
the person attempting to get the requirements changed.
That is the point I believe many PCTA folks want...i.e.
accept the requiremnts the way they are...after all, I did
it, so should you. If that mindset made any sense at all,
the diver's license tests would also require knowledge and
skill driving a vehicle with a manual gearbox.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3625. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 04:31:54 UTC
From: billsohl@mindspring.com
Message-ID: <3a95e777.5470938@news.mindspring.com>
Source record: 3923

On Thu, 22 Feb 2001 16:31:31 -0800, Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
wrote:

>"T. L. Bryant" wrote:
>> Does your state require you to have a motorcycle endorsement if have no
>> intention of ever owning or riding one?
>
>Probably not. Not doubt they are more firm about requiring a motorcycle
>test if you want a motorcycle license however.

Does your state require a license endorsement to drive a
manual gearbox vehicle even though you take and pass
the test using a car with an automatic transmission?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3626. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 04:34:55 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <974p9f$6vq$3@208.206.142.104>
Source record: 3924

Cecil wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Evidently you don't accept that dictionaries have multiple definitions
> > of many words because they apply differently in different circumstances.
>
> Evidently you don't comprehend that the person who makes the statement
> gets to choose the definition of the words he uses. Rail and whine all
> you wish. The following is a fact: >>In order to obtain HF ham privileges,<<
> a ham is forced to pass a Morse code exam, i.e. it is "required by the
> circumstances" (the FCC rules). "forced - required by circumstances"
>

When you can accurately say it without the prepositional phrase it will
have some meaning.

3627. Re: 11meters, freebanding, and the no-code tech ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 04:35:52 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <974pb8$6vq$4@208.206.142.104>
Source record: 3925

```
Cecil wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > The FIRST harmonic is the fundamental frequency.
>
> What's the FIRST overtone?

Overtone is not the same term as harmonic.
```

3628. Re: 11meters, freebanding, and the no-code tech ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 05:02:35 UTC
From: "Leland C. Scott" <no-spam@junk-mail.net>
Message-ID: <L9ml6.4720$v_1.458811@typhoon.mw.mediaone.net>
Source record: 3926

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:974mp8$21a$0@208.206.142.104...
> And why is it the first anyone hears of harmonic problems on 6 meters
> from high powered CB comes from a freebander?

Freebanders operating above channel 40 (27.405 MHz) would put any harmonic in the passband for TV channel 2. It would show up as noise on the video, and would be above 54.810 MHz. The video lower vestigial sideband crap from a local TV channel 2 station does far more to garbage up the 6m band than anything else I have heard. The upper 2 to 3 MHZ near the station is unusable, particularly on FM. The sideband sub-band section of 6m is normally not to bad, as long as you don't point your antenna at the TV station.

The video carrier for channel 2 is located at 1.25 MHz above the bottom of the channel so that puts it at 55.125 MHZ. The maximum power that can be used is 100 KW on channels 2 to 6. The spec's I have requires any video signal 1.25 MHz or greater, the lower sideband radiation must be 20 db below the carrier level or more. This means you can still have a huge signal at the top of the 6m band, and falling off as you go lower.

Frankly I think the local TV channel 2 station is much more of a problem on 6m than anything coming from a CBer's splatter box special foot-warmer, or a crappy cheap 10m export radio.

--
73's,

Leland C. Scott
KC8LDO

ARRL member
NCI member

"You ask what Morse Code is good for? I'll tell you. Morse
Code is used exclusively by Electronics Based life forms to
communicate amongst themselves using advanced Organic
Digital Signal Processors, running state of the art Artificial
Intelligence Software, to perform the highly complex
transmit encryption, receive decryption and error correction
functions."

3629. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 05:06:11 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net>
Message-ID: <3A95EFC3.48A647F3@ovis.net>
Source record: 3927

Cecil wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > Learning morse is not "compulsory" or "forced".
>
> Yes, it is if one wants to operate legally on the HF ham frequencies.
> From Webster's: "forced - enforced or compulsory - required by
> circumstances" The FCC enforces the Morse code requirement for HF hams.

"if one wants"? Not forced. Voluntary.

> > I have no argument with the dictionary definition.
>
> Of course you do, Dave. That's the only argument you have.

I've stated that I do not. The argument I have is with your improperly
selected definition.

Dave K8MN

3630. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 05:10:04 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net>
Message-ID: <3A95F0AC.CC8DFD89@ovis.net>
Source record: 3928

Cecil wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > Obtaining a ham ticket is not mandatory.
>
> That's a straw man argument because no one said a ham ticket is
> mandatory. Morse code *is* mandatory for an HF ham ticket. It is
> "required by circumstances" which is the definition of "forced".

Wait a minute. "required by circumstances" wasn't part of the
definition you provided earlier. Are you amending your definition?
An HF amateur license is not mandated. Once chooses to obtain one.

> > Now what do we do about that darned "forced" written test?
>
> Nothing. Some forced tests are reasonable, e.g. a driver's test.

It is not a forced test, Cecil. It is not mandatory to obtain an
amateur radio license or a driver's license.

I'm still not buying either the definition or the premise.

Dave K8MN

3631. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 05:13:03 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net>
Message-ID: <3A95F15F.FE210F74@ovis.net>
Source record: 3929

Cecil wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > We obviously cannot communicate, Cecil, even if we accept the
> > dictionary.
>
> We cannot communicate because you and Dick will not accept the
> Webster's dictionary definition of "forced - required by
> circumstances".

Nah, that's not the reason, Cecil. We can't communicate because, 1) you haven't settled on a definition of the word "forced" yet (let me know when you've settled on one definition and wish to stick with it) and 2) you are intent on playing word games.

I'm tiring of this silliness.

Dave K8MN

3632. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 05:15:29 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net>
Message-ID: <3A95F1F1.10E571B5@ovis.net>
Source record: 3930

Cecil wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > You were wrong the last time you trotted out this crap and you're wrong
> > now.
>
> So you assert the Webster's dictionary definition of "forced - required
> by circumstances", is incorrect. Take it up with the publishers. I, for
> one, will continue to honor the conventions of the English language. To
> do otherwise is to try to confound the language for ulterior purposes.
>
> The *fact* remains - in order to gain legal access to the HF ham bands,
> one is forced to learn Morse code, if one doesn't already know it.

You can't even stick to a single definition. "required by
circumstances"; is that your final answer?

Dave K8MN

3633. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 05:21:19 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net>
Message-ID: <3A95F34F.86480CFA@ovis.net>
Source record: 3931

Cecil wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > Several times you've given a dictionary definition chosen
> > from one of several meanings. Several times you've chosen the wrong
> > definition to suit the situation. I say that you HAVE chosen
> > definitions which suit your purpose and ignore definitions which do not.
>
> Of course, Dave, that's what people do. Does a computer bus have wheels?
> Of course not. When I choose the word "bus" for something inside a
> computer, do you object to that usage because it doesn't have wheels?
> Who died and made you the great white father of definitions? When I
> use the word "forced", I am using it correctly and in context. I chose
> the usage of the word. Trying to dictate the contextual definition of
> another person's statement is just the despicable act of a bully.

I think it must have been my elementary school teachers, the ones who instructed me in the use of a dictionary who died and left me in charge of definitions. If I found you trying to use the definition of a computer bus to define the kind which drives down the block discharging passengers, I'd laugh, call you a goofus and point out that it is as silly as your first choice of definition for the word "forced".

> The fact remains: In order to gain legal access to the HF ham bands,
> one is forced (required by circumstances) to learn Morse code, if one
> doesn't already know it.

...more panicky wordsmithing? We've now added the clause, "if one doesn't already know it" to your second definition (not the one you originally trotted out) of the word "forced".

Nobody is forced to learn morse code, Cecil. You're looking sillier with each post.

Dave K8MN

3634. Re: 11meters, freebanding, and the no-code tech ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 05:25:27 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A95F447.36021D10@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3935

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> Cecil wrote:
> >
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > The FIRST harmonic is the fundamental frequency.
> >
> > What's the FIRST overtone?
>
> Overtone is not the same term as harmonic.

I know that but you didn't answer my question.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3635. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 05:28:13 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net>
Message-ID: <3A95F4ED.260770B0@ovis.net>
Source record: 3934

T. L. Bryant wrote:
>
> In article <3A949DED.97503BF6@ovis.net>, k8mn@ovis.net says...
>
> >
> >
> >I don't think buggy whips or buggies are much used anymore. Morse is in
> >current use. That you don't care for it doesn't mean it ceases to
> >exist.
> >
> >Dave K8MN
>
> I guess you don't live close to a large Amish community, do you? Such items are
> still very much in use there.

I guess you'd be wrong.

> But since you want examples that are a little more up to date, I might also
> point out that there is nothing on a driver's license test that requires you to
> know how to drive a standard shift vehicle in order to obtain a standard
> driver's license. This is a matter of choice.

There's no practical or written exam required for a marriage license
either.

> All that matters to you and certain others in this newsgroup, is that you'd
> rather argue semantics over the usage of the word "forced" in a sentence, than
> the reasons why high-speed code testing should have been retained for access to
> HF phone portions.

How the hell do you know what matters to me? I don't consider 5 wpm to
be high speed morse. Are you now telling us that you consider it to be?

Dave K8MN

3636. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 05:29:43 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net>
Message-ID: <3A95F547.BF1FEA3A@ovis.net>
Source record: 3936

T. L. Bryant wrote:
>
> In article <3A94A29B.6A9C8F35@ovis.net>, k8mn@ovis.net says...
> >
>
> >> It's not a question of whether or not certain criteria are met. It's of
> whethe
> >r
> >> that criteria has relevance when it serves nothing more than having a
> >> recreational value as a communications mode. You can sit and argue symantics
> >> and word definitions as much as you want, but many perceived the high-speed
> >> morse testing of the past as being a hazing ritual that they were "forced"
> to
> >> take in order to have HF phone privileges. An applicant may have meet all
> othe
> >r
> >> criteria, but most definately *is* penalized if that all-mighty code test is
> >> not passed.
> >
> >Please don't start that "hazing ritual" crap again. The same penalty is
> >imposed if someone blows the almighty written exam: no license.
> >Don't you just hate that written "hazing ritual"?
> >
> >Dave K8MN
>
> Go back and read the part where I talked about criteria having relevance, and
> stop twisting my words to suit your own bias.

Your words weren't twisted. They were quoted. Your own bias is
evident. How is it any more valueable than mine?

Dave K8MN

3637. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 05:30:06 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A95F55E.2600EA2C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3937

Dave Heil wrote:
> The argument I have is with your improperly selected definition.

That simply cannot be, Dave. I very carefully selected the definition
directly out of the dictionary to convey the exact concept that I wanted
to convey. I chose to use the word. You are not God-like enough to
choose my words for me.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3638. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 05:31:50 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net>
Message-ID: <3A95F5C6.8065081@ovis.net>
Source record: 3933

T. L. Bryant wrote:
>
> In article <3A94A4C5.5C7FEF4B@ovis.net>, k8mn@ovis.net says...
> >
> >Jim Kelley wrote:
> >>
> >> Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com> wrote in message
> >> news:3eu79t4btpp6dagemdorlkmd3skcegqok4@4ax.com...
> >>
> >> > You are right Dave. I was using the word "forced" for editorial
> >> > purposes (smokescreen?) but I will stop. However I think you would
> >> > have to agree that if you want to be a HF ham you are *required* to
> >> > learn the code...
> >>
> >> TL says that somebody had to blackmail him to get him to learn the code.
> >> Must have been some photos of him caught in a compromising situation or
> >> something.
> >
> >...hand in pocket, not working around high voltage.
> >
> >Dave K8MN
>
> Freud said that people who resort to sexual inuendo, for lack of an argument,
> do so to compensate for their own shortcomings. (Pun intended)

Freud probably didn't get as many laughs.

Dave K8MN

3639. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 05:34:00 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net>
Message-ID: <3A95F648.2DBC31CA@ovis.net>
Source record: 3932

T. L. Bryant wrote:
>
> In article <3A94A41D.A32E6E38@ovis.net>, k8mn@ovis.net says...
>
> >Nobody in the history of the world has ever been forced to obtain an
> >amateur radio license. If one can't be forced to obtain a license, then
> >one cannot be forced to learn morse in order to obtain one.
> >
> >My state requires a motorcycle endorsement in order to ride a motorcyle.
> >That includes a written exam and a driving exam. I'm not tickled about
> >taking either but I want to drive a motorcycle. I don't feel forced at
> >all. Riding a motorcycle is not mandatory in West Virginia.
> >
> >Your argument is as invalid now as it was the last time this went
> >around.
> >
> >Dave K8MN
>
> Does your state require you to have a motorcycle endorsement if have no
> intention of ever owning or riding one?

Nope. It has not made obtaining a motorcycle endorsement any more
mandatory than an amateur radio license.

Dave K8MN

3640. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 05:36:37 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A95F6E5.E5233886@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3939

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> Cecil wrote:
> > That's a straw man argument because no one said a ham ticket is
> > mandatory. Morse code *is* mandatory for an HF ham ticket. It is
> > "required by circumstances" which is the definition of "forced".
>
> Wait a minute. "required by circumstances" wasn't part of the
> definition you provided earlier. Are you amending your definition?

Amending? Not really. I just have two dictionaries. "Required by
circumstances" is the definition of "forced" from my unabridged
dictionary. I get a hernia every time I pick it up so I don't open
it very often.

> It is not a forced test, Cecil. It is not mandatory to obtain an
> amateur radio license or a driver's license.

Nobody said it was mandatory to obtain an amateur radio license or a
driver's license. To imply that someone did say that is simply a strawman
argument because you have run out of logical arguments. In order to
obtain a driver's license, a driver is forced to take a driver's
test. That is a perfectly correct English language sentence, Dave.
Your disagreement simply shows your ignorance.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3641. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 05:37:59 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net>
Message-ID: <3A95F737.7B7BC45E@ovis.net>
Source record: 3938

Cecil wrote:
>
> Jim Kelley wrote:
> >
> > "T. L. Bryant" wrote:
> > > Does your state require you to have a motorcycle endorsement if have no
> > > intention of ever owning or riding one?
> >
> > Probably not. Not doubt they are more firm about requiring a motorcycle
> > test if you want a motorcycle license however.
>
> Why can't the Morse code requirement be handled the same way?

It already is. Neither is forced.

Dave K8MN

3642. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 05:39:18 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A95F786.3C6DF7B4@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3940

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> Cecil wrote:
> > We cannot communicate because you and Dick will not accept the
> > Webster's dictionary definition of "forced - required by
> > circumstances".
>
> Nah, that's not the reason, Cecil. We can't communicate because, 1) you
> haven't settled on a definition of the word "forced" yet ...

What's wrong with "required by circumstances"?
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3643. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 05:43:19 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net>
Message-ID: <3A95F877.7ABB0E8E@ovis.net>
Source record: 3941

Cecil wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Evidently you don't accept that dictionaries have multiple definitions
> > of many words because they apply differently in different circumstances.
>
> Evidently you don't comprehend that the person who makes the statement
> gets to choose the definition of the words he uses. Rail and whine all
> you wish. The following is a fact: In order to obtain HF ham privileges,
> a ham is forced to pass a Morse code exam, i.e. it is "required by the
> circumstances" (the FCC rules). "forced - required by circumstances"

More pap. I am:

forced to obtain a job.
forced to go grocery shopping.
forced to feed the dog.
forced to go out and pick up the newspaper.
forced to learn morse code.

Damn all this endless torment!

Find a definition which suits you yet or are you still finalizing it?

Dave K8MN

3644. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 05:43:52 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A95F898.78BFE16C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3942

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> Cecil wrote:
> > Evidently you don't comprehend that the person who makes the statement
> > gets to choose the definition of the words he uses. Rail and whine all
> > you wish. The following is a fact: >>In order to obtain HF ham privileges,<<
> > a ham is forced to pass a Morse code exam, i.e. it is "required by the
> > circumstances" (the FCC rules). "forced - required by circumstances"
>
> When you can accurately say it without the prepositional phrase it will
> have some meaning.

It already has meaning, Dick, and the prepositional phrase is part of
the meaning. Are you ignorant of conditional statements? To be more
precise: If a ham is to obtain HF ham privileges then he is forced to
pass a Morse code exam. That is an absolutely true statement.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3645. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 05:46:32 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A95F938.4FE2D643@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3943

Dave Heil wrote:
> Nobody is forced to learn morse code, Cecil.

That is a false statement, Dave. If a ham is to obtain HF ham
privileges then he is forced to learn Morse code. That is a
true statement.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3646. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 05:48:10 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A95F99A.F9D9EB53@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3944

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> Cecil wrote:
> > How can I possibly misuse something that is down in black and white
> > in the dictionary?
>
> Could it be that you deliberately chose a definition that didn't fit
> the context?

Nope, I deliberately chose a definition that exactly fits my context.
Sorry if it chaps your a$$.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3647. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 05:51:30 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A95FA62.C66BBD6E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3945

Dave Heil wrote:
> You can't even stick to a single definition. "required by
> circumstances"; is that your final answer?

Every definition that I have used means essentially the same
thing. "Done or produced with effort" means essentially the
same thing as "required by circumstances". Both definitions
are equally valid. One is from one dictionary and one is
from another. Do you object to all dictionaries or just some
of them?
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3648. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 05:53:50 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A95FAEE.D66F28D6@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3946

Dave Heil wrote:
> I don't consider 5 wpm to be high speed morse.

It's the highest speed Morse code exam we have.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3649. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 05:57:09 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A95FBB5.1342F5CE@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3947

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> Cecil wrote:
> > Why can't the Morse code requirement be handled the same way?
>
> It already is. Neither is forced.

Of course they are, Dave. If I want to operate a motorcycle legally
in Texas then I am forced (required by circumstances) to take a
motorcycle test. If you say that is not a true statement then you
are simply lying.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3650. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 06:00:10 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A95FC6A.4AF37F8C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3948

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> T. L. Bryant wrote:
> > Does your state require you to have a motorcycle endorsement if have no
> > intention of ever owning or riding one?
>
> Nope. It has not made obtaining a motorcycle endorsement any more
> mandatory than an amateur radio license.

You have completely missed the point so far, Dave. If one is to operate
a motorcycle legally it is mandatory that one take a motorcycle test, i.e.
one is forced (required by circumstances) to take a motorcycle test in
order to avoid illegal operation.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3651. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 06:05:06 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A95FD92.205AEF27@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3949

Dave Heil wrote:
> More pap. I am:
> forced to obtain a job.

Yes, if you want to support yourself financially, you are forced to
obtain a job.

> forced to go grocery shopping.

Yes, if you are out of food, you are forced to go grocery shopping.

> forced to feed the dog.

Yes, if you want your dog to survive, you are forced to feed the dog.

> forced to go out and pick up the newspaper.

Yes, if you want to read the newspaper, you are forced to pick it up.

> forced to learn morse code.

Yes, if you want to legally operate on the HF ham bands, you are
forced to learn Morse code.

By Jove, I think you've got it!
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3652. Re: FBI spy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 10:29:31 UTC
From: kelly@dvol
Message-ID: <3a963b5e.40103093@news2.dvol.com>
Source record: 3802

On Thu, 22 Feb 2001 07:36:09 -0500, Jon Bloom <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote:

>Here's something interesting:
>
>HANSSEN, ROBERT P, K9QVL (General)

>
>Same name and address as the FBI agent arrested for spying.
>
. . . just the kinda PR we *don't* need . .
>
>Jon
>
w3rv

3653. Re: Open Source Trusted E-QSL System proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 12:31:07 UTC
From: "J. Duffy Beischel" <duffyb01@fuse.net>
Message-ID: <t9clu91gv5ek66@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 3803
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc

I agree with John. I like getting cards in the mail and I like to see REAL QSL cards that have some creativity. Some of the DX cards have beautiful pictures of their homelands, station, etc. Yes, they may cost us more (greenstamps to the DX stations) but there is a great thrill in getting overseas mail with the QSL.

Also, I think the ARRL should sponsor an award(s) the promotes real QSLing beyond what we have today with WAS, WAC, and DXCC - both stateside and international.

Regards,

Duffy - WB8NUT
"WW Warren" <kb9tmp@my-deja.com> wrote in message
news:970mooqph1@dagobah.blueriver.net...
> John
> Why not upload those E-QSL 'Cards' to a free web page provider like
QSL.net, Angelfire or Geocities
> and put them on a web page so not just you but EVERYONE could see them? It
would also save space on
> your computer and wall for that matter! :^)
>
> --
> ---
> "73" from the cornfields of Orange County Indiana!
> <'}}}>< <'}}}>< WW - KB9TMP <'}}}>< <'}}}><
> on the web at http://www.qsl.net/kb9tmp/
> Orange Co. A.R.C. http://www.qsl.net/kb9ohy/
>
>
>
> "John Passaneau" <jxp16@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:970ktq$om6@r02n01.cac.psu.edu...
> > Hi all:
> > The problem I have with E-QSL's is that their boring. There is nothing
to
> >
> > display on wall. The ones I've received are not very well done and if I
do
> >
> > print them they don't look very good and I have to pay for the cost of
> >
> > printing. They take up a lot of room on the hard drive if you don' print
> >

> > them. So I find little to like about E-QSL's. I saw that the ARRL was
> >
> > looking into a system that would, as I read it, keep a trusted list of
> >
> > stations you have worked, and conformations from those stations which
would
> >
> > be good for awards. I guess that this would be OK, but not much fun. I
can
> >
> > see no way that E-QSL's can ever be as much fun as getting a bunch of
cards
> >
> > in the mail. I went to the E-QSL site and I had a bunch of "cards"
waiting
> >
> > for me, I looked at them and down loaded them, but after a bit I dumped
them
> >
> > off the computer, no magic, no fun, no interest.
> >
> >
> >
> >
> > --
> > John Passaneau
> > Penn State University, State College Pa.
> > W3JXP
> > w3jxp@arrl.net
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> > "Darryl Wagoner - WA1GON" <darryl_NOSPAM@shecora.com> wrote in message
> > news:904F5E29CdarrylNOSPAMshecorac@207.126.101.100...
> > > Greetings,
> > >
> > > I believe in E-QSL, but nothing I have seen so fair fills the bill.
> > >
> > > I think the solution should be open source so that we don't get
> > > locked in to one provider of trusted E-QSLs.
> > >
> > > Here is the idea:
> > >
> > > The system would use digital signatures based upon the RSA
> > > encryption standard. The public key would be signed by a
> > > trusted third party. Once the key has been signed, it can
> > > be transmitted with the E-QSL or looked up in a trusted public
> > > key server. The details is a little hard to explain, but

> > > the jest is once a amateur has a signed public key, anyone
> > > can validate their e-qsl information without using a active
> > > protocol with a third part. This means that my log program
> > > can email a qsl information almost in real time.
> > >
> > > Everything needed to do this is public and free to use. We
> > > will need the following functions:
> > >
> > > 1. Certification Authority software and libraries.
> > > 2. Signing libraries.
> > > 3. validation libraires.
> > >
> >
> >
> > sniped text to pacify the universities stupid mailer system
> >
> >
> >
> > > TQSL to be:
> > >
> > > 1. A trusted system
> > > 2. Free and open standards
> > > 3. Easy to use and implement. ie: Users pushs a button on
> > > his/her logging program and a TQSL is created. This eqsl
> > > could be sent via email, to a e-buro, etc. The important
> > > thing is once created it can be authenicated at any point
> > > by anyone, just by point software at it.
> > >
> > > Any takers?
> > >
> > > Darryl Wagoner WA1GON
> > > darryl@shecora.com
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
>
>

3654. Re: Open Source Trusted E-QSL System proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 12:42:49 UTC
From: lak <lak@radioland.net>
Message-ID: <#WHxtXZnAHA.338@cpmsnbbsa09>
Source record: 3846
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Apparently Mr. Cotter Pin, you have never sent a DX QSL, they cost of "one Hellva" (using red neck vernacular) more than $0.34 to send. In fact it is now for just a basic DX QSL as follows:

sending envelope $0.05
SASE $3.05 (up to)
QSL $0.15 (up to)
Total Cost $3.25 (up to)

Now to qualify this "up to" amount, this card was sent to a German QSL manager. I would guess the average cost is around $2.00 per card, if an American Ham is being nice and trying to pay their way.

What I cannot understand is this issue "pisses you off" so much. It just people putting ideas up for evaluation and process improvement. Personally the cheapest people in Ham Radio I have met are the ones who show up to Hamfests and want to give one $5.00 for a piece of equipment that really worth several hundred. These people usually are trying to buy low and then in turn sell high at another Hamfest. This does not have one damn thang (using neck vernacular again) with the cost of QSLing.

I dont know what exactly your problem is but dont take it out on the rest of us.

lak

"cotter pins" <thisiscream@aol.com> wrote in message news:tZcl6.117$oX3.6293@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
> Now let me get this straight Darryl....
>
> We now need a system of "E-QSL's" because (really) hams are
> too stinking *cheap* to spend 34 cents postage to put their QSL
> in a envelope..??
>
> This is the root cause (above) which is REALLY driving this issue!
> Is it no? Be honest now. What a bunch of tightwads you
> hams are. When's the last time GW saw sunlight opening up your moldy
> wallets? And I thought all these guys were tighter than a crab's asshole
> at hamfests - hoy.
>

3655. Re: Open Source Trusted E-QSL System proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 12:50:42 UTC
From: lak <lak@radioland.net>
Message-ID: <eN4qHcZnAHA.314@cpmsnbbsa09>
Source record: 3847

<K0HB@qwest.net> wrote in message news:973rthhgo1@news.netmar.com...
> In article <3A9562D8.760DD83A@shecora.com>, Darryl Wagoner
> <dwagoner@shecora.com> writes:

Stuff deleted before and after this......

> There are four reasons (at least) why this idea will not be widely
adopted.
>
> #1) Traditionalists (like me) who place high value on paper QSLs will not
> participate in an eQSL scheme.
>
> #2) Most major DXpeditions derive much of their funding from donations
> received in the QSL process. They are unlikely to participate in scheme
> which diminishes that funding channel.
>
right out of the box.
>
> 73, Pariah, K0HB

#1) No one says traditional cards would go away.

#2) If DXpeditions have this monetary need why dont they accept "Plastic
Money" donation via secure transactions on the internet or dial-in. (May be
this is why even after sending SASEs they still wont send their cards, man
gotta remember the basic financial law Money Talks BS Walks).

lak

3656. Re: 28.085 New channel 19 ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 12:59:26 UTC
From: David Robbins <k1ttt@berkshire.net>
Message-ID: <3A965EAE.6D5F0DFE@berkshire.net>
Source record: 3804

truckers from 'out west' are on various frequencies almost every day from here in New England. 28085 and 28535 are the most common frequencies. references in their chatter have placed them anywhere from mississippi to chicago and west into idaho and new mexico. they don't hear ham qrm most of the time because they are always running in close groups probably with squelches turned way up. they also show up on 28005, 28035, 28135, 28235, 28295, 28545, 29260, and 29295 regularly, though i have heard them on almost any 10kc channel from 28005 to 28295. they do seem to avoid 28300-28500. except for the frequencies above they only rarely seem to go above 28500, but that probably won't last.

as the arrl's recent washington mailbox column says there isn't much anyone can do about them unless you get the license plates and hand them to the fcc. i have given this info to riley and am hoping they can use their df network to at least narrow down some of these guys to particular interstates or areas so local df work can get started to track them down... the real question is who can do the ground work? the arrl doesn't seem to think they can do anything, though i have suggested they send their transmitter hunting book to all the oo's and see if kenwood will give them discount coupons for mobile hf rigs (to help their image after the truck stop stories). i would expect it will only take a few busts to get the word out that going about 28000 is a bad idea.

Ken Diaz wrote:
>
> Truckers from "back east" are S-7 to S-9 here in Southern California. Hope
> Reilly knows about this. This posting is so we can assist in trying to
> locate these guys (Texas?). These guys are now appearing daily.
> Thanks, Ken, WB9YCJ/6

--
David Robbins K1TTT
e-mail: mailto://k1ttt@berkshire.net
web: http://www.berkshire.net/~robbins/k1ttt.html or http://www.k1ttt.net
AR-Cluster node: 145.69MHz or telnet://k1ttt.net

3657. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 13:06:55 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net>
Message-ID: <3A96606F.3C03F821@ovis.net>
Source record: 3805

Cecil wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > The argument I have is with your improperly selected definition.
>
> That simply cannot be, Dave. I very carefully selected the definition
> directly out of the dictionary to convey the exact concept that I wanted
> to convey. I chose to use the word. You are not God-like enough to
> choose my words for me.

It is simple, can be and is. You selected a definition from your dictionary. It was incorrect for the situation. Now you're stuck with trying to defend it. As usual, you are now adding various clauses to add to the original definition you provided in order to attempt to make your case.

While I'm not generally god-like, it doesn't take much of a god to see through your flimsy attempt.

Twist in the wind.

Dave K8MN

3658. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 13:12:52 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net>
Message-ID: <3A9661D4.BD6A4189@ovis.net>
Source record: 3806

Cecil wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > Cecil wrote:
> > > That's a straw man argument because no one said a ham ticket is
> > > mandatory. Morse code *is* mandatory for an HF ham ticket. It is
> > > "required by circumstances" which is the definition of "forced".
> >
> > Wait a minute. "required by circumstances" wasn't part of the
> > definition you provided earlier. Are you amending your definition?
>
> Amending? Not really. I just have two dictionaries. "Required by
> circumstances" is the definition of "forced" from my unabridged
> dictionary. I get a hernia every time I pick it up so I don't open
> it very often.

Let me get this straight. Your excuse for adding a second definition
well after you provided the first is that your dictionary is too heavy
to lift? You're a yuk a minute, Cecil. Bill Clinton couldn't have done
better.

> > It is not a forced test, Cecil. It is not mandatory to obtain an
> > amateur radio license or a driver's license.
>
> Nobody said it was mandatory to obtain an amateur radio license or a
> driver's license. To imply that someone did say that is simply a strawman
> argument because you have run out of logical arguments. In order to
> obtain a driver's license, a driver is forced to take a driver's
> test. That is a perfectly correct English language sentence, Dave.
> Your disagreement simply shows your ignorance.

The sentence is properly constructed but it is inaccurate. If it is not
mandatory to obtain either a driving license or an amateur radio
license, no one is forced to obtain one any more than one is forced to
take a morse exam. If you have options, you are not forced.

You've stumbled on this one and now you are *forced* to live with it.

Dave K8MN

3659. Re: 28.085 New channel 19 ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 13:13:49 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A96620D.64510920@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3810

Ken Diaz wrote:
> Truckers from "back east" are S-7 to S-9 here in Southern California. Hope
> Reilly knows about this. This posting is so we can assist in trying to
> locate these guys (Texas?).

A Californian saying that Texas is "back east"? I would advise you not
to set foot in Texas ever again. :-)
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3660. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 13:14:17 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net>
Message-ID: <3A966229.7FF37997@ovis.net>
Source record: 3807

```
Cecil wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > Cecil wrote:
> > > We cannot communicate because you and Dick will not accept the
> > > Webster's dictionary definition of "forced - required by
> > > circumstances".
> >
> > Nah, that's not the reason, Cecil. We can't communicate because, 1) you
> > haven't settled on a definition of the word "forced" yet ...
>
> What's wrong with "required by circumstances"?

What happened? Did the one you originally chose *force* you to remove
the egg from your face? Why the amendment (or are you attempting to use
the new one as an addendum)?

Dave K8MN
```

3661. Re: Open Source Trusted E-QSL System proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 13:16:31 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A9662AF.E34EA723@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3811
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc

"J. Duffy Beischel" wrote:
> I agree with John. I like getting cards in the mail and I like to see REAL
> QSL cards that have some creativity.

There's no reason why the exact same QSL card cannot be sent as an
email GIF file.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3662. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 13:17:53 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net>
Message-ID: <3A966301.26BC1F2B@ovis.net>
Source record: 3808

Cecil wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > Cecil wrote:
> > > Evidently you don't comprehend that the person who makes the statement
> > > gets to choose the definition of the words he uses. Rail and whine all
> > > you wish. The following is a fact: >>In order to obtain HF ham privileges,<<
> > > a ham is forced to pass a Morse code exam, i.e. it is "required by the
> > > circumstances" (the FCC rules). "forced - required by circumstances"
> >
> > When you can accurately say it without the prepositional phrase it will
> > have some meaning.
>
> It already has meaning, Dick, and the prepositional phrase is part of
> the meaning. Are you ignorant of conditional statements? To be more
> precise: If a ham is to obtain HF ham privileges then he is forced to
> pass a Morse code exam. That is an absolutely true statement.

You're now attempting another game of adding material to your original lame statement in an attempt to make it valid. That "if" you're now using wasn't there initially. Neither was the "required by circumstances" portion. No one is forced to learn morse.

Dave K8MN

3663. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 13:19:17 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A966355.68E00E3E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3814

Dave Heil wrote:
> You selected a definition from your
> dictionary. It was incorrect for the situation.

That's your opinion, Dave. It is wrong. Your opinion and a buck
fifty will get you a cup of coffee. I very carefully selected
exactly the definition that matched the concept I wanted to
convey. That it chapped your a$$ is irrelevant.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3664. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 13:20:23 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net>
Message-ID: <3A966397.85E71E6@ovis.net>
Source record: 3809

Cecil wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > Nobody is forced to learn morse code, Cecil.
>
> That is a false statement, Dave. If a ham is to obtain HF ham
> privileges then he is forced to learn Morse code. That is a
> true statement.

Nobody is forced to learn morse code, Cecil. I am forced to endure your obtuse nature. What? I don't have to put up with it? I have options? I guess I'm not forced after all.

Dave K8MN

3665. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 13:24:04 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net>
Message-ID: <3A966474.49170723@ovis.net>
Source record: 3813

Cecil wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > You can't even stick to a single definition. "required by
> > circumstances"; is that your final answer?
>
> Every definition that I have used means essentially the same
> thing. "Done or produced with effort" means essentially the
> same thing as "required by circumstances". Both definitions
> are equally valid. One is from one dictionary and one is
> from another. Do you object to all dictionaries or just some
> of them?

That is a straw man. We're not debating whether I object to dictionaries. I object to you selecting incorrect definitions of a word. "I forced the door open." does not mean the same things as "I was forced to endure Cecil's endless games". You selected the wrong definition initially and are attempting to rectify that now.

It makes you look small.

Dave K8MN

3666. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 13:24:28 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A96648C.18C1678@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3816

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> Cecil wrote: In order to
> > obtain a driver's license, a driver is forced to take a driver's test.
>
> The sentence is properly constructed but it is inaccurate.

You are wrong, Dave. That sentence is obviously accurate as any
ordinary prudent man can see from reading it. The definition of
"forced - required by circumstances" is directly out of "Webster's
New Universal Unabridged Dictionary", Barnes & Noble, ï¿½1996.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3667. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 13:25:56 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net>
Message-ID: <3A9664E4.39420E92@ovis.net>
Source record: 3812

Cecil wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > Cecil wrote:
> > > Why can't the Morse code requirement be handled the same way?
> >
> > It already is. Neither is forced.
>
> Of course they are, Dave. If I want to operate a motorcycle legally
> in Texas then I am forced (required by circumstances) to take a
> motorcycle test. If you say that is not a true statement then you
> are simply lying.

You write "Of course" as if that somehow makes it fact. Of course you are less capable as a wordsmith than as an engineer. You are simply out of your league. To state otherwise makes you a liar.

Dave K8MN

3668. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 13:27:16 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net>
Message-ID: <3A966534.4A1F372A@ovis.net>
Source record: 3815

Cecil wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > T. L. Bryant wrote:
> > > Does your state require you to have a motorcycle endorsement if have no
> > > intention of ever owning or riding one?
> >
> > Nope. It has not made obtaining a motorcycle endorsement any more
> > mandatory than an amateur radio license.
>
> You have completely missed the point so far, Dave. If one is to operate
> a motorcycle legally it is mandatory that one take a motorcycle test, i.e.
> one is forced (required by circumstances) to take a motorcycle test in
> order to avoid illegal operation.

...and *if* a frog had wings he wouldn't bump his ass when he jumped.
If we had some meat, we could make some sandwiches....*if* we had some
bread.

Dave K8MN

3669. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 13:30:23 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net>
Message-ID: <3A9665EF.59858B0A@ovis.net>
Source record: 3817

Cecil wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > More pap. I am:
> > forced to obtain a job.
>
> Yes, if you want to support yourself financially, you are forced to
> obtain a job.
>
> > forced to go grocery shopping.
>
> Yes, if you are out of food, you are forced to go grocery shopping.
>
> > forced to feed the dog.
>
> Yes, if you want your dog to survive, you are forced to feed the dog.
>
> > forced to go out and pick up the newspaper.
>
> Yes, if you want to read the newspaper, you are forced to pick it up.
>
> > forced to learn morse code.
>
> Yes, if you want to legally operate on the HF ham bands, you are
> forced to learn Morse code.
>
> By Jove, I think you've got it!

Darn! I count only five *if*s in there. What do you suppose they mean? I'd say that they imply options. I think you'd better regroup and ponder this a while.

Dave K8MN

3670. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 13:35:34 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A966726.C0ED458@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3818

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> Cecil wrote:
> > What's wrong with "required by circumstances"?
>
> What happened? Did the one you originally chose *force* you to remove
> the egg from your face?

Nope, "Webster's Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary" gives the definition
as "forced - done or produced with effort". That overlaps the
definition of "forced - required by circumstances" which appears
in my unabridged dictionary which I rarely open because it is so large.
You don't have to be beaten with a stick to have force used against
you. Rules, regulations, and laws are almost always backed up by the
force of the issuing authority.

> Why the amendment (or are you attempting to use
> the new one as an addendum)?

Why the attempted diversion, Dave? Diversions are invariably employed
by people who are losing the argument. Please stick to the subject.
If a ham is to have legal HF ham privileges then he is forced
(required by circumstances) to pass a Morse code exam. You do
understand if/then statement logic, don't you?
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3671. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 13:47:25 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A9669ED.B81EB112@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3819

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> Cecil wrote:
> > Of course they are, Dave. If I want to operate a motorcycle legally
> > in Texas then I am forced (required by circumstances) to take a
> > motorcycle test. If you say that is not a true statement then you
> > are simply lying.
>
> You write "Of course" as if that somehow makes it fact. Of course you
> are less capable as a wordsmith than as an engineer. You are simply out
> of your league. To state otherwise makes you a liar.

People who consider themselves so expert that they don't ever have to
open a dictionary often get caught with their pants down. How does it
feel to have your omniscient opinion of yourself dashed by the simple
act of a dumb engineer opening a dictionary and proving you wrong?

The force of the State of Texas is behind the motorcycle test requirement.
If I want to operate a motorcycle legally in Texas, then I am forced
by the state to pass a motorcycle test. If I choose to ignore what is
"required by circumstances" then I will be forced to accept a traffic
ticket or worse.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3672. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 13:51:33 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A966AE5.AF6838B@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3820

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> Cecil wrote:
> > You have completely missed the point so far, Dave. If one is to operate
> > a motorcycle legally it is mandatory that one take a motorcycle test, i.e.
> > one is forced (required by circumstances) to take a motorcycle test in
> > order to avoid illegal operation.
>
> ...and *if* a frog had wings he wouldn't bump his ass when he jumped.
> *If* we had some meat, we could make some sandwiches....*if* we had some
> bread.

Those are true statements, Dave, just like my if/then statements are true.
In case you have forgotten your logic, if the 'if' part of an if/then
statement is false, then the entire statement is true. Thus, "if a frog
had wings he wouldn't bump his ass when he jumped", is a true statement.
So is, "If a ham is to have legal HF ham privileges, he is forced to take
a Morse code exam."
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3673. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 14:01:58 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A966D56.8BD0312C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3821

Dave Heil wrote:
> You're now attempting another game of adding material to your original
> lame statement in an attempt to make it valid. That "if" you're now
> using wasn't there initially. Neither was the "required by
> circumstances" portion. No one is forced to learn morse.

Dave, I am trying to simplify the concept down to a point where even
you can understand it. There are many ways to state an 'if' function
that don't use the word 'if'. "In order to" is one way. If you had
simply accepted my original statement as true, then I would not be
forced to mount a detailed defense. I am not changing anything. I
am expanding on the discussion so you will eventually understand it.
Your objections required me to expand on my original statement and
then you rag on me for expanding on my original statement. Tsk, Tsk.
Hope you don't treat your children that way.

Hams with HF privileges are forced to learn Morse. They are "required
by circumstances" to learn Morse code. The "circumstances" is the FCC's
Morse code requirement.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3674. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 14:08:58 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A966EFA.4FEC7E3F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3822

Dave Heil wrote:
> Darn! I count only five *if*s in there. What do you suppose they mean?
> I'd say that they imply options. I think you'd better regroup and
> ponder this a while.

You obviously don't understand the rules of logic, Dave. I suggest you stop considering yourself to be omniscient and open up a good logic book. If the 'if' portion of an if/then statement is false then the entire statement is true. If the 'if' portion of an if/then statement is true and the 'then' portion is true, then the entire statement is true. The only way an if/then statement can be false is for the 'if' portion to be true and the 'then' portion to be false. Every if/then statement I have made has been true. You were mistaken when you asserted that they were false.

If a ham wants legal HF ham privileges then he is forced (required by circumstances) to pass a Morse code exam. That's a true statement, Dave. There's just no getting around it. The force of the FCC is behind the Morse code requirement.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3675. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 14:24:21 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A967295.8079A954@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3823

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> Cecil wrote:
> > That is a false statement, Dave. If a ham is to obtain HF ham
> > privileges then he is forced to learn Morse code. That is a
> > true statement.
>
> Nobody is forced to learn morse code, Cecil.

I made an if/then statement which follows the rules of logic.
That if/then statement is true. According to the rules of classical
logic, your statement is actually false because HF hams are forced
(required by circumstances) to learn Morse code. There is an implied
'if' function in that statement.

I can make the same conditional statement without using the words,
"if" and "then".

In order to obtain HF privileges, a ham is forced (required by
circumstances) to pass a Morse code test.

It can be stated another way with the 'if' portion of the conditional
statement only implied.

HF hams are forced (required by circumstances) to pass a
Morse code test.

The implied 'if' portion are the HF privileges. If they don't pass the
Morse code exam, they are not HF hams. Thus the implied 'if' portion
of the implied conditional statement is false and therefore the entire
statement is true, following the accepted rules of classical logic.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3676. Re: FBI spy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 14:34:00 UTC
From: K0HB@arrl.org
Message-ID: <975sco$6hn$1@news.netmar.com>
Source record: 3825

In article <3a95b710.6229250@news2.dvol.com>, Brian Kelly, w3rv <kelly@dvol>
writes:

>.. . . we don't need that kinda "PR".

Obviously they have the wrong guy. This fellow knows Morse code, and we all
know that the bad guys wear black hats and never know the code.

73, Hans, K0HB

----- Posted via NewsOne.Net: Free (anonymous) Usenet News via the Web -----
http://newsone.net/ -- Free reading and anonymous posting to 60,000+ groups
NewsOne.Net prohibits users from posting spam. If this or other posts
made through NewsOne.Net violate posting guidelines, email abuse@newsone.net

3677. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 14:34:09 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A9674E1.6356D31A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3824

Dave Heil wrote:
> "I forced the door open." does not mean the same things as "I was
> forced to endure Cecil's endless games". You selected the wrong
> definition initially and are attempting to rectify that now.

Nope, both those definitions are valid dictionary definitions, Dave.
I correctly selected the one I wanted to use. You objected to my
selection. Now you are trying to convince us that you are an
omniscient guru when it comes to dictionaries and definitions. You
are not. You have made a simple logic mistake. Many people make the
same mistake.

"I am forced to endure Cecil's endless games" is a true statement
given some implied assumptions. The implied assumption is:

If I choose to argue with Cecil on r.r.a.p, then I am forced to
endure his endless games.

That is a true statement whether you choose to argue with me on
r.r.a.p or not. That is the rule of logic about which you are
mistaken. If you do not choose to argue with me on r.r.a.p, the
statement is still true according to the rules of classical logic.
That's why you are mistaken when you assume my if/then statements
are false. If the 'if' portion of an if/then statement is false,
then the entire statement is true, by definition.

If a ham is to obtain HF privileges then he is forced (required by
circumstances) to learn Morse code.

Sorry, Dave, that is a true statement.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3678. Re: 11meters, freebanding, and the no-code tech ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 14:52:22 UTC
From: John O'Flaherty <oflahert@toast.net>
Message-ID: <3A967926.1C7A246C@toast.net>
Source record: 3826

Cecil wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > Cecil wrote:
> > >
> > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > > The FIRST harmonic is the fundamental frequency.
> > >
> > > What's the FIRST overtone?
> >
> > Overtone is not the same term as harmonic.
>
> I know that but you didn't answer my question.

The first overtone is the second harmonic. Both the fundamental and all the harmonics are partial tones (at least in audio work). I've never heard the term 'first harmonic' before, althought the meaning is unambiguous.

john

3679. Re: 28.085 New channel 19 ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 15:02:56 UTC
From: Gary McAdams <g.m.mcadams@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <AYul6.1779$rL4.148796@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 3827

Ken Diaz <kenjd@email.msn.com> wrote in message
news:#yahnTFnAHA.341@cpmsnbbsa09...
> Truckers from "back east" are S-7 to S-9 here in Southern
California. Hope
> Reilly knows about this. This posting is so we can assist in
trying to
> locate these guys (Texas?). These guys are now appearing daily.
> Thanks, Ken, WB9YCJ/6
>
>

Ken,

This problem is like a cancer that has spread
through the body. The FCC cannot help, and
there is not a lot that you and I can do about
it either. If the intruders were stationary, there
might be a chance, but these guys are running
mobile, nose-to-tail. We have no chance to break in,
and they will never hear us on cw or rtty.

It gives me no satisfaction, but I saw this coming a
long time ago. During the latter stages of the last
sunspot cycle, intruders began to appear on the
ten meter band. Export radios first showed up
in East Asia, especially Indonesia and Taiwan.
These radios spread to our shores during the
sunspot minimum, and now show up every where.

It really hacks me off personally, but I really have
no idea what we can do. The FCC is no help.
because they would have to have personnel
in mobile DF vans in every truck stop to even
begin to effect a cure. I'm open to any reasonable
idea, but bitching to Mr. Hollingsworth is simply
preaching to the choir. I know that it is stooping to
their level, but I always try to operate on frequencies
ending in five. 28.085, 28.535 etc... I persevere and
possibly operating there through the QRM might
help prove a point to the intruders, and the point is
simply that there are already authorized users of their
new "company" channel. I also have a HTX-10 and will
do as another ham suggested, that is, to monitor the
most popular frequencies in an attempt to catch an
operator "in the act".

At any rate, I'm not going to simply concede the bands
to the illegals. If we give up, where will it end? Will the
next "company channel" be on 14.085, 7.085, 3.585?

Any reasonable suggestions welcomed.

Gary, WG7X

3680. Re: 11meters, freebanding, and the no-code tech ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 16:11:45 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <976241kgi0@208.206.142.76>
Source record: 3828

```
Cecil wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > Cecil wrote:
> > >
> > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > > The FIRST harmonic is the fundamental frequency.
> > >
> > > What's the FIRST overtone?
> >
> > Overtone is not the same term as harmonic.
>
> I know that but you didn't answer my question.

Un-huh. And the man didn't say overtone, he said harmonic.
```

3681. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 16:16:18 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9762ci$mc9$0@208.206.142.76>
Source record: 3829

Cecil wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > Cecil wrote:
> > > That's a straw man argument because no one said a ham ticket is
> > > mandatory. Morse code *is* mandatory for an HF ham ticket. It is
> > > "required by circumstances" which is the definition of "forced".

Cecil, ever Mister Twister the wordmeister, insists on replacing the proper word which is "required" with the word of quite different meaning, "required".

For sure not the first time we've seen him do this.

3682. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 16:22:00 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9762n8$n9r$0@208.206.142.76>
Source record: 3830

Cecil wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > Cecil wrote:
> > > Evidently you don't comprehend that the person who makes the statement
> > > gets to choose the definition of the words he uses. Rail and whine all
> > > you wish. The following is a fact: >>In order to obtain HF ham privileges,<<
> > > a ham is forced to pass a Morse code exam, i.e. it is "required by the
> > > circumstances" (the FCC rules). "forced - required by circumstances"
> >
> > When you can accurately say it without the prepositional phrase it will
> > have some meaning.
>
> It already has meaning, Dick, and the prepositional phrase is part of
> the meaning. Are you ignorant of conditional statements? To be more
> precise: If a ham is to obtain HF ham privileges then he is forced to
> pass a Morse code exam. That is an absolutely true statement.

I suppose that everyone sees what you're doing, and of course you know exactly. Your conditional statement eliminates "forced" from possibility of being the appropriate word. The conditional statement makes it a choice, not a mandatory action, thus a "requirement" and not a forced action. The individual chooses whether or not to meet the stated requirement. It's his choice.

3683. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 16:24:17 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9762rh$n9r$1@208.206.142.76>
Source record: 3831

Cecil wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > Nobody is forced to learn morse code, Cecil.
>
> That is a false statement, Dave. If a ham is to obtain HF ham
> privileges then he is forced to learn Morse code. That is a
> true statement.

It is not a true statemtment. If wants to obtain HF privileges he is REQUIRED to learn Morse code. No one was ever forced to learn if. Nor is he required -nor forced- to gain HF privileges.

3684. Re: 28.085 New channel 19 ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 16:26:46 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <976306$n9r$2@208.206.142.76>
Source record: 3832

Ken Diaz wrote:
>
> Truckers from "back east" are S-7 to S-9 here in Southern California. Hope
> Reilly knows about this. This posting is so we can assist in trying to
> locate these guys (Texas?). These guys are now appearing daily.
> Thanks, Ken, WB9YCJ/6

Tape 'em and send the tape to Riley.

3685. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 16:36:31 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9763if$oj4$0@208.206.142.76>
Source record: 3833

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> Cecil wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> > >
> > > T. L. Bryant wrote:
> > > > Does your state require you to have a motorcycle endorsement if have no
> > > > intention of ever owning or riding one?
> > >
> > > Nope. It has not made obtaining a motorcycle endorsement any more
> > > mandatory than an amateur radio license.
> >
> > You have completely missed the point so far, Dave. If one is to operate
> > a motorcycle legally it is mandatory that one take a motorcycle test, i.e.
> > one is forced (required by circumstances) to take a motorcycle test in
> > order to avoid illegal operation.
>
> ...and *if* a frog had wings he wouldn't bump his ass when he jumped.
> *If* we had some meat, we could make some sandwiches....*if* we had some
> bread.

By Cecil's definition that frog is FORCED to grow wings IF he doesn't
want to bump his ass, and by gard you're FORCED to go to the store IF
you want to eat.

3686. Re: 11meters, freebanding, and the no-code tech ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 16:38:15 UTC
From: Jim Weir <jim@rst-engr.com>
Message-ID: <cc4d9t4ef62sub1e5t7sp6joahlm3lg9ul@4ax.com>
Source record: 3834

John O'Flaherty <oflahert@toast.net>
shared these priceless pearls of wisdom:

->The first overtone is the second harmonic. Both the fundamental and all
->the harmonics are partial tones (at least in audio work). I've never
->heard the term 'first harmonic' before, althought the meaning is
->unambiguous.

I respectfully disagree. When I operate a crystal on third overtone, I'm operating on the third resonance of the fundamental, or the third harmonic. That is, a crystal operated at 30 MHz. on the third overtone is operating a fundamental 10 MHz. crystal with the plate buckling three times instead of once per cycle.

Jim
Jim Weir, VP Eng. RST Eng. WX6RST
A&P, CFI, and other good alphabet soup

3687. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 16:39:11 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9763nf$oj4$1@208.206.142.76>
Source record: 3835

Cecil wrote:
>

> People who consider themselves so expert that they don't ever have to
> open a dictionary often get caught with their pants down.

Not nearly so often as those who insist on twisting definitions to suit
their own purposes and get caught at it.

3688. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 16:39:23 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A96923B.252EE5AF@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3836

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Cecil, ever Mister Twister the wordmeister, insists on replacing the
> proper word which is "required" with the word of quite different
> meaning, "required".

Ok, Dick, have it your way. "Required" does not mean "required".
(Somebody get the net)
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3689. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 16:41:02 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A96929E.CD30427@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3837

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> Cecil wrote:
> > People who consider themselves so expert that they don't ever have to
> > open a dictionary often get caught with their pants down.
>
> Not nearly so often as those who insist on twisting definitions to suit
> their own purposes and get caught at it.

The definition I used is the definition directly from the dictionary.
That it chaps your a$$ is irrelevant.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3690. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 16:44:59 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A96938B.87FC1DCD@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3839

Dick Carroll wrote:
> By Cecil's definition ... you're FORCED to go to the store IF
> you want to eat.

It's not *my* definition, Dick. It is the definition of a word
in the English language directly from the dictionary. Ignoring
other solutions to your hunger problem, if you want to eat then
you are forced (required by circumstances) to go to the store.
That is a perfectly valid use of the word "forced". If you would
just open a dictionary once in awhile before opening your mouth,
you would not appear to be so ignorant.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3691. Re: Open Source Trusted E-QSL System proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 16:50:06 UTC
From: Rich@iwantnospam.org
Message-ID: <slrn99d507.q55.Rich@zippy.aa2ys.ampr.org>
Source record: 3838
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc

On Fri, 23 Feb 2001 07:31:07 -0500, J. Duffy Beischel <duffyb01@fuse.net> wrote:
>I agree with John. I like getting cards in the mail and I like to see REAL
>QSL cards that have some creativity. Some of the DX cards have beautiful
>pictures of their homelands, station, etc. Yes, they may cost us more
>(greenstamps to the DX stations) but there is a great thrill in getting
>overseas mail with the QSL.
>
>Also, I think the ARRL should sponsor an award(s) the promotes real QSLing
>beyond what we have today with WAS, WAC, and DXCC - both stateside and
>international.

I suspect that some of the reported decline is QSLing, besides the cost,
is simply that for younger people, there is no longer anything particularly
exotic about communicating with people in far-off places. The world
has turned into such a small place that there is nothing special about
seeing images, or getting things from the other side of the planet.

For example, my enjoyment of radio comes more from playing with the
technology, and not really from "Hey! I just talked with a guy living
in Denmark!" I suspect I'm not alone in that.

- Rich

--
Catapultam habeo. Nisi pecuniam omnem mihi dabis, ad caput tuum saxum
immane mittam.

3692. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 16:51:07 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A9694FB.E77FD4B4@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3840

Dick Carroll wrote:
> I suppose that everyone sees what you're doing, and of course you know
> exactly. Your conditional statement eliminates "forced" from possibility
> of being the appropriate word. The conditional statement makes it a
> choice, not a mandatory action, thus a "requirement" and not a forced
> action. The individual chooses whether or not to meet the stated
> requirement. It's his choice.

I didn't say a person had no choice so you are trying to erect another
strawman. The Morse code requirement is backed by the force of the
federal government. HF hams are forced (required by circumstances) to
pass a Morse code exam. Non-HF hams are not forced to pass a Morse
code exam. What is it about simple English that you do not understand?
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3693. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 16:56:21 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A969635.FD8E9CA@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3841

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> Cecil wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > Nobody is forced to learn morse code, Cecil.
> >
> > That is a false statement, Dave. If a ham is to obtain HF ham
> > privileges then he is forced to learn Morse code. That is a
> > true statement.
>
> It is not a true statemtment. If wants to obtain HF privileges he is
> REQUIRED to learn Morse code. No one was ever forced to learn if. Nor is
> he required -nor forced- to gain HF privileges.

Uhhhhh Dick, "required" is part of the definition of "forced". An HF ham is certainly "required by circumstances", i.e. "forced", to learn Morse code. If you don't like the definition of "forced", I suggest that you take it up with Webster's. I will continue to use my Webster's as the reference book for the words in the English language.

HF hams are forced (required by circumstances) to learn Morse code. If they don't learn Morse code then they are not HF hams. What is it about simple English language sentences that you don't understand?
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3694. Re: 11meters, freebanding, and the no-code tech ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 16:58:22 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A9696AE.43DCC5F6@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3842

```
Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> Cecil wrote:
> >
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > >
> > > Cecil wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > > > The FIRST harmonic is the fundamental frequency.
> > > > >
> > > > > What's the FIRST overtone?
> > > >
> > > > Overtone is not the same term as harmonic.
> > >
> > > I know that but you didn't answer my question.
> >
> > Un-huh. And the man didn't say overtone, he said harmonic.

Do you know the difference or not?
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----
```

3695. Re: Open Source Trusted E-QSL System proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 17:09:59 UTC
From: darryl_NOSPAM@shecora.com
Message-ID: <90517AA80darrylNOSPAMshecorac@207.126.101.100>
Source record: 3843
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc

lak@radioland.net (lak) wrote in <#GJWuzMnAHA.269@cpmsnbbsa07>:

>I agree with Darryl on this, in fact my correspondance with the ARRL
>regarding E-QSL revealed they are looking into this method. What is
>needed is actually an organization rather than individual. Historically,
>individuals will eventually quit or pass-on thus leaving the system
>"dead-in-the-water".
....
>The cavet for the organization accepting this responsibility is they
>cannot require membership to access. They could charge a fee for
>registration maintenance to recover costs.

Sure they could. That is one of the great things about this
model. It isn't one enity that is responsible. The CA (Certification
Authority) is free to put any requirements they wish. What
the awards sponsers can not be allowed to do is unreasonably
restrict the use of a CA for validating public keys. This
could mean that your local radio club could and should become
a CA. They would have the burden of proof that they should
be consider a trusted CA. If a CA does become "untrusted"
their certificates would not be honored.

By using this model it creates a open market for CA and reduces
the chances that one enity will end of with control over
the whole thing. That is why I started this effort. To
prevent a single enity from becoming the master of eqsls.

I just created a reflect on yahoo groups. If you are interest
in this please join. thanks

Post message: TrustedQSL@yahoogroups.com
Subscribe: TrustedQSL-subscribe@yahoogroups.com
Unsubscribe: TrustedQSL-unsubscribe@yahoogroups.com
List owner: TrustedQSL-owner@yahoogroups.com

Darryl WA1GON

3696. Re: 28.085 New channel 19 ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 17:12:53 UTC
From: Keith <kewyatt@apexmail.com>
Message-ID: <rn5d9t0t6b0rtargc8214aipuhreu0ddgo@news>
Source record: 3844

On Fri, 23 Feb 2001 15:02:56 GMT, Gary McAdams
<AYul6.1779$rL4.148796@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net> wrote:

>At any rate, I'm not going to simply concede the bands
>to the illegals. If we give up, where will it end? Will the
>next "company channel" be on 14.085, 7.085, 3.585?
>
>Any reasonable suggestions welcomed.
>
>Gary, WG7X

I posted this yesterday. If hams find a person that is using a Radio
on Ham Frequencies while in the employment of another then the law can
be used to prevent employees of companies from illegal use of frequencies.
Let say that all the truckers from ABC company jumped on the Frequency of
460.500 across the US. Then they would be prevented from doing so by Federal
law. Now the same law applies to ham frequencies. The way to deter this type
of activity is to start finding out who is the employer and then with evidence
contact the FCC. The FCC would then notifier the employer that there employee
is breaking federal law while in their employment. Recordings, pictures and
license plate numbers would help identify the employees that are violating
federal law.
It is no different then if you see a trucker driving reckless. You call the
police and tell them who, what and where and they issue the ticket. We are
gathering evidence of criminal activity and turning it over to the FCC for
enforcement proceedings.
I am positive if that enough employers are notified that their employees
are committing federal crimes they will put a stop to it. After all these
people need a paycheck.

--
Best Regards,

Keith (Use Reply-to for email)
---
http://Find_Free_Software@Strongsignals.com/
"Where would Christianity be if Jesus got eight to fifteen years with
time off for good behavior?" NY State Senator James Donovan, speaking
in support of capital punishment.

3697. Re: 28.085 New channel 19 ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 18:15:23 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nospam.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.g97toc0.pminews@ca.news.verio.net>
Source record: 3845

On Fri, 23 Feb 2001 07:13:49 -0600, Cecil wrote:

>A Californian saying that Texas is "back east"? I would advise you not
>to set foot in Texas ever again. :-)

A lot of Californians consider Colorado "back east", and I
know a group of Ohioians (or is that "Ahiya-ins") for whom "out
west" is Illinois and Kansas.

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

3698. Re: 28.085 New channel 19 ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 18:32:27 UTC
From: K0HB@qwest.net
Message-ID: <976abr$21p$1@news.netmar.com>
Source record: 3852

In article <#yahnTFnAHA.341@cpmsnbbsa09>, Ken Diaz <kenjd@email.msn.com>
writes:
>Truckers from "back east" are S-7 to S-9 here in Southern California. Hope
>Reilly knows about this. This posting is so we can assist in trying to
>locate these guys (Texas?). These guys are now appearing daily.
>Thanks, Ken, WB9YCJ/6

Put a 10M receiver in your car -- find them -- read the company name off the
door of the 18-wheeler -- send it to the FCC.

----- Posted via NewsOne.Net: Free (anonymous) Usenet News via the Web -----
http://newsone.net/ -- Free reading and anonymous posting to 60,000+ groups
NewsOne.Net prohibits users from posting spam. If this or other posts
made through NewsOne.Net violate posting guidelines, email abuse@newsone.net

3699. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 18:39:15 UTC
From: K0HB@arrl.org
Message-ID: <976aoj$2n5$1@news.netmar.com>
Source record: 3851

In article <3A95F938.4FE2D643@IEEE.org>, Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
writes:
>Dave Heil wrote:
>> Nobody is forced to learn morse code, Cecil.
>
>That is a false statement, Dave. If a ham is to obtain HF ham
>privileges then he is forced to learn Morse code. That is a
>true statement.

Dave's statement is absolutely true. You're adding the if/then
qualifiers, which may also make your statement true, but Dave's
statement has no such qualifiers and is also absolutely true.

And I thought you had a logical mind -- silly me!!!!!!

73, Hans, K0HB

----- Posted via NewsOne.Net: Free (anonymous) Usenet News via the Web -----
http://newsone.net/ -- Free reading and anonymous posting to 60,000+ groups
NewsOne.Net prohibits users from posting spam. If this or other posts
made through NewsOne.Net violate posting guidelines, email abuse@newsone.net

3700. Re: This Should Be A Warning

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 18:39:49 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010223133949.01278.00000514@nso-fa.aol.com>
Source record: 3848

Subject: Re: This Should Be A Warning
From: Jerry Oxendine <joxendi@bellsouth.net>
Date: Tue, 20 Feb 2001 13:21:24 -0500

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>
>> No nation is "REQUIRED" to obey international agreements
>> but it is considered good relations to abide by them. The
>> International Telecommunications Union has a number of
>> different radio services to consider. Amateur radio is not a
>> significant part of the total radio picture nor does it matter
>> in the real world of radio whether or not amateurs perform a
>> service (non-regulatory term) to anyone but themselves.

>BUT!~ The AGREEMENTS STILL require morse. PERIOD!

No. The only thing in S25 (amateur radio standards) of the ITU-R is
S25.5 which specifies that amateur radio license testing for any
license having below-30-MHz-privileges is manual international
morse code skill ("sending by hand and receiving by ear"). A singular
standard, not any sort of plural agreements.

Each and every ITU standard and recommendation is always
subject to review, study, and voting by ITU member nation
administrations. Resolutions obtained by such voting are
carried through by each member nation administration as
Good Faith. There is no specific "law" which requires strict
obedience to such agreements nor is there any "enforcement"
agency to prosecute those who do not abide by agreements.

>And the US has
>signed and, in so doing AGREED, to abide by that agreement.

The administration of the USA (Department of State, FCC, and NTIA)
voted on S25, the entire set of ITU-R amateur radio standards. They
did not "sign" some specific agreements on amateur radio but rather
accepted the ENTIRE set of standards and resolutions of the ITU, not
just ITU-R but ITU-T, the "telephone" part of international
communications in regards to tariffs, connections, standards for
signalling, etc.

>What part of this is so hard for you to understand?

Only those documents of the ITU which are not in English.

>And, since such agreements
>have been around for so many years, AND the US has abided by said agree-

>ment(s) in the past, it IS reasonable to assume we will abide by the
>current one until it expires or is replaced.

You may wish to review the radio laws of the nation of Japan. They
are a member nation of the ITU and they have a license class which
does permit amateur radio license granting below 30 MHz which
does not require a code test.

I have no problems with agreements. I have no problem with
recognizing that agreements are NOT ABSOLUTE LAW. They are
simply statements of Good Faith by government administrations.
It is considered good practice to abide by agreements, but those
agreements are not absolutes nor are they "enforced" by any
supra-law enforcement organization (there is none).

>We KNOW changes are in the
>works, It will remain until 2003 to see what these changes are...at
>which time, we can agree to it or not.

I know only that some nation administrations have stated they
will seek to change S25.5 at some time. That is public record,
but is "known" only by those who get such information. For that
matter, RS 8 (Radio Study group 8) of the ITU-R will take up S25,
is taking up S25, as a whole but what is not yet public is the
particular part of S25 which will be studied for change. Such
studies are done before a WRC.

Actions of the future are generally indeterminate. There is no
evidence than any human being has any power to "look into the
future" to know exactly what will happen. At best, one can only
presume certain trends in activities to carry on into the near
future based on near-past events and conditions.

>All this ballyhoo about Amateur Radio's status as a Service, hobby, or
>whatever, is achieving nothing. It's like sitting in your car which is
>on jack stands. Your engine is running, your speedo is indicting 45 MPH
>and you are going nowhere.

Strange analogy that goes nowhere.

>It is a FACT, Lennie, that Amateur Radio HAS
>rendered service to the community, state, and Nation.

Is US amateur radio defined principally on its service (non-regulatory
term)? Is it a (non-regulatory term) service or is it just one of many
radio services of US civil radio? It is the only one which is defined
specifically as a radio activity having non-pecuniary interests (that
defining "amateur").

The discussion seems to concern itself on the word "service." You
have to differentiate between a type and kind of radio defined in
Title 47 CFR ("radio services"), a military service, or some public
service rendered to the nation and citizens by its citizens.

>It is ALSO a fact that it is a HOBBY. Some hobbiests like to
>render public service when they can.

Part 97, Title 47 CFR, does not specifically state that amateur
radio is a public service to the nation...it is a radio activity engaged
in by individuals for non-pecuniary interests. The word "service" as
in "radio service" used throughout Title 47 is a regulatory term
denoting type and kind of radio regulated.

Individuals in amateur radio, just like individual citizens in the
nation, can always be of (non-regulatory term) service. That is
highly commendable. What is not of commendation is the
self-enoblement of individuals who are NOT of (non-regulatory
term) of service but use the panoply and patriotic bunting to
label themselves as being of (non-regulatory term) of service.

>I would like you to tell the local county ES officer that Amateur Radio
>wasn't a service during Hurricane Hugo. You have earthquakes, we *some-
>times* have hurricanes. During the floods in the Mississippi Valley, you
>are trying to tell me that Amateur Radio WASN'T involved? HORSE hockey!

You seem to be very, very sensitive to self-perceived negativisms.
Such is your particular problem, not mine. I mentioned nothing of
hurricanes or floods. The original posting of this thread was an
emotional tirade of an extra class radio amateur berating all other
radio amateurs for not doing enough for emergencies, such as
recently happened in the nations of India and Pakistan. I replied
with public information on earthquakes that already happened over
7 years ago in the state of California. I also gave a website for the
California OES and Auxilliary Communications Service (ACS).
I asked a question of "where were the radio amateurs during the
Northridge Earthquake of 1994?" Only one radio amateur in this
newsgroup gave a specific-detail source of where those amateurs
were...a few others seemed to explode with "outrage" even
though none of them had participated in that earthquake. None
of those listed any specifics in public view, only made generalities
and self-serving "patriotic" statements.

Now go back to the original posting under this thread and judge for
yourself just who is berating who.

>I asked this once before and I now ask it again: Can we agree that
>Amateur Radio is a R-E-S-O-U-R-C-E which has potential for assistance
>in local, state, and international disasters? Can we call it a
>"RESOURCE" and let it go at that?

US amateur radio is already defined by regulation. What you seem
to be seeking is self-glorification and enoblement courtesy of a
federally-issued amateur radio license. US amateur radio is
basically a hobby and those engaging in that radio activity not
for pecuniary interest are hobbyists.

>Lastly, IF, in your ever-so-knowledgable opinion, Amateur Radio is JUST
>a "hobby", why does FCC designate certain HF frequencies as EMERGENCY

>frequencies during disasters? Hmmmmm? This CAN be documented by contact
>ing FCC (1-800-CALL FCC) and ASKING them.

All US allocated emergency frequencies are given in Part 2, Title 47 CFR. That and all other Parts of Title 47 (to about October 1998) are free for download from the FCC website (under OET page documents) or the US Government Printing Office website. Printed copies of US law or regulations may be obtained from USGPO branch offices in over a dozen major cities or by mail order, but those cost money. Public-cleared military doctuments may also be obtained from the National Technical Information Service (NTIS). NTIS offers over 14,000 Army and similar publications for sale. I recommend NTIS TM 10-412INQ for large groups with appetites ($79 to US postal addresses). Others may have different tastes.

Under certain conditions the FCC will request certain frequencies (not just HF) in amateur radio bands be used for certain emergency conditions. That is NOT under discussion, was never intended to be under any discussion. Your question in that regard seems to serve nothing but an attempt at misdirection.

Now you go back to the first post in this thread and judge who was berating who when the USA has already had much experience with earthquakes and other natural disasters. Hint: It was done by someone who is an example of a licensee who holds the "highest" class lincense in US amateur radio.

3701. Re: This Should Be A Warning

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 18:39:51 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010223133951.01278.00000515@nso-fa.aol.com>
Source record: 3849

Subject: Re: This Should Be A Warning
From: Jerry Oxendine <joxendi@bellsouth.net>
Date: Wed, 21 Feb 2001 18:33:11 -0500

Mr. "Last Word" Lennie,

>Here is a question. Have you ever heard of Military Affiliate Radio
>System (MARS)?

Yes, ever since 1952. Between 1953 and 1955 I was one of the
operators of a transmitter at Army radio station ADA which had
3rd priority use for MARS single-channel RTTY. The MARS
"station" for the US Far East Headquarters was an office at
the Pershing Heights main building. Receivers were at the remote
Receiver Site shared by USA and USAF NW of Tokyo. [ADA had
36 to 40 transmitters serving the Far East Command]

>Who makes up the majority of the member stations of this system?

5000 members who are over 17 and hold valid US amateur radio
licenses *PLUS* the sponsoring agencies of the U.S. Army,
U.S. Air Force, and the U.S. Navy and their personnel. The
Military Affiliate Radio System is sponsored by the Department
of Defense and is the overall command agency of MARS activities.

>I'll fill you in, ole "Last Word" Lennie. It is HAMS.

See the acronym words: MILITARY Affilicate Radio System.
The three principal military branches do their own daily
command and control for their respective MARS functions.
More on this can be seen on -

http://www.asc.army.mil/mars/ (Ft.Huachuca, AZ)

http://public.afcp.scott.af.mil/public/mars1.html (Scott AFB, IL)

http://navymars.org/ (USN, USMC, USCG)

>They pass traf-
>fic from overseas personnel, provide phone patches for service people
>and their families, and deliver messages and greetings.

Licensed radio amateurs can assist MARS in such public service
roles. 5000 do so. However, MARS is essentially a secondary
backup radio system to existing military branch radio
communications plus existing to provide emergency
communications in the USA and territories. Unlike non-member
radio amateurs, MARS can utilize spectra other than the

allocated amateur bands since MARS exists under the DoD.

>They do this
>on a volunteer basis. During Desert Storm, I myself passed a number of
>messages from local servicemen/women here serving there to their
>families here at home.

That is commendable.

Since the Gulf War of 1990-1991, Internet connections have
proliferated in all branches of the US military. It is now possible
for most members of the US military to communicate directly
with family and friends using Internet facilities.

>NOW. I want you to make more of a fool of your-
>self by telling me that hams do NOT provide service to our Nation and
>its citizens.

Why do you want others to make fools of themselves? Is that the
only way you can "win" message arguments?

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <20010218182452.17624.00001497@ng-cm1.aol.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>>(Steve Robeson) writes:
>>
>> > Here's MORE of the "foolish" part of Lennie. Keeps repeating over and
>> >over tha same "rank etc" silliness.
>>
>> > No. It's the truth. You ARE a fool...although after giving it some
>> >deep consideration, I am probably wrong about you "acting" the fool.
>>
>> > Things are only "general" or "unspecific" when they unravel your
rants,
>> >Lennie. Which is pretty often.
>>
>> Gratuitous name-calling doesn't make Robeson's point.
>> Robeson's words here are an example of amateur radio's highest
>> class.

How does an example of amateur radio's highest class equate to
"foolishness" about the Military Affiliate Radio System? How does
repetition of an example of amateur radio's highest class using
personal insults serve any point in Oxendine's message?

3702. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 18:42:08 UTC
From: K0HB@arrl.org
Message-ID: <976au0$30d$1@news.netmar.com>
Source record: 3850

In article <3A966534.4A1F372A@ovis.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net> writes:
>Cecil wrote:

>....and *if* a frog had wings he wouldn't bump his ass when he jumped.
>*If* we had some meat, we could make some sandwiches....*if* we had some
>bread.

You missed one.... *if* my aunt had balls she'd be my uncle.

73, Hans, K0HB

----- Posted via NewsOne.Net: Free (anonymous) Usenet News via the Web -----
http://newsone.net/ -- Free reading and anonymous posting to 60,000+ groups
NewsOne.Net prohibits users from posting spam. If this or other posts
made through NewsOne.Net violate posting guidelines, email abuse@newsone.net

3703. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 18:50:14 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A96B0E6.B3576312@uci.edu>
Source record: 3853

Cecil wrote:
>
> Jim Kelley wrote:
> >
> > "T. L. Bryant" wrote:
> > > Does your state require you to have a motorcycle endorsement if have no
> > > intention of ever owning or riding one?
> >
> > Probably not. Not doubt they are more firm about requiring a motorcycle
> > test if you want a motorcycle license however.
>
> Why can't the Morse code requirement be handled the same way?

It kinda already is handled that way. The license that permits you to
operate Morse on HF requires you to know some Morse code.

73, Jim AC6XG

3704. Re: FBI spy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 18:50:26 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010223135026.06490.00000163@nso-fz.aol.com>
Source record: 3854

In article <3a963b5e.40103093@news2.dvol.com>, kelly@dvol (Brian Kelly, w3rv) writes:

>>Same name and address as the FBI agent arrested for spying.
>>
>. . . just the kinda PR we *don't* need . .
>>
>>Jon
>>
>w3rv

Posting a second time within 9 hours doesn't make it go away.

I downloaded Jon's link to the Hanssen Affidavit and found the 112 pages rather fascinating. Thank you, Jon.

Nowhere does the document mention any amateur radio license call sign. Why are you disturbed?

3705. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 18:52:02 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A96B152.947FE8C9@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3856

Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> Cecil wrote:
> > Why can't the Morse code requirement be handled the same way?
>
> It kinda already is handled that way. The license that permits you to
> operate Morse on HF requires you to know some Morse code.

And kinda not handled that way. The license that permits you to
operate SSB on HF requires you to know some Morse code.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3706. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 18:55:17 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A96B215.76D5725@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3857

K0HB@arrl.org wrote:
>
> In article <3A95F938.4FE2D643@IEEE.org>, Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
> writes:
> >Dave Heil wrote:
> >> Nobody is forced to learn morse code, Cecil.
> >
> >That is a false statement, Dave. If a ham is to obtain HF ham
> >privileges then he is forced to learn Morse code. That is a
> >true statement.
>
> Dave's statement is absolutely true.

Nope it's not, Hams. HF hams *are* forced (required by circumstances)
to learn Morse code. Why do so many of you guys have reading problems?
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3707. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 18:57:55 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A96B2B3.FD8DFCE1@IEEE.org>
Source record: 3858

Jim Kelley wrote:
> Hey Dave, I've no doubt that you've forced yourself to endure in this
> debate. I think that's what may the applicable use of the word 'force'
> here. I forced myself to learn code. I wanted to, but I nevertheless
> met the conditions of Cecils definition of force. I had to make myself
> sit down and practice instead of sitting down and watching TV.

You were "required by circumstances" to learn Morse code. That's
the definition of being "forced" to do it.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3708. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 18:59:47 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A96B323.9101D3F3@uci.edu>
Source record: 3855

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> Cecil wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > Nobody is forced to learn morse code, Cecil.
> >
> > That is a false statement, Dave. If a ham is to obtain HF ham
> > privileges then he is forced to learn Morse code. That is a
> > true statement.
>
> Nobody is forced to learn morse code, Cecil. I am forced to endure your
> obtuse nature. What? I don't have to put up with it? I have options?
> I guess I'm not forced after all.

Hey Dave, I've no doubt that you've forced yourself to endure in this debate. I think that's what may the applicable use of the word 'force' here. I forced myself to learn code. I wanted to, but I nevertheless met the conditions of Cecils definition of force. I had to make myself sit down and practice instead of sitting down and watching TV.

73, Jim AC6XG

3709. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 19:17:16 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A96B73C.44B72D80@uci.edu>
Source record: 3859

Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> On Thu, 22 Feb 2001 16:31:31 -0800, Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
> wrote:
>
> >"T. L. Bryant" wrote:
> >> Does your state require you to have a motorcycle endorsement if have no
> >> intention of ever owning or riding one?
> >>
> >Probably not. Not doubt they are more firm about requiring a motorcycle
> >test if you want a motorcycle license however.

> Does your state require a license endorsement to drive a
> manual gearbox vehicle even though you take and pass
> the test using a car with an automatic transmission?

I think we were discussing motorcycles.

So I find myself lead by this inescapable logic to the conclusion that
since carbuerator repair isn't required for a drivers license, Morse
code shouldn't be required for any other license. :-)

ac6xg

3710. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 19:30:27 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A96BA53.8070DB3A@uci.edu>
Source record: 3860

Cecil wrote:
>
> Jim Kelley wrote:
> > Hey Dave, I've no doubt that you've forced yourself to endure in this
> > debate. I think that's what may the applicable use of the word 'force'
> > here. I forced myself to learn code. I wanted to, but I nevertheless
> > met the conditions of Cecils definition of force. I had to make myself
> > sit down and practice instead of sitting down and watching TV.

> You were "required by circumstances" to learn Morse code. That's
> the definition of being "forced" to do it.

Not the definition I was referring to, but also true.

ac6xg

3711. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 19:32:22 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A96BAC6.5E753316@uci.edu>
Source record: 3861

Cecil wrote:
>
> Jim Kelley wrote:
> >
> > Cecil wrote:
> > > Why can't the Morse code requirement be handled the same way?
> >
> > It kinda already is handled that way. The license that permits you to
> > operate Morse on HF requires you to know some Morse code.
>
> And kinda not handled that way. The license that permits you to
> operate SSB on HF requires you to know some Morse code.

One is forced to meet ALL of the requirements, because only one type of
license is offered.

ac6xg

3712. Re: 28.085 New channel 19 ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 19:41:42 UTC
From: K0HB@arrl.org
Message-ID: <976edm$9b4$1@news.netmar.com>
Source record: 3862

In article <AYul6.1779$rL4.148796@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>, Gary McAdams <g.m.mcadams@worldnet.att.net> writes:

>
>Any reasonable suggestions welcomed.
>

Send your reports, with as much detail as possible, to:

HAMBAND-INTRUDERS@YAHOOGROUPS.COM

73, Hans, K0HB

----- Posted via NewsOne.Net: Free (anonymous) Usenet News via the Web -----
http://newsone.net/ -- Free reading and anonymous posting to 60,000+ groups
NewsOne.Net prohibits users from posting spam. If this or other posts
made through NewsOne.Net violate posting guidelines, email abuse@newsone.net

3713. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 20:22:33 UTC
From: tlbryant@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <976gq9029gj@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 3865

In article <974jg7$l6u$1@208.206.142.104>, dixie@townsqr.com says...
>
>
>
>"T. L. Bryant" wrote:
>>
>>
>> Like an umpire, I call 'em as I see 'em.
>
>
>Be glad yer not. The player's wud toss you outta the game.

You only wish. Players and managers don't have that authority.

3714. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 20:28:49 UTC
From: tlbryant@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <976h61129gj@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 3864

In article <3A95DB50.402CA417@IEEE.org>, Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org says...
>
>Jim Kelley wrote:
>>
>> "T. L. Bryant" wrote:
>> > Does your state require you to have a motorcycle endorsement if have no
>> > intention of ever owning or riding one?
>>
>> Probably not. Not doubt they are more firm about requiring a motorcycle
>> test if you want a motorcycle license however.
>
>Why can't the Morse code requirement be handled the same way?

I would have no problem with that, but the pro-code group might think there's still a reason to know it if you want to use HF phone. I've yet to see any good reason.

3715. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 20:33:54 UTC
From: tlbryant@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <976hfi229gj@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 3866

In article <974oll$6vq$1@208.206.142.104>, dixie@townsqr.com says...
>
>
>
>"T. L. Bryant" wrote:
>> Gee, TL I'm sure sorry you couldn't "force" yourself to do it. Maybe you
>> >should exercise a little better control over yourself?
>>
>> If that's intended to mean that I haven't passed any amateur licensing
exams,
>I
>> suggest you learn how to use an archive service, such as deja.com.
>
>
> I'm not concerned about you, TL. You is what you is. And if you walk
>talk and squawk like a .... then one must assume that is what you
>are.

It's strange that you should make such an insinuation if you're not concerned
about me.

3716. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 20:38:42 UTC
From: tlbryant@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <976hoi329gj@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 3867

In article <3A96B73C.44B72D80@uci.edu>, jwkelley@uci.edu says...

>> Does your state require a license endorsement to drive a
>> manual gearbox vehicle even though you take and pass
>> the test using a car with an automatic transmission?
>
>I think we were discussing motorcycles.
>
>So I find myself lead by this inescapable logic to the conclusion that
>since carbuerator repair isn't required for a drivers license, Morse
>code shouldn't be required for any other license. :-)
>
>ac6xg

..and here we have a perfect example someone trying to be "cute" when they
can't come up with a decent rebuttle.

3717. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 20:52:19 UTC
From: tlbryant@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <976ii3429gj@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 3870

In article <3A95F547.BF1FEA3A@ovis.net>, k8mn@ovis.net says...

>> >Please don't start that "hazing ritual" crap again. The same penalty is
>> >imposed if someone blows the almighty written exam: no license.
>> >Don't you just hate that written "hazing ritual"?
>> >
>> >Dave K8MN
>>
>> Go back and read the part where I talked about criteria having relevance,
and
>> stop twisting my words to suit your own bias.
>
>Your words weren't twisted. They were quoted. Your own bias is
>evident. How is it any more valueable than mine?
>
>Dave K8MN

Then you should read what you quote. I mentioned criteria having relevance. You then make a comment about "written hazing ritual" when you could read for yourself that was not what I meant. I see that as twisting my words. As for our respective "biases", it's obvious that you have a pre-conceived conclusion as to how things ought to be, and will only allow facts that suport that conclusion, excluding all others which may disprove it.

3718. Re: 28.085 New channel 19 ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 20:52:32 UTC
From: David Robbins <k1ttt@berkshire.net>
Message-ID: <3A96CD90.86C5AC96@berkshire.net>
Source record: 3863

are you going to create that group and do anything with the reports, or is it
just a bit bucket??? i don't see it in the group list now.

K0HB@arrl.org wrote:
>
> In article <AYul6.1779$rL4.148796@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>, Gary
> McAdams <g.m.mcadams@worldnet.att.net> writes:
>
> > >
> > >Any reasonable suggestions welcomed.
> > >
>
> Send your reports, with as much detail as possible, to:
>
> HAMBAND-INTRUDERS@YAHOOGROUPS.COM
>
> 73, Hans, K0HB
>
> ----- Posted via NewsOne.Net: Free (anonymous) Usenet News via the Web -----
> http://newsone.net/ -- Free reading and anonymous posting to 60,000+ groups
> NewsOne.Net prohibits users from posting spam. If this or other posts
> made through NewsOne.Net violate posting guidelines, email abuse@newsone.net

--
David Robbins K1TTT
e-mail: mailto://k1ttt@berkshire.net
web: http://www.berkshire.net/~robbins/k1ttt.html or http://www.k1ttt.net
AR-Cluster node: 145.69MHz or telnet://k1ttt.net

3719. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 21:01:15 UTC
From: tlbryant@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <976j2r529gj@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 3873

In article <3A95F4ED.260770B0@ovis.net>, k8mn@ovis.net says...
>
>> But since you want examples that are a little more up to date, I might also
>> point out that there is nothing on a driver's license test that requires you
t
>o
>> know how to drive a standard shift vehicle in order to obtain a standard
>> driver's license. This is a matter of choice.
>
>There's no practical or written exam required for a marriage license
>either.

...other than the fact that you have to swear that you don't have any STDs.

>> All that matters to you and certain others in this newsgroup, is that you'd
>> rather argue semantics over the usage of the word "forced" in a sentence,
than
>> the reasons why high-speed code testing should have been retained for access
t
>o
>> HF phone portions.
>
>How the hell do you know what matters to me? I don't consider 5 wpm to
>be high speed morse. Are you now telling us that you consider it to be?
>
>
>Dave K8MN

Please point out *specifically*, in the quoted material above, where I said
anything about 5 WPM being high speed. You've got a serious comprehension
problem.

3720. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 21:06:40 UTC
From: tlbryant@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <976jd0629gj@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 3872

In article <3A95F648.2DBC31CA@ovis.net>, k8mn@ovis.net says...

>> Does your state require you to have a motorcycle endorsement if have no
>> intention of ever owning or riding one?
>
>Nope. It has not made obtaining a motorcycle endorsement any more
>mandatory than an amateur radio license.
>
>Dave K8MN

You just don't get it, do you? No one said that it was mandatory to obtain an amateur license. The subject is the relevance of certain test requirements to obtain a license. Why is it so hard for you to stay on that?

3721. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 21:09:21 UTC
From: tlbryant@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <976ji1729gj@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 3869

In article <976au0$30d$1@news.netmar.com>, K0HB@arrl.org says...
>
>In article <3A966534.4A1F372A@ovis.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net> writes:
>>Cecil wrote:
>
>
>>....and *if* a frog had wings he wouldn't bump his ass when he jumped.
>>*If* we had some meat, we could make some sandwiches....*if* we had some
>>bread.
>
>You missed one.... *if* my aunt had balls she'd be my uncle.
>
>73, Hans, K0HB

Freud's assertations are once again proven.

3722. this is a test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 21:28:55 UTC
From: Pete <petejen@hotmail.net.au>
Message-ID: <LqAl6.1883$v5.6802@newsfeeds.bigpond.com>
Source record: 3868

Hi guys..new at this..so just testing to see if it works

3723. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 21:47:28 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A96DA70.F59CA7F5@uci.edu>
Source record: 3871

"T. L. Bryant" wrote:
>
> In article <3A96B73C.44B72D80@uci.edu>, jwkelley@uci.edu says...
>
> >> Does your state require a license endorsement to drive a
> >> manual gearbox vehicle even though you take and pass
> >> the test using a car with an automatic transmission?
> > >
> > >I think we were discussing motorcycles.
> > >
> > >So I find myself lead by this inescapable logic to the conclusion that
> > >since carbuerator repair isn't required for a drivers license, Morse
> > >code shouldn't be required for any other license. :-)
> > >
> > >ac6xg

> ..and here we have a perfect example someone trying to be "cute" when they
> can't come up with a decent rebuttle.

So apparently you think that citing carburator repair rather than manual
gearbox testing makes a big difference in Mr. Sohls proof about Morse
code and amateur radio licenses? I guess I shouldn't be surprised.

ac6xg

3724. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 21:51:29 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A96DB61.8E3E4274@uci.edu>
Source record: 3874

"T. L. Bryant" wrote:
>
> In article <3A95DB50.402CA417@IEEE.org>, Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org says...
> >
> >Jim Kelley wrote:
> >>
> >> "T. L. Bryant" wrote:
> >> > Does your state require you to have a motorcycle endorsement if have no
> >> > intention of ever owning or riding one?
> >>
> >> Probably not. Not doubt they are more firm about requiring a motorcycle
> >> test if you want a motorcycle license however.
> >
> >Why can't the Morse code requirement be handled the same way?

> I would have no problem with that, but the pro-code group might think there's
> still a reason to know it if you want to use HF phone. I've yet to see any good
> reason.

The point is that what someone is going to do after their license is
granted is irrelevant. The requirements are based upon the privileges
which are granted by the license, not the desires of the applicant.

73, ac6xg

3725. Re: How do I cancel my League membership?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 22:10:08 UTC
From: Walton Hackman <Walton205@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <976n41$a1d$1@mozo.cc.purdue.edu>
Source record: 3875
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Write to the ARRL and tell them you are willing to make a deal. Offer them
$100 if they will remove your name from the membership rolls.
Walton, W3NYT
==========
"smiley o'riley" <bummer-radio@licensing.org> wrote in message
news:goodbye@goodbye...
>
> I find I can no longer support the ARRL by being a member. What's the
best
> way to cancel a membership?
>
> TNX 73 de Smiley

3726. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 22:32:24 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net>
Message-ID: <3A96E4F8.414681F6@ovis.net>
Source record: 3877

Cecil wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > You selected a definition from your
> > dictionary. It was incorrect for the situation.
>
> That's your opinion, Dave. It is wrong. Your opinion and a buck
> fifty will get you a cup of coffee. I very carefully selected
> exactly the definition that matched the concept I wanted to
> convey. That it chapped your a$$ is irrelevant.

You mean you screwed up and chose the wrong definition and now are *forced* to take your lumps. That it chafes you to be called on being wrong doesn't bother me.

I often get free coffee for my opinion. You mean you don't?

Dave K8MN

3727. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 22:35:28 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net>
Message-ID: <3A96E5B0.4610718A@ovis.net>
Source record: 3876

Cecil wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > Cecil wrote: In order to
> > > obtain a driver's license, a driver is forced to take a driver's test.
> >
> > The sentence is properly constructed but it is inaccurate.
>
> You are wrong, Dave. That sentence is obviously accurate as any
> ordinary prudent man can see from reading it. The definition of
> "forced - required by circumstances" is directly out of "Webster's
> New Universal Unabridged Dictionary", Barnes & Noble, ï¿½1996.

Your writing that I am wrong does not make it so. What the hell does a prudent man have to do with this? What happened to the original definition you brought forth. Have you now abandoned it in favor of this "johnny-come-lately" one you are now using?

You are a genuine homespun BSer, Cecil.

Dave K8MN

3728. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 22:44:34 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net>
Message-ID: <3A96E7D2.3B7B5F2F@ovis.net>
Source record: 3878

Cecil wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > Cecil wrote:
> > > What's wrong with "required by circumstances"?
> >
> > What happened? Did the one you originally chose *force* you to remove
> > the egg from your face?
>
> Nope, "Webster's Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary" gives the definition
> as "forced - done or produced with effort". That overlaps the
> definition of "forced - required by circumstances" which appears
> in my unabridged dictionary which I rarely open because it is so large.

It overlaps? How does that take place, pray tell. Did you have the
lighter book under the one which is too large (formerly heavy) to open?
Why didn't you introduce the second definition at the same time as the
first? Was it because you were beaten over the head with the first one?

> You don't have to be beaten with a stick to have force used against
> you. Rules, regulations, and laws are almost always backed up by the
> force of the issuing authority.

Yeah and your attitude is now *forced*-strained, unnatural or affected
(Random House College Dictionary).

> > Why the amendment (or are you attempting to use
> > the new one as an addendum)?
>
> Why the attempted diversion, Dave? Diversions are invariably employed
> by people who are losing the argument. Please stick to the subject.
> If a ham is to have legal HF ham privileges then he is forced
> (required by circumstances) to pass a Morse code exam. You do
> understand if/then statement logic, don't you?

There was no diversion. You simply switched definitions after choosing
the wrong one. Then you added the *if* portion. You can't debate
without injecting new information, used selectively.

Twist in the wind.

Dave K8MN

3729. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 22:49:08 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net>
Message-ID: <3A96E8E4.974FD36@ovis.net>
Source record: 3880

Cecil wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > Cecil wrote:
> > > Of course they are, Dave. If I want to operate a motorcycle legally
> > > in Texas then I am forced (required by circumstances) to take a
> > > motorcycle test. If you say that is not a true statement then you
> > > are simply lying.
> >
> > You write "Of course" as if that somehow makes it fact. Of course you
> > are less capable as a wordsmith than as an engineer. You are simply out
> > of your league. To state otherwise makes you a liar.
>
> People who consider themselves so expert that they don't ever have to
> open a dictionary often get caught with their pants down. How does it
> feel to have your omniscient opinion of yourself dashed by the simple
> act of a dumb engineer opening a dictionary and proving you wrong?

...a dumb engineer who can't tell the difference between one useage of a
word and another. You haven't proven anything.

> The force of the State of Texas is behind the motorcycle test requirement.
> If I want to operate a motorcycle legally in Texas, then I am forced
> by the state to pass a motorcycle test. If I choose to ignore what is
> "required by circumstances" then I will be forced to accept a traffic
> ticket or worse.

The *if* implies options. No one forces you to operate a motorcycle.
No one forces you to to take an exam for a motorcycle endorsement. No
one forced you to take a morse exam.

I can hear it now (Cecil to state police), "I was required by
circumstances to ride this motorcycle without insurance".

You should do comedy clubs, Cecil.

Dave K8MN

3730. Re: 28.085 New channel 19 ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 22:50:57 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.10.10102232251020.12558-100000@exp.bde-arc.ampr.org>
Source record: 3879

On Fri, 23 Feb 2001, Cecil wrote:
> Ken Diaz wrote:
> > Truckers from "back east" are S-7 to S-9 here in Southern California. Hope
> > Reilly knows about this. This posting is so we can assist in trying to
> > locate these guys (Texas?).
>
> A Californian saying that Texas is "back east"? I would advise you not
> to set foot in Texas ever again. :-)

Do you have a problem with geography? Texas is east of California, unless
you're looking for a "long path" route.

3731. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 22:52:05 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net>
Message-ID: <3A96E995.4AF630BC@ovis.net>
Source record: 3881

Cecil wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > Cecil wrote:
> > > You have completely missed the point so far, Dave. If one is to operate
> > > a motorcycle legally it is mandatory that one take a motorcycle test, i.e.
> > > one is forced (required by circumstances) to take a motorcycle test in
> > > order to avoid illegal operation.
> >
> > ...and *if* a frog had wings he wouldn't bump his ass when he jumped.
> > *If* we had some meat, we could make some sandwiches....*if* we had some
> > bread.
>
> Those are true statements, Dave, just like my if/then statements are true.
> In case you have forgotten your logic, if the 'if' part of an if/then
> statement is false, then the entire statement is true. Thus, "if a frog
> had wings he wouldn't bump his ass when he jumped", is a true statement.

...not necessarily. There are numerous circumstances in which the frog
could still bump his ass. There are a number of circumstances where,
even if we had meat and bread, we couldn't make sandwiches. Yet you
blindly state that the statements are true. Tsk, tsk.

> So is, "If a ham is to have legal HF ham privileges, he is forced to take
> a Morse code exam."

Tsk, tsk, tsk. More false conclusions.

Dave K8MN

3732. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 23:00:33 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net>
Message-ID: <3A96EB91.DF3635CF@ovis.net>
Source record: 3883

Cecil wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > You're now attempting another game of adding material to your original
> > lame statement in an attempt to make it valid. That "if" you're now
> > using wasn't there initially. Neither was the "required by
> > circumstances" portion. No one is forced to learn morse.
>
> Dave, I am trying to simplify the concept down to a point where even
> you can understand it. There are many ways to state an 'if' function
> that don't use the word 'if'. "In order to" is one way. If you had
> simply accepted my original statement as true, then I would not be
> forced to mount a detailed defense. I am not changing anything. I
> am expanding on the discussion so you will eventually understand it.
> Your objections required me to expand on my original statement and
> then you rag on me for expanding on my original statement. Tsk, Tsk.
> Hope you don't treat your children that way.

I hope you don't continue to drink to excess, Cecil. You've certainly changed the definition from the incorrect one you initially brought forth. That isn't expanding. It is changing the definition. I rag on you for that.

You were not forced to learn morse code. I was not forced to learn morse code. Leonard H. Anderson certainly hasn't been forced to learn morse code. "Forced - enforced or compulsory" (Random House College Dictionary)

> Hams with HF privileges are forced to learn Morse. They are "required
> by circumstances" to learn Morse code. The "circumstances" is the FCC's
> Morse code requirement.

What's the matter, Cecil. Don't you like your first definition any more? I'd really enjoy hearing tales of how you were compelled to learn morse.

Dave K8MN

3733. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 23:03:51 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net>
Message-ID: <3A96EC57.1BC55C01@ovis.net>
Source record: 3882

Cecil wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > Darn! I count only five *if*s in there. What do you suppose they mean?
> > I'd say that they imply options. I think you'd better regroup and
> > ponder this a while.
>
> You obviously don't understand the rules of logic, Dave. I suggest you
> stop considering yourself to be omniscient and open up a good logic book.
> If the 'if' portion of an if/then statement is false then the entire
> statement is true. If the 'if' portion of an if/then statement is true
> and the 'then' portion is true, then the entire statement is true. The
> only way an if/then statement can be false is for the 'if' portion to
> be true and the 'then' portion to be false. Every if/then statement I
> have made has been true. You were mistaken when you asserted that they
> were false.

And you are stating that there is no way that the "then" portion is
false. I strongly disagree. I further state that the if implies
options.

> If a ham wants legal HF ham privileges then he is forced (required by
> circumstances) to pass a Morse code exam. That's a true statement, Dave.
> There's just no getting around it. The force of the FCC is behind the
> Morse code requirement.

Your statement does not become true because you insist that it is.
No one is required to learn morse or to take an FCC exam. Both are
entirely optional.

Dave K8MN

3734. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 23:10:21 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net>
Message-ID: <3A96EDDD.88119A70@ovis.net>
Source record: 3884

Cecil wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > Cecil wrote:
> > > That is a false statement, Dave. If a ham is to obtain HF ham
> > > privileges then he is forced to learn Morse code. That is a
> > > true statement.
> >
> > Nobody is forced to learn morse code, Cecil.
>
> I made an if/then statement which follows the rules of logic.
> That if/then statement is true. According to the rules of classical
> logic, your statement is actually false because HF hams are forced
> (required by circumstances) to learn Morse code. There is an implied
> 'if' function in that statement.
>
> I can make the same conditional statement without using the words,
> "if" and "then".
>
> In order to obtain HF privileges, a ham is forced (required by
> circumstances) to pass a Morse code test.
>
> It can be stated another way with the 'if' portion of the conditional
> statement only implied.
>
> HF hams are forced (required by circumstances) to pass a
> Morse code test.
>
> The implied 'if' portion are the HF privileges. If they don't pass the
> Morse code exam, they are not HF hams. Thus the implied 'if' portion
> of the implied conditional statement is false and therefore the entire
> statement is true, following the accepted rules of classical logic.

Neat logic lesson, Cecil. The following statement is also true:
"No person is forced to obtain an HF ham ticket". So is, "If a person
does not desire an HF amateur radio license, then he need not learn
morse code."

Dave K8MN

3735. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 23:15:47 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net>
Message-ID: <3A96EF23.9B7E5688@ovis.net>
Source record: 3885

Cecil wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > "I forced the door open." does not mean the same things as "I was
> > forced to endure Cecil's endless games". You selected the wrong
> > definition initially and are attempting to rectify that now.
>
> Nope, both those definitions are valid dictionary definitions, Dave.
> I correctly selected the one I wanted to use. You objected to my
> selection. Now you are trying to convince us that you are an
> omniscient guru when it comes to dictionaries and definitions. You
> are not. You have made a simple logic mistake. Many people make the
> same mistake.

Sure, both are valid but their meaning is not the same. You chose the incorrect definition and have since abandoned it for one more to your liking. No one has to be omniscient or a guru to see what transpired.

> "I am forced to endure Cecil's endless games" is a true statement
> given some implied assumptions. The implied assumption is:
>
> If I choose to argue with Cecil on r.r.a.p, then I am forced to
> endure his endless games.
>
> That is a true statement whether you choose to argue with me on
> r.r.a.p or not. That is the rule of logic about which you are
> mistaken. If you do not choose to argue with me on r.r.a.p, the
> statement is still true according to the rules of classical logic.
> That's why you are mistaken when you assume my if/then statements
> are false. If the 'if' portion of an if/then statement is false,
> then the entire statement is true, by definition.

...and you mean that the use of the "if" word implies options to do or not do something. I have not stated that your "if" statements are false, only that, in typical Cecil fashion, you added them after making a blanket statement.

> If a ham is to obtain HF privileges then he is forced (required by
> circumstances) to learn Morse code.
>
> Sorry, Dave, that is a true statement.

Sorry, Cecil. I don't buy the "then" portion of your statement.

Dave K8MN

3736. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 23:19:36 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A96F008.9F0BA154@uci.edu>
Source record: 3886

Dave Heil wrote:
> I strongly disagree. I further state that the if implies
> options.

Could the word 'when' be used instead of 'if'?

Jim AC6XG

3737. Re: This Should Be A Warning

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 23:20:25 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nospam.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.g987yy0.pminews@ca.news.verio.net>
Source record: 3887

On 23 Feb 2001 18:39:49 GMT, Len Over 21 wrote:

>I have no problems with agreements. I have no problem with
>recognizing that agreements are NOT ABSOLUTE LAW. They are
>simply statements of Good Faith by government administrations.
>It is considered good practice to abide by agreements, but those
>agreements are not absolutes nor are they "enforced" by any
>supra-law enforcement organization (there is none).

International treaties such as the Radio Regulations have the
force of law in the United States.

If one is found violating a provision of same which does not
have a counterpart in FCC Regs thw individual will receive an
FCC Notice of Violation (FCC Form 793 may be used) that instead
of starting with "You appear to be in violation of Section
xx.xxx of the FCC Rules" will start with "You appear to be in
violation of Section XXX of the International Radio
Regulations". The Communications Act does, in fact, obligate
compliance with treaty requirements.

As you know, US Government stations and foreign radio stations
are not subject to FCC Rules, and when one is found in apparent
violation of standards derived from the International Radio
Regs, they are cited (FCC Form 74) as apparent violations of Section
XXX of the International Radio Regulations. The Form 74 is
sent to the U S Government agency frequency manager or the
foreign government Adminstration, as appropriate.

If the FCC receives an equivalent notice from a foreign
Administration that an FCC-regulated station was found in
violation of the Radio Regs, the FCC turns around and issues
a Form 793 to the licensee citing the section of the Radio
Regs as reported by the foreign Administration.

When a specific Administration files a complaint with the ITU
that another Administration is intentionally disregarding or
violating some provisions of the International Telecommunications
Convention, the Radio Regulations, the Telegraph and Telephone
Regulations, a specific Agreement, or a ruling of the IFRB,
where an exception was not taken at the time of the signing of
the treaty or Agreement in question, the matter is referred to
mandatory arbitration under the auspices of the ITU Secretary-General,
per all such agreements.

That was the route we had to take when Radio Omdurman (Sudan) was intentionally causing harmful interference (Middle Eastern politics at work) by operating 2 kHz offset from a MF broadcast co-channel assignment with Kol Yisrael (Israel) while I was the latter's ITU liaison engineer at the Israeli Ministry of Communications (equivalent of the FCC) in the mid-60s. It took about 2 years but Omdurman was eventually brought into compliance by order of the ITU Secretary-General.

The Radio Regs are, in fact, enforceable treaty.

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

3738. Re: This Should Be A Warning

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 23:20:26 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nospam.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.g988dg1.pminews@ca.news.verio.net>
Source record: 3888

On 23 Feb 2001 18:39:51 GMT, Len Over 21 wrote:

>See the acronym words: MILITARY Affilicate Radio System.

News for you Lennie -- in "your time" in the 50s, the "A" in
the acronym was AMATEUR, not "affiliate" - certainly not
"affilicate" (yeah, cheap shot....) It was changed
sometime later. In that era, what is now known as "Navy MARS"
was known as "Naval Reserve Amateur Radio". See old copies of
QST.

>Licensed radio amateurs can assist MARS in such public service
>roles. 5000 do so. However, MARS is essentially a secondary
>backup radio system to existing military branch radio
>communications plus existing to provide emergency
>communications in the USA and territories. Unlike non-member
>radio amateurs, MARS can utilize spectra other than the
>allocated amateur bands since MARS exists under the DoD.

IIRC one must be a licensed amateur to get authorization to
operate one's station with a MARS callsign in MARS activities.

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

3739. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 23:22:15 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net>
Message-ID: <3A96F0A7.BD5ABAA@ovis.net>
Source record: 3889

T. L. Bryant wrote:
>
> In article <3A95F547.BF1FEA3A@ovis.net>, k8mn@ovis.net says...
>
> >> >Please don't start that "hazing ritual" crap again. The same penalty is
> >> >imposed if someone blows the almighty written exam: no license.
> >> >Don't you just hate that written "hazing ritual"?
> >> >
> >> >Dave K8MN
> >>
> >> Go back and read the part where I talked about criteria having relevance,
> and
> >> stop twisting my words to suit your own bias.
> >
> >Your words weren't twisted. They were quoted. Your own bias is
> >evident. How is it any more valueable than mine?
> >
> >Dave K8MN
>
> Then you should read what you quote. I mentioned criteria having relevance. You
> then make a comment about "written hazing ritual" when you could read for
> yourself that was not what I meant. I see that as twisting my words. As for our
> respective "biases", it's obvious that you have a pre-conceived conclusion as
> to how things ought to be, and will only allow facts that suport that
> conclusion, excluding all others which may disprove it.

...and this differs from your own bias in what way? Do you mean that I
should give up my view, be reasonable and see it your way?

Dave K8MN

3740. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 23:24:24 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net>
Message-ID: <3A96F128.51094668@ovis.net>
Source record: 3890

T. L. Bryant wrote:
>
> In article <3A95F648.2DBC31CA@ovis.net>, k8mn@ovis.net says...
>
> >> Does your state require you to have a motorcycle endorsement if have no
> >> intention of ever owning or riding one?
> >
> >Nope. It has not made obtaining a motorcycle endorsement any more
> >mandatory than an amateur radio license.
> >
> >Dave K8MN
>
> You just don't get it, do you? No one said that it was mandatory to obtain an
> amateur license. The subject is the relevance of certain test requirements to
> obtain a license. Why is it so hard for you to stay on that?

That was the subject? How many posting generations back?
I thought you were asking me about my state's motorcycle endorsement
regs.

Dave K8MN

3741. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-23 23:26:34 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net>
Message-ID: <3A96F1AA.C9CA48A1@ovis.net>
Source record: 3891

T. L. Bryant wrote:
>
> In article <3A95F4ED.260770B0@ovis.net>, k8mn@ovis.net says...
> >
> >> But since you want examples that are a little more up to date, I might also
> >> point out that there is nothing on a driver's license test that requires you
> t
> >o
> >> know how to drive a standard shift vehicle in order to obtain a standard
> >> driver's license. This is a matter of choice.
> >
> >There's no practical or written exam required for a marriage license
> >either.
>
> ...other than the fact that you have to swear that you don't have any STDs.
>
>
> >> All that matters to you and certain others in this newsgroup, is that you'd
> >> rather argue semantics over the usage of the word "forced" in a sentence,
> than
> >> the reasons why high-speed code testing should have been retained for access
> t
> >o
> >> HF phone portions.
> >
> >How the hell do you know what matters to me? I don't consider 5 wpm to
> >be high speed morse. Are you now telling us that you consider it to be?
> >
> >
> >Dave K8MN
>
> Please point out *specifically*, in the quoted material above, where I said
> *anything* about 5 WPM being high speed. You've got a serious comprehension
> problem.

Okay. "...reasons why high speed code testing should have been retained
for access...". That satisfy you?

Dave K8MN

3742. Re: 11meters, freebanding, and the no-code tech ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-24 01:07:47 UTC
From: ssb411d@cs.com
Message-ID: <20010223200747.09323.00002484@ng-mm1.news.cs.com>
Source record: 3892

Wow!,

You guys are a tough crowd. At first, I was little surprised at you, Dick. But then I realized that you weren't the Dick I thought you were. No pun intended.

Harmonics are simply signals from a transmitter or oscillator occurring on whole-number multiples of the desired operating frequency. End of story.

If you look at the title of this particular thread, you'll notice the word "freebanding" contained therein. It's easy to forget that freebanding also includes operation on the frequencies directly below the lower limit of the citizens band, 26.9650MHz. I'm sure that all of you "seasoned" amateurs are aware that the 6 meter band, 50 thru 54MHz is open to US operators holding Technician class licenses and above. I'm not sure what all the excitement is about? Is it because RM called it the first harmonic? That's just symantics, I don't think there's anybody in this group, with an ounce of gray matter, that doesn't understand the implied meaning of his statement...whether technically correct or not. I refuse to believe that a group of grown adults could be this petty, I'll just assume then that it was merely a "misunderstanding."

Now back to Dick,

>So, then he is deliberately a very willing renegade, an absolute radio
>outlaw, and has no desire nor intent to change his stripes. We see.

Well Dick, I'm not sure if you're referring to me n the previous post or Mark, who made the original proposal. That first sentence describes neither of us, so I don't really see the connection there. I'm NOT a freebander and from what I've read of Mark's original post, he HAS changed his stripes...and encourages others to do the same. I respectfully suggest you reread his post.

>And we also see that the FCC is not particularily interested, and is
>MORE interested in giving him a freebee ham radio license or upgrade,
>and ARRL is salivating to sign him up. Neat.

I'll agree with you on the FCC's disinterest. H O W E V E R, nobody gave me a freebee ham radio license and I was a member of the ARRL before I became a licensed amateur. I "earned" my GROL long before that and my previous involvement with 11 meter radio laid a nice rudimentary foundation, thank you. As for Mark, I'm pretty sure he too is already an ARRL member and quite frankly, I personally wouldn't be too surprised if he were already a licensed amateur. Just a gut feeling.

I did attempt to satisfactorily answer a statement re. how the ARRL has "attacked" CB. If calling it like it is makes me a renegade, then I accept the title with pride. If you re-read the thread perhaps you'll get a better feel for the context in which some of these posts are worded.

73 de Bert
SSB411D

P.S. Thanks RM for the defensive support, but in the future don't bother replying. Statements like these are merely a con"troll"ed effort to fan the flames. Thanks again.

3743. Re: >> NO CODE = NO HAM. <<

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-24 01:09:26 UTC
From: ssb411d@cs.com
Message-ID: <20010223200926.09323.00002485@ng-mm1.news.cs.com>
Source record: 3893

Nicely put, Mark. Class act!

3744. Re: 11meters, freebanding, and the no-code tech ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-24 01:32:52 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010223203252.01718.00000071@nso-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 3898

In article <3A967926.1C7A246C@toast.net>, John O'Flaherty <oflahert@toast.net>
writes:

>The first overtone is the second harmonic.

Not in radio work.

>Both the fundamental and all
>the harmonics are partial tones (at least in audio work).

In music, yes.

>I've never
>heard the term 'first harmonic' before, althought the meaning is
>unambiguous.
>
You never heard it because it's not used.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3745. Re: 11meters, freebanding, and the no-code tech ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-24 01:32:53 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010223203253.01718.00000072@nso-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 3896

In article <20010222200612.26108.00002409@ng-mo1.aol.com>, rmoretta@aol.com (RMoretta) writes:

>I think we can safely assume that YOU do NOT operate on 6 meters. Guess where
>the first harmonic of some high powered CB transmissions fall? Do your
>homework
>before posting...please.

Umm - it's the SECOND harmonic.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3746. Re: 11meters, freebanding, and the no-code tech ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-24 01:32:54 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010223203254.01718.00000073@nso-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 3894

In article <20010221223210.26080.00002145@ng-mo1.aol.com>, rmoretta@aol.com (RMoretta) writes:

>Go reread the ORIGINAL post. The one concerning RM-9807. By "attacking" >RM-9807, the ARRL really stuck its "two cents" where it didn't belong.

Hold on a second there.

Why doesn't the ARRL (or any other interested party) have the right to comment to the FCC? Would you say the same thing about a cb group or individual commenting on an RM about the amateur radio service?

> And
>that
>concerned "legal" 11 meters.

It is about changing the definition of what is legal in that service.

>That was an an attempt by CBer's to address its
>own "concerns" in DC. Perhaps it would have died all on its own, but disagree
>or not...the ARRL's concerns should be confined to amateur radio.

They are! Legalizing long distance communication on cb would affect hams.

>Don't like
>a
>service paralleling the amateur service?(As meritless an arguement as that
>is!)...let the ITU agreement handle it, NOT the ARRL!

The citizens radio service is not meant to parallel the amateur radio service - never was.
>
>You'll probably find that many of us agree with the illegal operators on 10
>meters.

Agree with them how?

>To call them "11 meter guys" is a perfect example of why Mark's idea
>has come about.

They are not hams. Why are they operating illegally?

>This combined with the league's self "involvement" has
>brought
>us to this point. The "concern" is very accurately placed. You can rest
>assured
>that before I cast my next vote, I'll ask my division(Hudson) director and
>vice

>director their position on league involvement in 11 meter "concerns." Perhaps
>the next incarnation of "RM-9807" will not be met with the same shenanigans,
>particularly after the ITU does away with the code requirements for int'l
>comms
>under 30MHz. Good day.

All interested parties have the right to comment to the FCC on proposed
actions. Freedom of speech and all that. Why would you change that basic right?

73 de Jim, N2EY

3747. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-24 01:32:54 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010223203254.01718.00000074@nso-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 3895

In article <96b8p4113q9@enews1.newsguy.com>, tlbryant@my-deja.com (T. L. Bryant) writes:

>It reminds me of that scene in the movie "Good Will Hunting"
>where Matt Damon's character was critical of a Harvard student who was
>spending
>all of his money for college, when everything he wanted to know could be
>obtained for the price of a library card.
>
"Will Hunting" is a fictional character, not a real person. He is portrayed as a super-genius who has taught himself the equivalent of several doctorates in a variety of subjects, but who works as a janitor and gets in trouble with the law. He may have lots of knowledge, but he doesn't use it. He avoids the responsibility of actually DOING anything constructive besides custodial work until the very end of the movie.

He knew the price of everyhting and the value of nothing. (Shaw's definition of a cynic).

Besides, how smart can a guy be who almost let a gal like Minnie Driver get away?

73 de Jim, N2EY

3748. Re: Jim - Off topic - Interesting info on the Titanic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-24 01:32:55 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010223203255.01718.00000075@nso-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 3897

In article <t9b2du5nt6ar97@corp.supernews.com>, "Leland C. Scott"
<no-spam@junk-mail.net> writes:

>> But the main point remains that the Titanic disaster was the result of a
>whole
>> series of mistakes.
>
>No doubt about that. The issue with the steel quality only came about once
>the wreck was located a few years ago, and some samples were retrieved for
>analysis.

Yup.

>> It did not have a single cause. The list of things that
>> could have prevented the disaster is a long one.
>
>Now everyone can have fun debating which "cause" was the most significant
>single one, other than not hitting the iceberg, which could have prevent the
>ship from going down.

Why limit it? We can have two debates: one on things that would have prevented the collision in the first place, and one on things that would have prevented the loss of life if the collision had occurred anyway.

For example, a bigger rudder would have allowed the ship to turn slightly faster, and avoided the iceberg completely. Better steel might have reduced the damage enough so that rescue ships would have gotten there before she sank. (Almost all of those lost died of hypothermia from being in the cold water.)

>This sure beats debating the CW testing, and exam
>issues, at least for a while. 8-))

Those are dead issues, anyway. The code test in the US is reduced to the minimum, other countries are rapidly following suit, and not much else can be expected before the treaty requirement changes. The writtens won't change much because the FCC doesn't want them to - best we hams can do is make the question pools bigger and better.

> Take care.
>
You too! The lessons of Titanic need to be learned by each generation. The biggest single cause was plain old carelessness - lack of attention to detail.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3749. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-24 01:57:15 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9774dr$p3e$0@208.206.142.90>
Source record: 3899

Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > Cecil wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > > Nobody is forced to learn morse code, Cecil.
> > >
> > > That is a false statement, Dave. If a ham is to obtain HF ham
> > > privileges then he is forced to learn Morse code. That is a
> > > true statement.
> >
> > Nobody is forced to learn morse code, Cecil. I am forced to endure your
> > obtuse nature. What? I don't have to put up with it? I have options?
> > I guess I'm not forced after all.
>
> Hey Dave, I've no doubt that you've forced yourself to endure in this
> debate. I think that's what may the applicable use of the word 'force'
> here. I forced myself to learn code. I wanted to, but I nevertheless
> met the conditions of Cecils definition of force. I had to make myself
> sit down and practice instead of sitting down and watching TV.
>

Far as I can tell that's where Cecil's argument breaks down. When one forces himself to do something is he really being forced? Not at all. He has a choice to not force himself, but he declines.That's self inducement instead of force.

3750. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-24 01:57:19 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A9714FF.EEA3A581@IEEE.org>
Source record: 4002

Dave Heil wrote:
> You mean you screwed up and chose the wrong definition and now are
> *forced* to take your lumps. That it chafes you to be called on being
> wrong doesn't bother me.

Delude yourself all you choose, Dave. You have been exposed as being
ignorant of the definition of a word in the English dictionary. There's
no way for you to recover.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3751. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-24 01:59:05 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9774h9$p3e$1@208.206.142.90>
Source record: 3900

Cecil wrote:

The license that permits you to
> operate SSB on HF requires you to know some Morse code.

Yep. And if you only want to operate Pactor you've got to learn both
Morse code and all that other non-applicable stuff.

3752. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-24 02:01:23 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <9774lj$p3e$2@208.206.142.90>
Source record: 4001

Cecil wrote:
>
> Jim Kelley wrote:
> > Hey Dave, I've no doubt that you've forced yourself to endure in this
> > debate. I think that's what may the applicable use of the word 'force'
> > here. I forced myself to learn code. I wanted to, but I nevertheless
> > met the conditions of Cecils definition of force. I had to make myself
> > sit down and practice instead of sitting down and watching TV.
>
> You were "required by circumstances" to learn Morse code. That's
> the definition of being "forced" to do it.

Circumstances forced you to MAKE A CHOICE whether or not you wanted to learn Morse code in order to meet the reqiurements of a HF ham radio license. That's the only force involved.

3753. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-24 02:03:19 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A971667.21728417@IEEE.org>
Source record: 4003

Dave Heil wrote:
> What the hell does a prudent man have to do with this?

That you don't know speaks volumes about your ignorance.

> What happened to the original
> definition you brought forth. Have you now abandoned it in favor of
> this "johnny-come-lately" one you are now using?

The two definitions overlap but the second one is a tad closer to
the concept I wanted to convey. Does your self proclaimed omniscience
limit me to only one definition?
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3754. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-24 02:08:53 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A9717B5.EDFA2B63@IEEE.org>
Source record: 4004

Dave Heil wrote:
> No one forces you to operate a motorcycle.

I didn't say anyone forces me to operate a motorcycle so your
statement is an irrelevant strawman.

> No one forces you to to take an exam for a motorcycle endorsement. No
> one forced you to take a morse exam.

You have missed the point entirely, Dave. Texas motorcycle riders are
forced (required by circumstances) to pass a motorcycle test. HF hams
are forced (required by circumstances) to pass a Morse code exam.
Non-motorcycle riders are not forced to pass a motorcycle test.
Non-HF hams are not forced to pass a Morse code exam. How can you
possibly not comprehend such a simple concept.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3755. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-24 02:10:54 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A97182E.2DEDF2EF@IEEE.org>
Source record: 4005

Jim Kelley wrote:
> One is forced to meet ALL of the requirements, because only one type of
> license is offered.

Which brings us back to the question. Why is Morse code skill required of
people who don't use it while manual transmission skill is not required of
people who don't use it?
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3756. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-24 02:11:57 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A97186D.FC960E33@IEEE.org>
Source record: 4006

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> Cecil wrote:
>
> The license that permits you to
> > operate SSB on HF requires you to know some Morse code.
>
> Yep. And if you only want to operate Pactor you've got to learn both
> Morse code and all that other non-applicable stuff.

So we are back to the original question. Why cannot Morse code be
handled like manual transmissions are handled?
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3757. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-24 02:21:30 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A971AAA.2C793586@IEEE.org>
Source record: 4008

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> Cecil wrote:
> > Nope, "Webster's Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary" gives the definition
> > as "forced - done or produced with effort". That overlaps the
> > definition of "forced - required by circumstances" which appears
> > in my unabridged dictionary which I rarely open because it is so large.
>
> It overlaps? How does that take place, pray tell.

Easy, oh clueless one. Something that is required by circumstances
normally is produced with some effort.

> Did you have the
> lighter book under the one which is too large (formerly heavy) to open?
> Why didn't you introduce the second definition at the same time as the
> first? Was it because you were beaten over the head with the first one?

It is because I have arthritis and the big dictionary is painful to
pick up. The two definitions are essentially the same.

> There was no diversion. You simply switched definitions after choosing
> the wrong one. Then you added the *if* portion. You can't debate
> without injecting new information, used selectively.

You are forcing me to inject new information, Dave, in an effort to overcome
your ignorance. You cannot have your cake and eat it too. You cannot criticize
me both for your requirement that I expand my explaination because of your
ignorance and rag on me at the same time for that very explaination.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3758. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-24 02:25:55 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A971BB3.7AFCA55@IEEE.org>
Source record: 4009

Dave Heil wrote:
> I hope you don't continue to drink to excess, Cecil.

I'm on a diet and haven't had a drink in weeks.

> You've certainly
> changed the definition from the incorrect one you initially brought
> forth. That isn't expanding. It is changing the definition. I rag on
> you for that.

But I did it for you, Dave, because of your ignorance. Why do you object to a second definition from a Webster's dictionary that helps to alleviate your ignorance?

> You were not forced to learn morse code. I was not forced to learn
> morse code.

We are HF hams, Dave. Therefore, we were forced (required by circumstances) to learn Morse code. Non-HF hams are not forced to learn Morse code. HF hams are.

> > Hams with HF privileges are forced to learn Morse. They are "required
> > by circumstances" to learn Morse code. The "circumstances" is the FCC's
> > Morse code requirement.
>
> What's the matter, Cecil. Don't you like your first definition any
> more? I'd really enjoy hearing tales of how you were compelled to learn
> morse.

You don't think the FCC has the power to compel HF hams to learn Morse?
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3759. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-24 02:27:21 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccoll@radiks.net>
Message-ID: <CZEl6.1561$794.660764@nntp2.onemain.com>
Source record: 4007

"Cecil" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3A97186D.FC960E33@IEEE.org...
>
> So we are back to the original question. Why cannot Morse code be
> handled like manual transmissions are handled?
> --
> http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca
>

This may be the only thread in the history of rrap that not only stayed on
topic but returned to it.

3760. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-24 02:38:02 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A971E8A.B254619C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 4011

Dave Heil wrote:
> And you are stating that there is no way that the "then" portion is
> false. I strongly disagree.

Take the logic statement If A then B. If A is false then the entire
statement is true. If A is true and B is true then the entire statement
is true. If A is true and B is false then the entire statement is false.

If a ham is to obtain HF privileges, he is forced (required by circumstances)
to pass a Morse code exam.

If a ham doesn't have HF privileges, the statement is true.

If a ham has HF privileges and has passed a Morse code exam, the
statement is true.

If a ham has HF privileges and hasn't passed a Morse code exam, the
statement is false because that outcome is impossible (outside of fraud).

So yes, it is impossible for the 'then' portion to be false because,
neglecting fraud, it is impossible for an HF ham not to have passed
a Morse code exam.

The logic is completely valid and consistent.

> Your statement does not become true because you insist that it is.
> No one is required to learn morse or to take an FCC exam. Both are
> entirely optional.

You continue to be confused. HF hams are required to learn Morse. Hams
are required to take an FCC exam. Neither is optional for hams. Please
show me a ham who has not passed an FCC exam. Please show me an HF ham
who has not passed a Morse code exam.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3761. Re: This Should Be A Warning

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-24 02:45:19 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010223214519.01278.00000545@nso-fa.aol.com>
Source record: 4010

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.g988dg1.pminews@ca.news.verio.net>, "Phil Kane"
<Phil.Kane@nospam.spam> writes:

>On 23 Feb 2001 18:39:51 GMT, Len Over 21 wrote:
>
>>See the acronym words: MILITARY Affilicate Radio System.
>
> News for you Lennie -- in "your time" in the 50s, the "A" in
> the acronym was AMATEUR, not "affiliate" - certainly not
> "affilicate" (yeah, cheap shot....) It was changed
> sometime later. In that era, what is now known as "Navy MARS"
> was known as "Naval Reserve Amateur Radio". See old copies of
> QST.

News for you, "Phillie," the MARS acronym has meant
Military Affiliate Radio System for 38 years...since 1962
or thereabouts. Please see the history of MARS as given
on the USAF MARS home page given following.

If you wish to use cutesy nicknames for others, then you
will be subject to the same regardless of Ed Hare's
wishes...

>>Licensed radio amateurs can assist MARS in such public service
>>roles. 5000 do so. However, MARS is essentially a secondary
>>backup radio system to existing military branch radio
>>communications plus existing to provide emergency
>>communications in the USA and territories. Unlike non-member
>>radio amateurs, MARS can utilize spectra other than the
>>allocated amateur bands since MARS exists under the DoD.
>
> IIRC one must be a licensed amateur to get authorization to
> operate one's station with a MARS callsign in MARS activities.

The following is a reproduction of the USAF MARS home
page, converted from HTML to conventional ASCII text as
near as possible to the original format -

==========

United States Air Force Military Affiliate Radio System (MARS)

The Air Force MARS office is located at the Headquarters, Air
Force Communications Agency (AFCA), Scott AFB, Illinois.
This office is a headquarters staff function, serving as the
primary point of contact, systems manager, and focal point for
all matters pertaining to Air Force MARS activities, functions

and management initiatives in support of DOD objectives. Governing directives for Air Force MARS: Air Force Instruction (AFI) 33-106, Managing High Frequency Radios, Land mobile Radios, Cellular Telephones, and the Military Affiliate Radio System; Department of Defense Directive (DoDD) 4650.2, Military Affiliate Radio System. The Chief of MARS is responsible for the dissemination of policies, procedures and directives concerning administration, operations, training, frequency management, equipment and logistical matters for the worldwide USAF MARS program. Represents HQ AF, HQ AFCA, Air Force MAJCOMs, and FOAs interests at meetings and conferences at the Joint Services MARS Panel, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for command, control, communications and intelligence (OASD/C3I), National Communications System (NCS - SHARES), Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), and other federal, national and state entities. Administers to an affiliate volunteer population of approximately 3,000 members and 300 contingency military stations consisting of active, reserve and Air National Guard unit MARS stations. Establishes and maintains procedures to manage, control and account for surplus government property used to support the affiliate portion of the Air Force MARS program. Coordinates closely with the AF Frequency Management Agency. Maintains an active liaison with the Army and Navy-Marine Corps MARS Chiefs. Promotes Air Force and public interest in MARS and amateur radio. Attends and participates in national and regional conventions of amateur radio groups; attends regional MARS conferences. The point of contact for all USAF MARS matters is:

Hq AFCA/GCGS (MARS)
203 West Losey Street, Room 3065
Scott AFB IL 62225-5234
Phones: (DSN) 576-5552; Comml (618) 256 5552

What is MARS?

The Military Affiliate Radio System is a Department of Defense sponsored program, established as separate managed and operated programs by the Army, Navy, and Air Force. The program consists of licensed amateur radio operators who are interested in military communications. They contribute to the MARS mission providing auxiliary or emergency communications on a local, national, and international basis as an adjunct to normal communications.

MARS History?

In November 1925, the Army Amateur Radio System (AARS) was formed by a few dedicated pioneers in the United States Army Signal Corps. This organization continued until the

start of World War II when operations were suspended. Army amateur radio was authorized to resume operations in 1946 and the Army Amateur Radio System was reactivated and functioned as such until 1948 when the Army and Air Force established the Military Amateur Radio System, later renamed the Military Affiliate Radio System (MARS). In 1962, the Navy-Marine Corps MARS program was launched making MARS a joint service program.

MARS Mission

Provide Department of Defense sponsored emergency communications on a local, national, and international basis as an adjunct to normal communications.
Provide auxiliary communications for military, civil, and/or disaster officials during periods of emergency.
Assist in effecting normal communications under emergency conditions.
Create interest, and furnish a means of training members in military communications procedures.
Provide a potential reserve of trained radio communications personnel.
Handle moral and quasi-official record and voice communications traffic for Armed Forces and authorized U.S. Government civilian personnel stationed throughout the world.
Conduct an appropriate Amateur Radio program as a part of the annual celebration of Armed Forces Day.

Eligibility to Join MARS

The applicant must:
Be 18 years of age or older.
Be a United States citizen or resident alien.
Possess a valid amateur radio license issues by the Federal Communications Commission.
Have digital capability, i.e., Packet, Amtor, Pactor, or G-TOR.
Possess a station capable of operating on MARS HF frequencies.

MARS members must agree to operate in accordance with the rules and regulations governing MARS as follow:
A Minimum of 12 hours participation per calendar quarter with 6 hours in their primary HF assignment.

Benefits of MARS Membership

Add to the enjoyment of your, amateur radio hobby through the expanded horizon of MARS.
Become part of the Air Force MARS worldwide communications system.
Increase your communications skills and capabilities.

Selected correspondence courses in communications-electronics subjects are available free to MARS members from their respective affiliated serve after completion of six months active membership.
Operate on specially assigned military radio frequencies in voice, teletype, PACKET and other digital modes of communications.
Join a group of dedicated fellow radio amateurs participating in meaningful public service.
Gain a feeling of being associated with a military mission and contributing to the welfare and preparedness of the nation.
Participate in regulated, disciplined radio nets with structured lines of organization and very specific operating rules.
Participate in the MARS Excess/Surplus Equipment Program after 6 months active membership. Issue of equipment is based on availability of equipment, and possible assigned mission of individual activity. The granting of MARS membership to an individual or activity does not in itself convey an automatic right or entitlement of the recipient to receive or demand MARS property.

Typical MARS Frequencies

MARS members stations meet periodically in scheduled networks on military frequencies outside of the amateur bands. There are various types of networks and each accomplishes a specific goal. For example, administrative networks to take care of much of the day-to-day management of the program; traffic networks which exist solely to pass third party traffic; and of course, emergency networks which are established to provide for communication needs during periods of emergency. There are also technical nets and training nets. MARS nets operate in different modes. Although high frequency (HF) single sideband (SSB) voice is predominant, there are RTTY, VHF, PACKET, other digital modes and even slow scan TV nets. You may not join or belong to more than one MARS service at the same time.

How to Join MARS

To join, send a request for application forms to:
E-mail: USAF.MARS@scott.af.mil
or,
(Conventional mail)
Chief Air Force MARS
HQ AFCA/GCGS (MARS)
203 W Losey St, Room 3065
Scott AFB, IL 62225-5222
May 2000

Return to top
==========

I would requrest that any comments, critiques, or name-calling of any kind concerning USAF MARS to be directed to Chief, Air Force MARS, at Scott AFB rather than myself.

In "my day" in radio, being the 1950s, 1960s, 1970s, 1980s and 1990s, inclusive, I had little contact with MARS activities. I can only comment on what the MARS chiefs of the respective military branches have stated publicly. Any "behind the scenes" or hidden descriptions of "insider" experiences or definitions are inadmissible as inaccurate and irrelevant hearsay.

3762. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-24 02:45:19 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010223214519.01278.00000546@nso-fa.aol.com>
Source record: 4012

In article <3A96DB61.8E3E4274@uci.edu>, Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> writes:

>The point is that what someone is going to do after their license is
>granted is irrelevant. The requirements are based upon the privileges
>which are granted by the license, not the desires of the applicant.

Is that the point? All along I thought the requirements were
established by the licensing authority.

As far as US amateur radio is concerned, an amateur license
is granted by the FCC, not the desires of the already-licensed.

3763. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-24 02:45:20 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010223214520.01278.00000547@nso-fa.aol.com>
Source record: 4013

In article <976j2r529gj@enews4.newsguy.com>, tlbryant@my-deja.com (T. L. Bryant) writes:

>In article <3A95F4ED.260770B0@ovis.net>, k8mn@ovis.net says...
>>
>>> But since you want examples that are a little more up to date, I might
>also
>>> point out that there is nothing on a driver's license test that requires
>you
>t
>>o
>>> know how to drive a standard shift vehicle in order to obtain a standard
>>> driver's license. This is a matter of choice.
>>
>>There's no practical or written exam required for a marriage license
>>either.
>
>...other than the fact that you have to swear that you don't have any STDs.

...not required any more in Los Angeles County.

All of the "license" arguments well away from the fact do
nothing for the conversation except to misdirect it.

To get a dog license in Los Angeles, one does not have to
be a dog or live like one. One may be in a dog's abode by
doing nasty after a marriage agreement, however... :-)

>>> All that matters to you and certain others in this newsgroup, is that
>you'd
>>> rather argue semantics over the usage of the word "forced" in a sentence,
>than
>>> the reasons why high-speed code testing should have been retained for
>access
>t
>>o
>>> HF phone portions.
>>
>>How the hell do you know what matters to me? I don't consider 5 wpm to
>>be high speed morse. Are you now telling us that you consider it to be?
>>
>>
>>Dave K8MN
>
>Please point out *specifically*, in the quoted material above, where I said
>*anything* about 5 WPM being high speed. You've got a serious comprehension

>problem.

Heil goes after misdirection a great deal. Irrelevancies are cited well off the mark due to an inability to rationalize His having to take a 20 WPM morse test (do we know if he got a waiver?).

So far, the PCTAs have misdirected by citing: (1) Pilot licenses (not applicable); (2) marriage licenses (not applicable, no test); (3) rodeo cowboys supposedly licensed by FCC (none, not applicable, implied by Heil). Those that do not use rationales for continuation of "hazing rituals" will bring out misdirection by trying for English mis-use. :-)

Heil seems to insist that all do as He did or be thought "inferior." He has already said He is "superior." He has further stated that only His, and His alone, definitions (of anything) shall be considered suitable, correct, and relevant for any sort of discussion. That should end any discussion.

3764. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-24 02:45:33 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A97204D.F5E7D10E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 4014

Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > I strongly disagree. I further state that the if implies
> > options.
>
> Could the word 'when' be used instead of 'if'?

Any number of word combinations logically equate to the 'if'
function of an if/then statement. The 'if' function is often
implied in the syntax. The following statement:

An HF ham is forced (required by circumstances) to pass a
Morse code exam.

has the 'if' function implied. This is what Dave is missing or
ignoring. An HF ham has HF privileges. How did he get them? He
passed a Morse code exam. He cannot have HF privileges without
passing a Morse code exam. Therefore, if a ham has HF privileges
he was forced (required by circumstances) to pass a Morse code
exam. There is no other way the FCC will legally allow a ham
on HF. The Morse code requirement is required by the circumstances
which exist at the FCC. That's the definition of "forced".
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3765. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-24 02:51:20 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A9721A8.458C866D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 4015

Dave Heil wrote:
> Neat logic lesson, Cecil. The following statement is also true:
> "No person is forced to obtain an HF ham ticket".

Of course it's true, Dave. But since nobody has asserted that anyone
is forced to obtain an HF ham ticket, it is also irrelevant and can
simply be considered as your strawman diversionary tactic. You continue
to miss the point. HF hams are forced (required by circumstances) to pass
a Morse code exam. The Morse code requirement is certainly required by the
circumstances which exist at the FCC. That, my friend, is the definition
of "forced", straight from Webster's.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3766. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-24 02:58:35 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A97235B.9B29097E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 4016

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Far as I can tell that's where Cecil's argument breaks down. When one
> forces himself to do something is he really being forced? Not at all. He
> has a choice to not force himself, but he declines.That's self
> inducement instead of force.

But that's not my argument, Dick, that is Jim's statement. Of course,
since you cannot refute my argument, you choose to divert attention
away from my argument to Jim's statement.

I have been very careful with my syntax. I have used passive voice.
HF hams are forced (required by circumstances) to pass a Morse code
exam. Non-HF hams are not forced to pass a Morse code exam. The
Morse code requirement is "required" by the "circumstances" existing
at the FCC. That's the definition of "forced". Would Jim have forced
himself to learn Morse code if he had not been forced (required by
circumstances)?
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3767. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-24 03:10:24 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A972620.A3BA4906@IEEE.org>
Source record: 4017

Dave Heil wrote:
> Sure, both are valid but their meaning is not the same.

Their meanings certainly overlap and their meanings are the same
in the overlap area. "Produced with effort" and "required by
circumstances" can certainly mean that the effort required was
required by the circumstances. Can you think of a case where
the effort required was not required by the circumstances.

> ...and you mean that the use of the "if" word implies options to do or
> not do something.

The 'if' word implies conditions. Those same conditions are often
implied without the existence of an 'if' word. That is what you are
missing or ignoring. What is implied by "HF ham"? The implication
is clear. An HF ham was forced (required by circumstances) to pass
a Morse code exam. Non-HF hams are not forced to pass a Morse code
exam. You have painted yourself into a logical corner and are
arguing an impossibility. Neglecting fraud, it is not possible for
an HF ham to exist without passing a Morse code exam.

> > If a ham is to obtain HF privileges then he is forced (required by
> > circumstances) to learn Morse code.
>
> Sorry, Cecil. I don't buy the "then" portion of your statement.

You don't buy that the Morse code requirement is required by the
circumstances existing at the FCC????? Not to buy that, Dave, is
not to buy reality. Please produce an HF ham who was not forced
(required by circumstances) to pass a Morse code exam.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3768. Re: 28.085 New channel 19 ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-24 03:16:36 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A972794.D4D87C1A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 4018

"D. Stussy" wrote:
> Do you have a problem with geography? Texas is east of California, unless
> you're looking for a "long path" route.

Nope, just have a problem being associated with Eastern liberals.
Why do you think they differentiate the Far East from the Near East?
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3769. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-24 03:25:49 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A9729BD.E1484292@IEEE.org>
Source record: 4021

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Circumstances forced you to MAKE A CHOICE whether or not you wanted to
> learn Morse code in order to meet the reqiurements of a HF ham radio
> license. That's the only force involved.

Nope, the fact remains - HF hams are forced (required by circumstances)
to pass a Morse code exam. Non-HF hams are not forced to pass a Morse
code exam. The Morse code requirement is required by the circumstances
existing at the FCC. That's the Webster's definition of "forced".
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3770. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-24 03:26:18 UTC
From: tlbryant@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <9779kq02pej@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 4024

In article <3A96DB61.8E3E4274@uci.edu>, jwkelley@uci.edu says...
>

>> I would have no problem with that, but the pro-code group might think
there's
>> still a reason to know it if you want to use HF phone. I've yet to see any
goo
>d
>> reason.
>
>The point is that what someone is going to do after their license is
>granted is irrelevant. The requirements are based upon the privileges
>which are granted by the license, not the desires of the applicant.
>
>73, ac6xg

IOW, regardless of the relevancy of the requirement, as long as they show
that they can beep, they can do whatever they want afterwords.

3771. Re: 28.085 New channel 19 ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-24 03:30:04 UTC
From: k5pf@aol.comPaul
Message-ID: <20010223223004.02128.00001358@ng-bd1.aol.com>
Source record: 4019

>
>Truckers from "back east" are S-7 to S-9 here in Southern California.

I agree with the Texas location. These folks were heard in North Carolina, at a time when Texas beacons were also coming in.

One gave a mile marker of 869. It takes a big state to have that many miles on a given highway!

Is there a central place where data is funneled, prior to sending it to FCC?

K5PF

3772. Re: This Should Be A Warning

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-24 03:30:42 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010223223042.01758.00000451@nso-bh.aol.com>
Source record: 4020

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.g987yy0.pminews@ca.news.verio.net>, "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nospam.spam> writes:

>On 23 Feb 2001 18:39:49 GMT, Len Over 21 wrote:
>
>>I have no problems with agreements. I have no problem with
>>recognizing that agreements are NOT ABSOLUTE LAW. They are
>>simply statements of Good Faith by government administrations.
>>It is considered good practice to abide by agreements, but those
>>agreements are not absolutes nor are they "enforced" by any
>>supra-law enforcement organization (there is none).
>
> International treaties such as the Radio Regulations have the
> force of law in the United States.

> If one is found violating a provision of same which does not
> have a counterpart in FCC Regs thw individual will receive an
> FCC Notice of Violation (FCC Form 793 may be used) that instead
> of starting with "You appear to be in violation of Section
> xx.xxx of the FCC Rules" will start with "You appear to be in
> violation of Section XXX of the International Radio
> Regulations". The Communications Act does, in fact, obligate
> compliance with treaty requirements.

What is the specific codification of US Law in regards to "violation of international treaties?" Or agreements? Or memberships for some international purpose? How is membership by the USA administration in the ITU regarded as "law?"

Those questions are asked for the purpose of clarification since they are not easily seen by ordinary layperson citizens of the US.

Not having violated any FCC regulation, I have never seen any such FCC Notice of Violation. How is that Notice of Violation applicable to "international law?" As far as I am concerned as a US citizen within the borders of the USA, I am bound only to US law.

> As you know, US Government stations and foreign radio stations
> are not subject to FCC Rules, and when one is found in apparent
> violation of standards derived from the International Radio
> Regs, they are cited (FCC Form 74) as apparent violations of Section
> XXX of the International Radio Regulations. The Form 74 is
> sent to the U S Government agency frequency manager or the
> foreign government Adminstration, as appropriate.

I do NOT "know the above." How is that applicable to international standards agreed upon by a UN body? If there is violation of an "international law" then why is an FCC form used? What is the importance of an FCC form number?

> If the FCC receives an equivalent notice from a foreign
> Administration that an FCC-regulated station was found in
> violation of the Radio Regs, the FCC turns around and issues
> a Form 793 to the licensee citing the section of the Radio
> Regs as reported by the foreign Administration.

What are you trying to say there? Is the USA's FCC some kind of supra-national radio enforcement agency? Or is that Form simply issued by a US agency citing a US citizen? If that is the case, why is this so applicable to "international law?"

> When a specific Administration files a complaint with the ITU
> that another Administration is intentionally disregarding or
> violating some provisions of the International Telecommunications
> Convention, the Radio Regulations, the Telegraph and Telephone
> Regulations, a specific Agreement, or a ruling of the IFRB,
> where an exception was not taken at the time of the signing of
> the treaty or Agreement in question, the matter is referred to
> mandatory arbitration under the auspices of the ITU Secretary-General,
> per all such agreements.

How is some "international law" enforced in that regard? Do specific Radio Forces from complaining countries invade the radiospace of the "offending" country? :-)

Let's cut to the chase there. What I am saying is that international agreements or treaties are only "enforceable" as the member nations want to make them, enforced by administrations of specific countries internally. As such they are handled "in-country" by a country's regulating agency.

It's fairly obvious that treaties and agreements should be handled in Good Faith by all nations involved in such treaties or agreements. There is NO supra-national agency that can enforce any treaty or agreement violations. The closest the earth has to such a body is the United Nations which can, and has, made resolutions "allowing" the use of force against certain countries who have violated any treaty or agreement. That force is enacted by member nations, not by the UN itself. The UN has no specific "international law" enforcement body, only various administrations who agree to enact force after a resolution passed by the UN.

> That was the route we had to take when Radio Omdurman (Sudan)
> was intentionally causing harmful interference (Middle Eastern
> politics at work) by operating 2 kHz offset from a MF broadcast
> co-channel assignment with Kol Yisrael (Israel) while I was the

> latter's ITU liaison engineer at the Israeli Ministry of
> Communications (equivalent of the FCC) in the mid-60s. It took
> about 2 years but Omdurman was eventually brought into compliance
> by order of the ITU Secretary-General.

That's all very interesting, but how does a Sudan-Israel conflict over MF broadcasting involve US amateur radio?

Lastly, how is it that one "highest" rated US radio amateur can berate other US radio amateurs for "not doing enough" on natural disaster aid when there is ample evidence of the USA having already suffered natural disasters in the near past?

> The Radio Regs are, in fact, enforceable treaty.

As far as I am concerned, US law and regulations apply to US citizens. Since when do US citizens "sign treaties" to "agree" to US law and regulations? Or are they "signing international treaties" or something just to be subject to US law within US borders? If the US administration wants to set US law and regulations according to some international resolutions and standards, fine with me. I've supported that in the past and see no problem with that. However, if you want me to abide by some "international law" within the boundaries of the USA, then I have to ask some deep specifics and do a lot of questioning, some of it possibly taken negatively by those whose agendas involve newsgroup message points.

3773. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-24 03:31:50 UTC
From: tlbryant@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <9779v612pej@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 4023

In article <3A96DA70.F59CA7F5@uci.edu>, jwkelley@uci.edu says...
>
>"T. L. Bryant" wrote:
>>
>> In article <3A96B73C.44B72D80@uci.edu>, jwkelley@uci.edu says...
>>
>> >> Does your state require a license endorsement to drive a
>> >> manual gearbox vehicle even though you take and pass
>> >> the test using a car with an automatic transmission?
>> >
>> >I think we were discussing motorcycles.
>> >
>> >So I find myself lead by this inescapable logic to the conclusion that
>> >since carbuerator repair isn't required for a drivers license, Morse
>> >code shouldn't be required for any other license. :-)
>> >
>> >ac6xg
>
>> ..and here we have a perfect example someone trying to be "cute" when they
>> can't come up with a decent rebuttle.
>
>So apparently you think that citing carburator repair rather than manual
>gearbox testing makes a big difference in Mr. Sohls proof about Morse
>code and amateur radio licenses? I guess I shouldn't be surprised.
>
>ac6xg

I know of no state that requires knowledge of either in order to obtain a
driver's license. Too many people are going off on a tangent and making
comparisons that are totally without thought or reason.

3774. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-24 03:34:03 UTC
From: tlbryant@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <977a3b22pej@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 4025

In article <3A96F0A7.BD5ABAA@ovis.net>, k8mn@ovis.net says...

>> Then you should read what you quote. I mentioned criteria having relevance.
Yo
>u
>> then make a comment about "written hazing ritual" when you could read for
>> yourself that was not what I meant. I see that as twisting my words. As for
ou
>r
>> respective "biases", it's obvious that you have a pre-conceived conclusion
as
>> to how things ought to be, and will only allow facts that suport that
>> conclusion, excluding all others which may disprove it.
>
>
>...and this differs from your own bias in what way? Do you mean that I
>should give up my view, be reasonable and see it your way?
>
>Dave K8MN

That would be a start, since your reasoning is flawed.

3775. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-24 03:39:18 UTC
From: tlbryant@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <977ad632pej@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 4027

In article <3A96F1AA.C9CA48A1@ovis.net>, k8mn@ovis.net says...

>> >> All that matters to you and certain others in this newsgroup, is that
you'd
>> >> rather argue semantics over the usage of the word "forced" in a sentence,
>> than
>> >> the reasons why high-speed code testing should have been retained for
acces
>s
>> t
>> >o
>> >> HF phone portions.
>> >
>> >How the hell do you know what matters to me? I don't consider 5 wpm to
>> >be high speed morse. Are you now telling us that you consider it to be?
>> >
>> >
>> >Dave K8MN
>>
>> Please point out *specifically*, in the quoted material above, where I said
>> *anything* about 5 WPM being high speed. You've got a serious comprehension
>> problem.
>
>Okay. "...reasons why high speed code testing should have been retained
>for access...". That satisfy you?
>
>Dave K8MN

Yeah? So, how does that prove I claimed 5 WPM is a high speed? Would you care
to elaborate on how you came to this conclusion?

3776. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-24 03:46:37 UTC
From: tlbryant@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <977aqt42pej@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 4026

In article <3A96F128.51094668@ovis.net>, k8mn@ovis.net says...
>
>T. L. Bryant wrote:
>>
>> In article <3A95F648.2DBC31CA@ovis.net>, k8mn@ovis.net says...
>>
>> >> Does your state require you to have a motorcycle endorsement if have no
>> >> intention of ever owning or riding one?
>> >
>> >Nope. It has not made obtaining a motorcycle endorsement any more
>> >mandatory than an amateur radio license.
>> >
>> >Dave K8MN
>>
>> You just don't get it, do you? No one said that it was mandatory to obtain
an
>> amateur license. The subject is the relevance of certain test requirements
to
>> obtain a license. Why is it so hard for you to stay on that?
>
>That was the subject? How many posting generations back?
>I thought you were asking me about my state's motorcycle endorsement
>regs.
>
>Dave K8MN

That's always been the subject. You're comparisons and miscomprehensions are
not my fault. I've pointed them out, but you seem more obsessed with arguing
about what the definition of "is" (read: "forced") is.

3777. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-24 03:57:34 UTC
From: tlbryant@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <977bfe52pej@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 4029

In article <20010223203254.01718.00000074@nso-fo.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com says...

>In article <96b8p4113q9@enews1.newsguy.com>, tlbryant@my-deja.com (T. L.
>Bryant) writes:
>
>>It reminds me of that scene in the movie "Good Will Hunting"
>>where Matt Damon's character was critical of a Harvard student who was
>>spending
>>all of his money for college, when everything he wanted to know could be
>>obtained for the price of a library card.
>>
>"Will Hunting" is a fictional character, not a real person. He is portrayed as
>a super-genius who has taught himself the equivalent of several doctorates in
a
>variety of subjects, but who works as a janitor and gets in trouble with the
>law. He may have lots of knowledge, but he doesn't use it. He avoids the
>responsibility of actually DOING anything constructive besides custodial work
>until the very end of the movie.
>
>He knew the price of everyhting and the value of nothing. (Shaw's definition
of
>a cynic).
>
>Besides, how smart can a guy be who almost let a gal like Minnie Driver get
>away?
>
>73 de Jim, N2EY

I posted this nearly two weeks ago (give or take) and you're just now
responding to it?

While "Good Will Hunting" may be a work of fiction, the names of people that I
posted along this thread are not fictional characters. They were all
successful, and none held a college degree. It's interesting how you ignored
that part of the discussion.

3778. Re: 28.085 New channel 19 ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-24 03:57:54 UTC
From: Hans K0HB <k0hb@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <3A973142.7BF9AD2A@arrl.org>
Source record: 4022

David Robbins wrote:

> are you going to create that group and do anything with the reports, or is it
> just a bit bucket??? i don't see it in the group list now.

The address is QRV. Traffic will be collated and sent to FCC and ARRL
three times a week.

73, Hans, K0HB

3779. Re: 28.085 New channel 19 ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-24 04:47:05 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net>
Message-ID: <B6BCA6F9.3642%stewartx@sccoast.net>
Source record: 4028

Ken Diaz wrote:

> Truckers from "back east" are S-7 to S-9
> here in Southern California. Hope
> Reilly knows about this. This posting
> is so we can assist in trying to
> locate these guys (Texas?). These
> guys are now appearing daily.

A person I met through a co-worker bragged about using a ham radio and ham frequencies to talk to other drivers from the same company on the road (it seems one of the drivers at the company started it, bragged about it, and other drivers followed). He even showed me the radio in his truck (one of those "imported" CB rigs). Neither of them (the co-worker or this driver) knew about my ham radio involvement.

The following Monday, I contacted a manager at the company, explained that this person was violating FCC rules, and suggested that I might file a complaint with the FCC. I followed up with a letter, complete with quotes from FCC regs.

About two weeks later, I asked the co-worker about the driver and was told that he had been fired. As I understand it, the company put out a notice to remove all illegal radio equipment from their trucks and later inspected the trucks to see if employees complied. When a radio was still found in the driver's truck after the notice, he was fired.

The purpose of this is to point out that the company itself, not the FCC, may be the best place to start if you discover a driver operating without a license in the ham bands. Many companies probably would not want this type of trouble, so may take more immediate action. Remember, even the independant drivers work for companies (the names on the trailers), so this may even work for them also.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net

3780. Re: This Should Be A Warning

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-24 04:59:22 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010223235922.20346.00002436@ng-fv1.aol.com>
Source record: 4030

>Subject: Re: This Should Be A Warning
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/23/01 10:39 AM Pacific Standard Time

Jerry asked:

>>Who makes up the majority of the member stations of this system?

Lennie tries to make an ignorant point:

>See the acronym words: MILITARY Affilicate Radio System.
>The three principal military branches do their own daily
>command and control for their respective MARS functions.
>More on this can be seen on -

Maybe, Oh Snide One, that's why he saud "majority"...?!?!

Guess reading a bit woulda solved that, but YOU are on a rant again.

3781. Re: This Should Be A Warning

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-24 05:08:46 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010224000846.20346.00002437@ng-fv1.aol.com>
Source record: 4031

>Subject: Re: This Should Be A Warning
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/23/01 10:39 AM Pacific Standard Time
>Message-id: <20010223133949.01278.00000514@nso-fa.aol.com>

>>What part of this is so hard for you to understand?

>Only those documents of the ITU which are not in English.

Jerry, Lennie is a dyed-in-the-wool Clintonian democrat. Promises,
treaties and vows are for "the other guy". That we Americans profess a love of
laws and judicial process is just an annoyance to creeps like him.

>Part 97, Title 47 CFR, does not specifically state that amateur
>radio is a public service to the nation...it is a radio activity engaged
>in by individuals for non-pecuniary interests. The word "service" as
>in "radio service" used throughout Title 47 is a regulatory term
>denoting type and kind of radio regulated.

Lennie completely ignores the the REALITIES of Amatuer Radio. If it
weren't for the service we DO provide, we'd have NOTHING to take to the table
when defending OUR allocations.

Of course, Lennie has NO license, ergo nothing to lose.

More Andersonian hate, tripe and rhetoric.

Nothing we didn't expect.

3782. Re: This Should Be A Warning

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-24 05:27:04 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010224002704.20346.00002439@ng-fv1.aol.com>
Source record: 4032

>Subject: Re: This Should Be A Warning
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/23/01 7:30 PM Pacific Standard Time

>What is the specific codification of US Law in regards to "violation
>of international treaties?" Or agreements? Or memberships for
>some international purpose? How is membership by the USA
>administration in the ITU regarded as "law?"

Geez, Lennie...something you DON'T know...?!?!

Don't like it when someone holds YOUR heels to the flame, huh...?!?!

>As far as I am concerned as a
>US citizen within the borders of the USA, I am bound only to US law.

And as the Gentleman told you, Your Geezerness, Treaties ratified by the United States ARE "law" in the United States!

In what shade of black and white do you need that?

> If there is violation of an
>"international law" then why is an FCC form used? What is the
>importance of an FCC form number?

Run, Lennie..RUN!

>Let's cut to the chase there. What I am saying is that
>international agreements or treaties are only "enforceable" as
>the member nations want to make them, enforced by
>administrations of specific countries internally. As such they
>are handled "in-country" by a country's regulating agency.

OK, here's the Brass Ring. The State Department has told the FCC that it has ratified ITU treaties. The FCC will therefore enforce those provisions. Need it any simpler, Lennie?

>It's fairly obvious that treaties and agreements should be
>handled in Good Faith by all nations involved in such treaties
>or agreements. There is NO supra-national agency that can
>enforce any treaty or agreement violations.

Saddam Hussein tried the "Maybe I Will...Maybe I Won't" policy. It didn't work for him, either.

And there IS an agency..It's called the World Court in The Hague, The Netherlands.

>The UN has no specific "international law" enforcement
>body, only various administrations who agree to enact force
>after a resolution passed by the UN.

Sorry. Wrong.

>Lastly, how is it that one "highest" rated US radio amateur can
>berate other US radio amateurs for "not doing enough" on
>natural disaster aid when there is ample evidence of the USA
>having already suffered natural disasters in the near past?

US Amateurs are licensed, not rated. However I have a Private Pilot's
license with a Single Engine Land "rating" on that.

>As far as I am concerned, US law and regulations apply to US
>citizens. Since when do US citizens "sign treaties" to "agree"
>to US law and regulations?

Since they elect officials to act on thier behalf in such matters.

>....then I have to ask some deep specifics and do a lot of questioning, >some
of it possibly taken negatively by those whose agendas involve
>newsgroup message points.

No, you just can't stand having your know-it-all attitude hung out to dry
by someone who is obviously far better suited to comment on it than you,
Lennie.

I think Phil's credentials are impeccable. Unless you care to call them
into question?

3783. Re: 28.085 New channel 19 ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-24 05:33:07 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010224003307.01469.00000119@nso-fk.aol.com>
Source record: 4033

In article <976abr$21p$1@news.netmar.com>, K0HB@qwest.net writes:

>Put a 10M receiver in your car -- find them -- read the company name off the
>door of the 18-wheeler -- send it to the FCC.
>
And TAPE THEIR TRANSMISSIONS.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3784. Re: 28.085 New channel 19 ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-24 05:33:07 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010224003307.01469.00000118@nso-fk.aol.com>
Source record: 4034

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.g97toc0.pminews@ca.news.verio.net>, "Phil Kane"
<Phil.Kane@nospam.spam> writes:

>A lot of Californians consider Colorado "back east", and I
> know a group of Ohioians (or is that "Ahiya-ins") for whom "out
> west" is Illinois and Kansas.
>
Ohioans prefer the term "Buckeyes"

73 de Jim, N2EY

3785. Re: FBI spy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-24 05:33:07 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010224003307.01469.00000120@nso-fk.aol.com>
Source record: 4035

In article <975sco$6hn$1@news.netmar.com>, K0HB@arrl.org writes:

>n article <3a95b710.6229250@news2.dvol.com>, Brian Kelly, w3rv <kelly@dvol>
>writes:
>
>
>>.. . . we don't need that kinda "PR".
>
>Obviously they have the wrong guy. This fellow knows Morse code, and we all
>know that the bad guys wear black hats and never know the code.

How do you know that this guy knows the code, Hans?

73 de Jim, N2EY

3786. Re: This Should Be A Warning

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-24 05:34:03 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010224003403.20346.00002440@ng-fv1.aol.com>
Source record: 4036

>Subject: Re: This Should Be A Warning
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/23/01 6:45 PM Pacific Standard Time

>In "my day" in radio, being the 1950s, 1960s, 1970s, 1980s
>and 1990s, inclusive, I had little contact with MARS
>activities. I can only comment on what the MARS chiefs
>of the respective military branches have stated publicly.
>Any "behind the scenes" or hidden descriptions of
>"insider" experiences or definitions are inadmissible as
>inaccurate and irrelevant hearsay.

Had you been a licensed Amateur Radio operator instead of the hateful,
lying antagonist that you ahve become, you MIGHT have had some better insight
as to the true working relationships, rather than a cut-and-paste from a
website.

Of course, this kind of thing allows you to wallow in your mediocrity,
able to dispaly only your ability to surf the net for ANY piece that can
"prove" your newsgroup message point tally.

Repeated for futher comment:

>Any "behind the scenes" or hidden descriptions of
>"insider" experiences or definitions are inadmissible as
>inaccurate and irrelevant hearsay.

Lennie-to-English: "I don't want to hear the truth".

Of COURSE you don't want to hear it, Lennie. Nothing like the
testimonials of LICENSED Hams who have "been there, done that" to ruin (again)
your rants.

Putz.

3787. Re: This Should Be A Warning

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-24 06:04:43 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <hoje9t8ad7bl1e7mshc619lckcm0v5k51c@4ax.com>
Source record: 4037

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:

>>Phil.Kane@nospam.spam> writes:
>> News for you Lennie -- in "your time" in the 50s, the "A" in
>> the acronym was AMATEUR, not "affiliate"

>News for you, "Phillie," the MARS acronym has meant
>Military Affiliate Radio System for 38 years...since 1962
>or thereabouts.

My February 1953 QST page 50 has an article about the
"Military Affiliate Radio System" so apparently the name dates at
least that far back...

3788. Re: 11meters, freebanding, and the no-code tech ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-24 07:51:51 UTC
From: John O'Flaherty <oflahert@toast.net>
Message-ID: <3A976817.BA4054D7@toast.net>
Source record: 4038

Jim Weir wrote:

> John O'Flaherty <oflahert@toast.net>
> shared these priceless pearls of wisdom:
>
> ->The first overtone is the second harmonic. Both the fundamental and all
> ->the harmonics are partial tones (at least in audio work). I've never
> ->heard the term 'first harmonic' before, althought the meaning is
> ->unambiguous.
>
> I respectfully disagree. When I operate a crystal on third overtone, I'm
> operating on the third resonance of the fundamental, or the third harmonic.
> That is, a crystal operated at 30 MHz. on the third overtone is operating a
> fundamental 10 MHz. crystal with the plate buckling three times instead of once
> per cycle.

I see that I was wrong about the actual usage of the term 'overtone', and that the third overtone is the third harmonic of the fundamental, or the fundamental times three. Still, 'first overtone' doesn't sound right to me, because there's nothing 'over' about it, and the word 'fundamental' already means that.

john

3789. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-24 12:33:11 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net>
Message-ID: <3A97AA07.20D9C741@ovis.net>
Source record: 4039

Cecil wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > You mean you screwed up and chose the wrong definition and now are
> > *forced* to take your lumps. That it chafes you to be called on being
> > wrong doesn't bother me.
>
> Delude yourself all you choose, Dave. You have been exposed as being
> ignorant of the definition of a word in the English dictionary. There's
> no way for you to recover.

You write like a man who is becoming desperate, Cecil. You've painted yourself into a corner. Now you've become shrill because I've pointed it out. Maybe you can find a new way to sell your idea that learning morse is compulsory. Good luck on your quest.

Dave K8MN

3790. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-24 12:38:27 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net>
Message-ID: <3A97AB43.60EBE506@ovis.net>
Source record: 4040

Cecil wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > What the hell does a prudent man have to do with this?
>
> That you don't know speaks volumes about your ignorance.

Neat dodge but you did not reply to the question. What does being prudent have to do with the matter at hand?

> > What happened to the original
> > definition you brought forth. Have you now abandoned it in favor of
> > this "johnny-come-lately" one you are now using?
>
> The two definitions overlap but the second one is a tad closer to
> the concept I wanted to convey. Does your self proclaimed omniscience
> limit me to only one definition?

Perhaps you can trot out several additional definitions in an attempt to make your case. Certainly the first one wasn't applicable at all. Since I've already stated that I claim no omniscience, why do you persist in using that term. Are you omniscient in your ability to choose the correct definition from a list of several? Apparently not.

Dave K8MN

3791. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-24 12:42:48 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net>
Message-ID: <3A97AC48.17CCA9F1@ovis.net>
Source record: 4041

Cecil wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > No one forces you to operate a motorcycle.
>
> I didn't say anyone forces me to operate a motorcycle so your
> statement is an irrelevant strawman.
>
> > No one forces you to to take an exam for a motorcycle endorsement. No
> > one forced you to take a morse exam.
>
> You have missed the point entirely, Dave. Texas motorcycle riders are
> forced (required by circumstances) to pass a motorcycle test. HF hams
> are forced (required by circumstances) to pass a Morse code exam.
> Non-motorcycle riders are not forced to pass a motorcycle test.
> Non-HF hams are not forced to pass a Morse code exam. How can you
> possibly not comprehend such a simple concept.

...because force is not involved. Taking a motorcycle exam is not compulsory. Taking an amateur exam is not compulsory. Why can't you understand this? It must be the Libertarian leaning toward anarchy--the view that anything which is regulated is "forced".

Has it dawned on you that you are probably not going to succeed in swaying me toward your view on this?

Dave K8MN

3792. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-24 12:55:27 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net>
Message-ID: <3A97AF3F.7A5379DC@ovis.net>
Source record: 4042

Cecil wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > Cecil wrote:
> > > Nope, "Webster's Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary" gives the definition
> > > as "forced - done or produced with effort". That overlaps the
> > > definition of "forced - required by circumstances" which appears
> > > in my unabridged dictionary which I rarely open because it is so large.
> >
> > It overlaps? How does that take place, pray tell.
>
> Easy, oh clueless one. Something that is required by circumstances
> normally is produced with some effort.

Really. I suppose you'd then have to define the quantity of effort.
If I'm *forced* to pick up the TV Guide, I'm not really putting forth
effort.

> > Did you have the
> > lighter book under the one which is too large (formerly heavy) to open?
> > Why didn't you introduce the second definition at the same time as the
> > first? Was it because you were beaten over the head with the first one?
>
> It is because I have arthritis and the big dictionary is painful to
> pick up. The two definitions are essentially the same.

I had no idea that health problems would enter the discussion. I
wouldn't want to cause you pain. The definitions are assuredly not the
same.

> > There was no diversion. You simply switched definitions after choosing
> > the wrong one. Then you added the *if* portion. You can't debate
> > without injecting new information, used selectively.
>
> You are forcing me to inject new information, Dave, in an effort to overcome
> your ignorance. You cannot have your cake and eat it too. You cannot criticize
> me both for your requirement that I expand my explaination because of your
> ignorance and rag on me at the same time for that very explaination.

I'm not *forcing* you to do anything, Cecil. You're doing it because
you can't stand to be bested in an argument. It is your free will which
causes your continued responses. It is not compulsory to reply.
It would be refreshing for you to not to take us down the path of
substitution, weaving and whirling, in attempting to make your point.

Dave K8MN

3793. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-24 13:01:52 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net>
Message-ID: <3A97B0C0.DB1AA78@ovis.net>
Source record: 4043

Cecil wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > I hope you don't continue to drink to excess, Cecil.
>
> I'm on a diet and haven't had a drink in weeks.
>
> > You've certainly
> > changed the definition from the incorrect one you initially brought
> > forth. That isn't expanding. It is changing the definition. I rag on
> > you for that.
>
> But I did it for you, Dave, because of your ignorance. Why do you object
> to a second definition from a Webster's dictionary that helps to alleviate
> your ignorance?

That's kind of you. You're obviously a superior being. I'll be
eternally grateful that you saw fit to assist me in my struggle for
understanding. I'm really having trouble understanding why that first
definition was abandoned in favor of this new one. I also have trouble
understanding why you've totally ignored the definition which I provided
you. Did you have trouble understanding it?

> > You were not forced to learn morse code. I was not forced to learn
> > morse code.
>
> We are HF hams, Dave. Therefore, we were forced (required by circumstances)
> to learn Morse code. Non-HF hams are not forced to learn Morse code. HF
> hams are.

Please explain how we were forced to become HF hams, Cecil. All of
these years I was absolutely certain that I chose to become a ham.

> > > Hams with HF privileges are forced to learn Morse. They are "required
> > > by circumstances" to learn Morse code. The "circumstances" is the FCC's
> > > Morse code requirement.
> >
> > What's the matter, Cecil. Don't you like your first definition any
> > more? I'd really enjoy hearing tales of how you were compelled to learn
> > morse.
>
> You don't think the FCC has the power to compel HF hams to learn Morse?

I don't think the FCC has the power to force me to become a ham at all.

Dave K8MN

3794. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-24 13:28:55 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net>
Message-ID: <3A97B717.4FF4A1E2@ovis.net>
Source record: 4046

Cecil wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > And you are stating that there is no way that the "then" portion is
> > false. I strongly disagree.
>
> Take the logic statement If A then B. If A is false then the entire
> statement is true. If A is true and B is true then the entire statement
> is true. If A is true and B is false then the entire statement is false.
>
> If a ham is to obtain HF privileges, he is forced (required by circumstances)
> to pass a Morse code exam.

> If a ham doesn't have HF privileges, the statement is true.
>
> If a ham has HF privileges and has passed a Morse code exam, the
> statement is true.
>
> If a ham has HF privileges and hasn't passed a Morse code exam, the
> statement is false because that outcome is impossible (outside of fraud).
>
> So yes, it is impossible for the 'then' portion to be false because,
> neglecting fraud, it is impossible for an HF ham not to have passed
> a Morse code exam.

If a ham is to obtain HF privileges, he is forced (required by
circumstances)to pass a Morse code exam.

So if the B portion relating to being forced to pass a morse exam is
false, the entire statement is false. So "he is forced (compulsory) to
pass a morse exam." can be a false statement. That makes the entire
statement false. Apparently the whole thing hinges on that definition
of the word forced.

How about this one: If obtaining an HF amateur radio license is not
mandatory then no person is forced (compulsory) to pass a morse exam.

Does that meet your logical requirements? It sounds pretty good to me.

> The logic is completely valid and consistent.

See my logical response above.

> > Your statement does not become true because you insist that it is.
> > No one is required to learn morse or to take an FCC exam. Both are
> > entirely optional.
>

> You continue to be confused. HF hams are required to learn Morse. Hams
> are required to take an FCC exam. Neither is optional for hams. Please
> show me a ham who has not passed an FCC exam. Please show me an HF ham
> who has not passed a Morse code exam.

The false part is that no one is required to obtain an HF ham ticket.
While a morse exam is part of becoming an HF ham, nobody is forced to
obtain such license. I've never argued that there are HF hams who have
not passed a morse exam, I've argued that morse exams are not forced.
Please stick with the discussion at hand.

Dave K8MN

3795. Re: FBI spy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-24 13:32:42 UTC
From: Keith Wood <kw@bctv.com>
Message-ID: <3A97B7FA.F27B005C@bctv.com>
Source record: 4047

N2EY wrote:
>
> In article <975sco$6hn$1@news.netmar.com>, K0HB@arrl.org writes:
>
> >n article <3a95b710.6229250@news2.dvol.com>, Brian Kelly, w3rv <kelly@dvol>
> >writes:
> >
> >
> >>.. . . we don't need that kinda "PR".
> >
> >Obviously they have the wrong guy. This fellow knows Morse code, and we all
> >know that the bad guys wear black hats and never know the code.
>
> How do you know that this guy knows the code, Hans?

He was a General in the 1990s.

But the real proof is in all of those "No code - no ham" messages that
he posted.

In Russki.

3796. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-24 13:32:59 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010224083259.01718.00000098@nso-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 4044

In article <977bfe52pej@enews1.newsguy.com>, tlbryant@my-deja.com (T. L. Bryant) writes:

>I posted this nearly two weeks ago (give or take) and you're just now
>responding to it?

I just came across it. Is there a time limit on responding to posts?
>
>While "Good Will Hunting" may be a work of fiction, the names of people that
>I
>posted along this thread are not fictional characters. They were all
>successful, and none held a college degree. It's interesting how you ignored
>that part of the discussion.

I haven't gotten that far yet.

Of course some people are successful without degrees. And others with degrees are not successful. No degree or other qualification is a guarantee of success.

But if you or a loved one needed to have an operation, would you want a surgeon who had been trained in a good medical school and who had a medical degree, or one who was self-taught from books in the library?
>
73 de Jim, N2EY

3797. Re: League needs to straighten up

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-24 13:32:59 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010224083259.01718.00000097@nso-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 4045

In article <20010219155424.03195.00001078@ng-fa1.news.cs.com>, ssb411d@cs.com (SSB411D) writes:

>Just reread Mark's proposal. It's calling for 11 meter ops to take the
>ridiculously easy Technician exam. A 35 question multiple choice exam for
>which
>the 384 question pool is published.

Not only published, but available at many sites on the web. You can also take practice exams at a several websites, so you don't have to guess about whether you'll pass.
>
>I recently took this exam and it took me approx. 5 to 6 minutes to "blow"
>through it, including the filling out of the associated paperwork.

Congratulations and welcome!

> I
>personally
>want to progress further, however, the point is that many 11 meter ops are a
>mere 35 questions and $39.00 away from full voting privileges. It IS a good
>LEGAL alternative.

Plus the VE fee and a trip to a testing session.

The FCC WANTS cbers and "freebanders" to get ham licenses and go legal. That's why the test requirements have been changed over the years. It's much easier to enforce the regs on licensed operators than on unlicensed ones.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3798. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-24 13:35:44 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net>
Message-ID: <3A97B8B0.B211F431@ovis.net>
Source record: 4048

Cecil wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > Neat logic lesson, Cecil. The following statement is also true:
> > "No person is forced to obtain an HF ham ticket".
>
> Of course it's true, Dave. But since nobody has asserted that anyone
> is forced to obtain an HF ham ticket, it is also irrelevant and can
> simply be considered as your strawman diversionary tactic. You continue
> to miss the point. HF hams are forced (required by circumstances) to pass
> a Morse code exam. The Morse code requirement is certainly required by the
> circumstances which exist at the FCC. That, my friend, is the definition
> of "forced", straight from Webster's.

But, Cecil, if no one is required to obtain an amateur ticket, how can one be forced to learn morse code? It is certainly an integral part of the equation. Your definition (in this latest incarnation) only fits if someone is desirous of becoming an HF ham. Your earlier "produced by effort" definition did not fit at all and has since been abandoned by you. I'm happy that you've found one which suits you better. This said, one is not forced to learn morse code. There is an option of learning it or not learning it.

Dave K8MN

3799. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-24 13:42:22 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net>
Message-ID: <3A97BA3E.33207E07@ovis.net>
Source record: 4049

Cecil wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > Sure, both are valid but their meaning is not the same.
>
> Their meanings certainly overlap and their meanings are the same
> in the overlap area. "Produced with effort" and "required by
> circumstances" can certainly mean that the effort required was
> required by the circumstances. Can you think of a case where
> the effort required was not required by the circumstances.

"I forced the door open" and "I was forced to surrender my money" do not use the same meaning of the word "forced". In the second, no effort is implied.

> > ...and you mean that the use of the "if" word implies options to do or
> > not do something.
>
> The 'if' word implies conditions. Those same conditions are often
> implied without the existence of an 'if' word. That is what you are
> missing or ignoring. What is implied by "HF ham"? The implication
> is clear. An HF ham was forced (required by circumstances) to pass
> a Morse code exam. Non-HF hams are not forced to pass a Morse code
> exam. You have painted yourself into a logical corner and are
> arguing an impossibility. Neglecting fraud, it is not possible for
> an HF ham to exist without passing a Morse code exam.

The word "if" implies options. The "if" tells us that the individual has choices open to him.

> > > If a ham is to obtain HF privileges then he is forced (required by
> > > circumstances) to learn Morse code.
> >
> > Sorry, Cecil. I don't buy the "then" portion of your statement.
>
> You don't buy that the Morse code requirement is required by the
> circumstances existing at the FCC????? Not to buy that, Dave, is
> not to buy reality. Please produce an HF ham who was not forced
> (required by circumstances) to pass a Morse code exam.

No, I do not accept "then he is forced to learn morse code". That is what is being debated. You have not proven that anyone is forced to learn morse code.

Dave K8MN

3800. Wayne Green and Richard Hoagland on Art Bell Show

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-24 13:48:11 UTC
From: Johnnie Code-cut <nfinelli9000@aol.com>
Message-ID: <vYOl6.263$ju2.50967@newsread2.prod.itd.earthlink.net>
Source record: 4050
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Go to the URL below to hear an interesting
debate between Wayne Green and Richard
Hoagland - moderated by Art Bell. It's a "good un!"

http://www.artbell.com/sound.html

3801. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-26 05:57:40 UTC
From: billsohl@mindspring.com
Message-ID: <3a99ef94.1142339@news.mindspring.com>
Source record: 4151

On 26 Feb 2001 01:33:42 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:

>In article <3a97cea2.43470735@news.mindspring.com>, billsohl@mindspring.com
>(Bill Sohl) writes:
>>>Of course a car that has an automatic transmission does not take up more
>>road
>>>space, use lots more fuel or emit lots more pollution than a similar manual
>>>transmission car. The same cannot be said of voice modes vs. Morse.
>>
>>That has ZERO bearing on the need for a code test or
>>knowledge of code as a skill.
>
>It has all the bearing in the world, Bill. My use of a manual transmission car
>vs. a similar model with automatic transmission has very little effect on other
>drivers, the environment or resource depletion. My use of Morse vs. voice on
>the ham bands has a BIG effect on other hams.

From what you have said now, it appears YOU want the
code test as a means to draft new code users...which
is not the purpose of the requirement. If someone sends
poor code does that have a BIG effect on other hams...or
only an effect on the other person trying to copy code.

If you want to hype the narrowbandwidth value of morse
over voice, that's fine, but the FCC sure hasn't bought
that argument as a justification for code testing.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3802. Re: 11meters, freebanding, and the no-code tech ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-26 06:04:24 UTC
From: billsohl@mindspring.com
Message-ID: <3a99f157.1593587@news.mindspring.com>
Source record: 4152

On 26 Feb 2001 01:33:43 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:

>In article <3a994ac3.2917577@news.mindspring.com>, billsohl@mindspring.com
>(Bill Sohl) writes:
>
>>On 25 Feb 2001 13:33:24 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>>
>>>In article <3A9894FA.A403FF14@IEEE.org>, Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
>>writes:
>>>
>>>>Dick Carroll wrote:
>>>>> ... then FCC lowered the license requrements
>>>>> till anyone who wanted could easily and effortlessy get a ham radio
>>>>> license,and they showed up in the ham bands with even more brazen
>>>>> attitudes, ...
>>>>
>>>>Let me get this straight, Dick. Lowering the license requirements
>>>>caused more radio outlaws to show up on the ham bands?
>>>
>>>Yup. Along with lots of other people, of course.
>>
>>On what basis do you make that claim?
>
>Observation of the amateur bands over the past 35 years. Knowing many hams who
>got their licenses in that time, and the paths they took to get them.
>
>> Please provide
>>both your definition of what constitutes a "radio
>>outlaw"
>
>Anyone (in the USA) who operates an unlicensed radio transmitter outside of the
>provisions of FCC Part 15 and Part 95. Specifically, the activities of
>"freebanders", and cbers who violate FCC regs are examples of "radio outlaws".
>
>> and what proofs/evidence that "loering ham radio
>>qualifications" has brought more of such "radio outlaws"
>>to the airwaves (either in amateur bands, or not).
>>
>Let me clarify, Bill.
>
>I know plenty of hams who were "radio outlaws" at one time. Then they got ham
>licenses, and most of them cleaned up their acts and became legal. A few
>brought their "bad habits" with them - but only a few.

Sounds like a good thing to me. Even the "non-prior outlaw" group
of hams has it share of "bad-habit" characters.

>Many of these folks would have become hams straightaway, but they perceived the
>license requirements as being too difficult. So they did their outlaw thing for
>a time. Then the requirements for a ham license were eased, and they got ham
>licenses.

Sounds like a good thing to me.

.....
>I'm not passing judgement on any of this - just reporting what has happened.

The impression you gave originally implied bad things.
Your clarification indicates pretty good results.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3803. Re: 11meters, freebanding, and the no-code tech ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-26 06:06:20 UTC
From: billsohl@mindspring.com
Message-ID: <3a99f214.1782202@news.mindspring.com>
Source record: 4153

On 26 Feb 2001 04:47:17 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

>"T. L. Bryant" wrote:
>>
>> In article <20010225083324.01707.00000190@nso-fp.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com says...
>> ---
>> >One of the main reasons the FCC has lowered the requirements for a ham
>> license,
>> >and simplified the license structure, over the past 25 years is this: They
>> want
>> >the "freebanders" and the non-commercial cbers to get ham licenses.
>> >73 de Jim, N2EY
>>
>> Do you have any quotes from any FCC that proves this?
>
>
>Whatta ya want, a notarized statement from the Chairman?

How about just a quote from any FCC staffer or from any
prior FCC documentation?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3804. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-26 06:08:03 UTC
From: W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com>
Message-ID: <97crtd$87g$1@iac5.navix.net>
Source record: 4154

This is about Cecil's daily mental masturbation...

"Cecil" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3A99DF5C.220942E7@IEEE.org...
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Don't you know, Larry? When Cecil gets on one of his sensational
> > wild-assed 'logical' debate tangents, subject matter loses all
> > importance. What is important then is that he "wins".
>
> This is not about winning, Dick. This is about truth, logic, and
> the American way of life.
> --
> http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

3805. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-26 06:16:41 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net>
Message-ID: <3A99F4A6.366642A3@ovis.net>
Source record: 4155

Cecil wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > Let's play turnabout. Are you so omniscient as to dismiss my statements
> > as irrelevant? Who made you the relevance god?
>
> It is my right to dismiss anything as irrelevant to me. It is your right
> to dismiss anything as irrelevant to you. It is not your right to dismiss
> anything as irrelevant to me.
>
> > We haven't settle the point unless I agree to it. Consider it
> > unsettled.
>
> It is settled, Dave. I have proven it beyond a shadow of a doubt. That
> you don't accept it is your personal problem, not mine. I have used a
> valid definition from a Webster's unabridged dictionary. I have graphically
> diagrammed the arguments using symbolic logic. There are no holes in my
> logic.

There are enough holes in it to fly a 747 through. But then again, you
can dismiss anything as irrelevant and change both conditions and
definitions to suit your argument. I don't have a personal problem in
this. I don't accept your view. Nothing can be settled unless you and
I agree that it is settled. I have not agreed.

No one is forced to learn morse code.

> I think we can reach agreement on what we are both saying if we replace
> the word "forced" with the definition of "forced" that we are each using.
>
> When you say: "No one forces a ham to learn Morse code" and you replace
> "forces" thusly: "No one holds a gun to a ham's head and makes him learn
> Morse code", I will agree that is a true statement given your very narrow
> definition of "forces".

You mean, my narrow definition when compared to your, "everything I do
is required by circumstance" definition? I surely wish I could take you
seriously, Mr. Mensa.

> > Under your peculiar supposition, we are all required by circumstance to
> > do everything we undertake.
>
> Not everything, but lots of things are like that. The circumstances are that
> if you don't eat, you die. To continue living, you are required by those
> circumstances to continue eating. No person is holding a gun to your head but
> Mother Nature might as well be holding a gun to your head.

I gave you a fairly lengthy list of items, all of which you described as "required by circumstance". These were the kinds of things which a normal person would never say are forced on him like picking up a newspaper. But to you they all were. It is apparent that you do not believe in free will or choices open to man.

Mother nature, by the way, is a ficticious character.

Dave K8 Mother Nature

3806. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-26 06:21:58 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net>
Message-ID: <3A99F5EA.FC302CC1@ovis.net>
Source record: 4156

Cecil wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > But you were, at some point according to your rather twisted view,
> > forced (required by circumstance) to learn morse at some point.
>
> Nope Dave, the fact is I was never forced to learn Morse code. I wish
> I had been forced because it would make my argument easier. I learned
> Morse code in cub scouts with absolutely no reward. There was a potential
> reward because Boy Scouts could earn a merit badge by learning Morse
> code but I never made it to the Boy Scouts.

Well then, I sincerly thank you for accepting my view. If you were not
"required by circumstance" to learn morse code, you'd be hard pressed to
state that others were given that all had options to undertake it.

> The people who knew Morse code before they became interested in getting
> a ham license were not forced by the FCC regulations to learn Morse code
> because they already knew it.
>
> > Gee, you seem to have snipped the portion of your statement I responded
> > to. My answer fit your comment.
>
> Sorry, I'm having trouble understanding your point.

I believe you.

>
> > You are not allowed (even with all caps) to tell me what I am allowed or
> > not allowed to do.
>
> Choosing definitions for my words is something you are not allowed to do
> because I am 100% in control of that particular function.
>
> > ... but you were, according to your own earlier postings, required by
> > another circumstance to learn morse. You apparently have no free will
> > open to you.
>
> Nope, I was not required by any circumstances to learn Morse code. It
> was a 100% fun thing to do. However, there are a lot of people who
> believe in predestination which gives a person no choice. Could be
> I was forced by predestination to learn Morse code.

I take this as pretty much of an admission that your view of "forced
learning of morse" are a Texas tall tale.

> > I surely wish I could take you seriously.
>
> How many postings would you make if you took me seriously?

As many as I'd care to make...

Dave K8MN

3807. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-26 06:31:27 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net>
Message-ID: <3A99F80A.B33A72AD@ovis.net>
Source record: 4157

Cecil wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > By your own view, SOME circumstance forced you to learn morse.
> > *chortle*
>
> Eat the *chortle*, Dave. I have refuted that in another thread.

But you have insisted that even the most mundane and ordinary daily activity is, in some manner, "required by circumstance". Are you now stating that this isn't necessarily true?

> > > Morse code is compulsory for HF hams, Dave. What is it about "requirement"
> > > that you don't understand. For all HF hams, requirements are compulsory.
> > > If they were not compulsory, there would exist some lazy HF hams who
> > > weren't compelled to know Morse code. Where are they, Dave? I don't
> > > know any.
> >
> > Easy. They are not HF hams. They chose not to meet the requirements.
>
> That proves my argument and blows yours completely out of the water.
> Diagram it using symbolic logic and you will see.
>
> > Easy. They are not HF hams. They chose not to meet the requirements.
> > No one is forced to learn morse code.
>
> Use symbolic logic to diagram the argument, Dave. You will see that
> you just lost. Most HF hams are forced to learn Morse code.
> The people who chose not to learn Morse code are not HF hams so WHERE
> ARE THE HF HAMS WHO CHOSE NOT TO LEARN MORSE CODE? Could it be that
> they had no choice? If there are no HF hams who chose not to learn
> Morse code, that 100% proves my argument.

...not unless these characters were ordered by a judge to become HF hams. Amateur radio is not a mandatory activity any more than newsgroup posting is.

You're writing more Bravo Sierra, Cecil. My statement was: No one is forced to learn morse code.

No one is forced to enter amateur radio....absolutely no one. Produce a person who was forced to learn morse.

Dave K8MN

3808. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-26 06:40:59 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net>
Message-ID: <3A99FA55.DC6CE8C@ovis.net>
Source record: 4158

Cecil wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > You must be having a senior moment. By your own twisted view, SOME
> > CIRCUMSTANCE must have forced you to learn morse. *giggle*
>
> Well, of course, it could have been predestination. I was in cub scouts
> and was introduced to Morse code. It looked like fun so I learned it.
> It's possible that destiny or God dictated the outcome but I am not
> aware of any circumstances that forced me to learn Morse code. Are you?

I am aware of none. I'm the one who maintains that no one is forced to
learn morse code. It is only within the last few posts that you've come
around to my way of thinking. I believe that we have choices open to us
in undertaking any action. Of course there can be consequences to our
choices but we still have the choices open to us.

> > A statement does not become irrelevant because you say it is irrelevant.
>
> I don't say it's irrelevant unless I have tested it using symbolic logic.
> If it falls outside the areas of argument, then it is, by definition,
> irrelevant.

...because YOU state that it is outside the area of argument. I haven't
agreed to your terms.

> > > ALL HF hams who don't already know Morse code are required by circumstances
> > > to learn Morse code. If what you say is true, where are the HF hams who
> > > didn't learn Morse code?
> >
> > Easy. They aren't HF hams because, of their own volition, the chose not
> > to meet the requirements for licensing.
>
> So you are saying the only people who had a choice are not hams. HF hams
> had no choice except to know/learn Morse code. That's what your answer
> implies. You seem to be wrestling with a logical conundrum. Try again.

If a guy sez, "Ham radio still requires passage of a morse code exam.
I'm not going to learn any stinking morse code", that is his choice. He
had options. He was not forced to learn morse code and he was not
forced to enter amateur radio. Then again, he is not going to become an
HF ham.

I just pinned your conundrum.

Dave K8MN

3809. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-26 06:53:08 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net>
Message-ID: <3A99FD33.3212191B@ovis.net>
Source record: 4159

T. L. Bryant wrote:
>
> In article <3A9836CF.25B74C27@ovis.net>, k8mn@ovis.net says...
>
> >> If my ideas are preconceived, I'd appreciate you showing me how you think it
> i
> >s
> >> so. FYI, I used pro-code, until I started digging into the facts about why
> >> continued testing of code at 13 and 20 WPM, served no purpose other than a
> >> hazing ritual for those who only wished to have HF phone privileges. It's
> >> called objective reasoning. Your reasoning is subjective, and as such, is
> >> always flawed.
> >
> >You used pro-code? I've never tried it.
>
> Sometimes my thoughts get ahead of my fingers, and I hit "send" before
> proofreading. It's a sign of a genius.

Yeah, not proofreading before sending sounds pretty bright.

>
> >Let's see...at one point I didn't know morse. Then I learned it. Later
> >yet I passed the Novice exam. Through the years, I increased my code
> >speed until I passed the Extra. The period from not knowing morse to
> >passing the Amateur Extra was about seventeen years. After passing the
> >Extra, I increased my speed because of desire and through much
> >practice. That's hardly shows that I had any preconceived ideas about
> >morse testing.
>
> All this shows is that you like using morse as a means of communication. It
> proves nothing.

How do you know what my views of morse testing or use were during those
years? Pretty dismissive comment coming from a fellow armed with few
facts.

> >During the period of the debate over whether morse testing should be
> >continued, I've weighed the evidence and found the views of your side to
> >be wanting. I've observed that generally, things which are deregulated
> >do not improve whether the things are telephone service, airline service
> >or amateur radio.
>
> That is a blanket assumption, that cannot be proven. After one year, I've not
> seen any changes, for better or worse.

Telephones, cable service, airlines and the like have been deregulated
for some time. Prices continue to go up; service goes down. As far as
amateur radio, I've noted a number of newer ops, mostly using voice
modes who have some pretty bad operating habits and a pronounced
"accent". It hasn't kept me from working some of 'em.
>
> >I don't share your view of ham radio utopia and probably never will.
> >Live with it.
> >
> >Dave K8MN
>
> All that I hae to say to that is 5 WPM is here to stay. Live with it.

I've already accepted that and I've been living with it. I'm still
looking for the explosion in growth. According to some, many of the
newcomers will be professionals who will dazzle us with technological
advances. I'm waiting for that too.

Dave K8MN

3810. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-26 06:57:39 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net>
Message-ID: <3A99FE29.9B5BEACD@ovis.net>
Source record: 4160

Cecil wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > Nope. Not until you agree that becoming a ham is an entirely voluntary
> > undertaking and that it bears relevance to the discussion at hand.

> If anyone who volunteers to be an ham is not allowed to become a ham
> then the process is NOT "entirely voluntary" and your so-called
> volunteer is *required by circumstances* to pass an exam.

No one who desires to become a ham is turned away at the gate--not even Leonard H. Anderson. Allowed to become a ham? Is this your pet phrase. I acknowledge that there are examination elements required. That still doesn't mean that anyone is forced to undertake them.

No one is forced to learn morse code. No one is forced to become a radio amateur.

> I will meet you halfway. I will agree that no one holds a gun to the
> head of a prospective ham in the act of forcing him take a ham exam.

That's awfully kind of you.

Dave K8MN

3811. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-26 07:01:19 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net>
Message-ID: <3A99FF13.B0B39406@ovis.net>
Source record: 4161

Cecil wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > You can't lose with the
> > ability to set any conditions you like on a discussion while retaining
> > the ability to dismiss any of your opponent's statements as irrelevant.
>
> That's what I have been telling you all this time, Dave. I choose the
> valid definitions for the words I use to argue with. I verify my
> premises against reality. I can't lose as long as I don't violate
> any rules of logic.

You can't lose when you change the statement, dictate the definitions
and set the conditions. Of course you'd have to have the aquiesence of
your opponent. Unfortunately for you, I'm not agreeing to that.

> > Doesn't win you many points though.
>
> I didn't know we were playing for points. I thought we were trying to
> reach a meeting of the minds. You should have told me you were just
> playing a silly game.

Any time someone gets into a discussion with you here, he'd better be
aware that he's going to end up playing a silly game. I've not forgotten
that you've said that nothing you post here is to be taken seriously.
You're never hear for real debate or discussion.

> > Do whatever you need to do in order to think yourself a winner.
>
> Likewise, I'm sure. It's a pity that one has to comprehend the subject
> before knowing one has lost.

Keep working on it. It may come to you.

Dave K8MN

3812. Re: 11meters, freebanding, and the no-code tech ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-26 07:03:37 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net>
Message-ID: <3A99FFA0.EDA8EF16@ovis.net>
Source record: 4163

Cecil wrote:
>
> Aaron Jones wrote:
> > I know you could challenge us to come give you a test,
> > but in reality that piece of info is just as unverifiable for
> > most of us as is Cecil's...
>
> Well, I proved I could score 100% on the Extra exam in March. :-)

As with your arguments, there had to be a change in the conditions before it could happen. Weren't the you the guy who told us that you would not ever take the Extra exam?

Man, I wish I could take you seriously.

Dave K8MN

3813. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-26 07:04:53 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net>
Message-ID: <3A99FFE7.6FB53EBF@ovis.net>
Source record: 4162

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> Cecil wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > By your own view, SOME circumstance forced you to learn morse.
> > > *chortle*
> >
> > Eat the *chortle*, Dave. I have refuted that in another thread.
> >
> > > > Morse code is compulsory for HF hams, Dave. What is it about "requirement"
> > > > that you don't understand. For all HF hams, requirements are compulsory.
> > > > If they were not compulsory, there would exist some lazy HF hams who
> > > > weren't compelled to know Morse code. Where are they, Dave? I don't
> > > > know any.
> > >
> > > Easy. They are not HF hams. They chose not to meet the requirements.
> >
> > That proves my argument and blows yours completely out of the water.
> > Diagram it using symbolic logic and you will see.
> >
> > > Easy. They are not HF hams. They chose not to meet the requirements.
> > > No one is forced to learn morse code.
> >
> > Use symbolic logic to diagram the argument, Dave. You will see that
> > you just lost. Most HF hams are forced to learn Morse code.
> > The people who chose not to learn Morse code are not HF hams so WHERE
> > ARE THE HF HAMS WHO CHOSE NOT TO LEARN MORSE CODE? Could it be that
> > they had no choice? If there are no HF hams who chose not to learn
> > Morse code, that 100% proves my argument.
>
> Well, dave, that proves it, Right? Cecil has said some half-dozen times
> in one post that YOU lost the "argument". Doncha feel bad? <BSEG>

Yeah, declares victory enough times so that even HE might start to
believe it.

Dave K8MN

3814. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-26 07:09:43 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net>
Message-ID: <3A9A0110.28C55240@ovis.net>
Source record: 4164

Cecil wrote:
>
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > I don't give a damn whether both statements are true or not.
> > Why don't you come up with something intelligent to discuss, instead
> > of playing your silly, childish, logic-trap games?
>
> That's the whole problem with our society. Nobody gives a damn
> anymore. All they do is sit around and whine about postings that
> they don't comprehend.
>
> Let me summarize my present position:
>
> All Hams are *required by circumstances* to take exams.
> All HF hams are *required by circumstances* to know/learn Morse code.

That's his present position. Stay tuned. It could change in a heart
beat.

Note that it is no way the original statement I made.

Dave K8MN

3815. Re: This Should Be A Warning

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-26 07:34:53 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net>
Message-ID: <3A9A069B.79D70EB8@ovis.net>
Source record: 4165

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3A99B2EA.1BCBC2C8@ovis.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net> writes:
>
> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >>
> >> In article <3A97C059.4C35B759@ovis.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net> writes:
> >>
> >> >> In article <cuvyxnansvbet.g988dg1.pminews@ca.news.verio.net>, "Phil
> >Kane"
> >> >> <Phil.Kane@nospam.spam> writes:
> >> >>
> >> >> >On 23 Feb 2001 18:39:51 GMT, Len Over 21 wrote:

> >> Not at all. Why does Herr Oberst Heil have to jump in waving
> >> his swagger stick?
> >>
> >Are you posting material in a newsgroup or having a private e-mail
> >exchange with Phil? Have you ever commented on an item not when not
> >being directly addressed?
>
> Gosh, I thought all these public messages were public.
> Seems to me that anyone can "jump in" on public
> postings. Guess that isn't "supposed" to happen in
> the good Oberst's orderly little world. :-)

You're having a senior moment, Leonard H. That was precisely my point.
You were giving me hell about jumping in. Try to stay with the flow.

> >> >What the man told you was factual.
> >>
> >> Was it more factual than a statement of one military branch's
> >> MARS headquarters?
> >>
> >It was no less factual and already provided once without posting an
> >entire article.
>
> Ah, so the Oberst Gives Orders on what is acceptible for
> posting and what is not acceptible. Sehr gutt.

How old are you?

> So...information on a MARS branch "shall be interpretted"
> by a communications attorney and accepted carte blanche?

The man provided you with the information. Did you think he was packing
your ass?

> Why is the good Oberst so afraid of direct input from some
> ancilliary amateur activity that is controlled by the DoD?

Fear? What fear, Leonard H.?

> Does the good Oberst think that "lower classes" cannot
> understand a MARS Hq statement in English?

Are you making a point here?

> >What you are doing above is what you have repeatedly accused others of
> >doing. Grow up.
>
> The good Oberst has a decided lack of humor. He "knows what
> is best for everyone." Information shall be cleared or uncleared
> only over His desk. Ach zo! :-)

So when you do these things--using the German military terms, assigning
ranks and coming up with the droll names, that is humor. When someone
else does it to you, it is an attack or denigration. You certainly have
a dual standard.

> Quit acting like some bad stereotypical Oberst. This is not the
> Waffen SS. You try but cannot cow anyone with all the Orders,
> cowboy.

...sideways with a hot Weller gun.

> >You come off like an eight year old on the playground, Leonard H.
> >Act your age.
>
> This is not a playground to act out your control-freak fantasies.
> I know that is disturbing news to you but try to accept it.
>
> >And your posting of material in its entirety from a MARS web page does
> >what about that?
>
> Ach zo...everyone is to Follow Orders in a Linear line of
> messaging? Did the good Oberst read the first post of this
> particular thread? He did not? Why not?
>
> > Are you a MARS official?
>
> No, that's why a reposting of a MARS home page was
> thought informative. Of course, you knew all this so "it
> wasn't needed." :-)

The posting of an entire article from a web page was needed because you
are not a MARS official. That defies belief!

> > Are you a MARS member?
>

> No. Are you? :-)

I was from 1968-70 and from 1980-85. You may recall that I've been
overseas for fifteen years.
>
> The USAF MARS home page gave membership requirements
> and how to apply. Was that Against Orders or something?

...and posting the URL would have been too easy.

> >Are you a radio amateur? Are you a sidewalk superintendant?
>
> Does the FCC require Commissioners or FCC Staff to have
> amateur radio licenses in order to regulate US amateur radio?

I can sell beef and be a vegetarian. You aren't an FCC commissioner or
on the FCC staff and don't regulate amateur or any other radio. You
aren't even a participant in amateur radio.

> Why are you jumping in on a thread Barking Orders? Aren't
> you retired from government service? Do you need some
> pet whipping boys or something? Sorry Herr Oberst, I won't
> be your bondage victim. No one should. Now be a good
> sort and put away the leather, whips, and chains...you are
> starting to look very foolish.

Anyone who wants to see foolish need only read the paragraph above.

> Tell you what, why don't you get some kind of Revolution
> going on divorcing the US amateur radio service from FCC
> control. You obviously don't think anyone can become a
> new amateur unless they've already had amateur radio
> experience. Since they don't know anything about amateur
> radio they can't pass any tests and therefore won't become
> licensed. Maybe you could start a "Waffen ARS" and run
> all newcomers through some Basic Training to "properly
> instill amateur radio values (as you see them)" and especially
> to insure "discipline" so as to never give "higher officers" any
> back-talk...from anyone. To hell with all this "free speech"
> about federal regulations, ey Herr Oberst? Everyone has to
> Obey You, right? Right, only You "know what is best" and
> all others should shut up. :-)
>
> Wow, this amateur radio activity is sure tough as a hobby!

What's your hold up in getting your license, Leonard H.? You've been
shedding skin cells on this planet for seven decades. What is it you
are waiting for? It may be tough for you to swallow but until you go
ahead and take the plunge, you are an onlooker, a bystander, a sidewalk
superintendant, and SWL, a wannabe. If you had any serious interest in
obtaining an amateur license, you could have had it in the several years
you've wasted blathering here. Study material is available.

Good luck with that 5 wpm!

Dave K8MN

3816. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-26 07:38:43 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net>
Message-ID: <3A9A07C3.4390020B@ovis.net>
Source record: 4166

Cecil wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Don't you know, Larry? When Cecil gets on one of his sensational
> > wild-assed 'logical' debate tangents, subject matter loses all
> > importance. What is important then is that he "wins".
>
> This is not about winning, Dick. This is about truth, logic, and
> the American way of life.

Truth? You've boasted that nothing you post here can be taken seriously! Logic? When you change the conditions, call any statement made by your opponent irrelevant and make the definitions? The American Way of Life? Maybe some Texas rustic Libertarian variant...

Dave K8MN

3817. Re: This Should Be A Warning

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-26 09:06:34 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010226040634.04492.00002178@ng-ce1.aol.com>
Source record: 4167

>Subject: Re: This Should Be A Warning
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/25/01 8:37 PM Pacific Standard Time
>Message-id: <20010225233725.01718.00000174@nso-fo.aol.com>

>Gosh, I thought all these public messages were public.
>Seems to me that anyone can "jump in" on public
>postings. Guess that isn't "supposed" to happen in
>the good Oberst's orderly little world

Nor in yours, Lennie the Undecided. YOU have chastised ME for having the temerity to comment on your "comments" to third parties as if I had tapped your private e mail.

Of course, I expect no less from you.

>Ah, so the Oberst Gives Orders on what is acceptible for
>posting and what is not acceptible.

Gee...I WONDER from whom he got THAT idea...???

>Quit acting like some bad stereotypical Oberst.

Ahhh...but LENNIE! Why should YOU be the only one to have some play-fun time?

>This is not the
>Waffen SS. You try but cannot cow anyone with all the Orders,
>cowboy.

What's WITH you and the NEED to assert that anything stated contrary to The Word of Lennie MUST be Nazi? In this post and others you have been riding Dave with the same neo-Nazi crap that you pummeled ME with?

Of course, you have since denied DOING those things, yet here you are, once again, caught in ANOTHER lie. But don't worry, we weren't surprised.

>This is not a playground to act out your control-freak fantasies.
>I know that is disturbing news to you but try to accept it.

You should read what you write, Lennie. Seems YOU are the one with the comprehension problems here.

>Does the FCC require Commissioners or FCC Staff to have
>amateur radio licenses in order to regulate US amateur radio?

So you perceive that since YOU don't have a license you have the RIGHT to be foul, lying and obnoxious?

>Sorry Herr Oberst, I won't be your bondage victim.

As much as I am sure that disappoints him, Dave...(Mind's eye view of Lennie in leather with rubber ball in his mouth, tied to the ottoman...Mrs. A in Pointed black leather bra and nazi officers cap with cat-o-nine...Lennie crying for more as she drags lashes accross his butt.....)

>Now be a good
>sort and put away the leather, whips, and chains...you are
>starting to look very foolish.

Having been disarmed of another rant, YOU are the one looking foolish, Lennie.....

Again, I might add........

>Everyone has to
>Obey You, right? Right, only You "know what is best" and
>all others should shut up.

I am sure you'd LOVE for people to allow you to run rampant, spewing your hate and sludge without impedement. Sorry. Won't happen.

>Wow, this amateur radio activity is sure tough as a hobby!

THIS isn't Amatuer Radio.

YOU will NEVER know Amatuer Radio. You can talk about it...you can criticize it...you can dream about it...but it will always elude you.

Because YOU, Lennie the Liar, just can't HANDLE it!

3818. Re: This Should Be A Warning

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-26 09:11:48 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010226041148.04492.00002179@ng-ce1.aol.com>
Source record: 4168

>Subject: Re: This Should Be A Warning
>From: Dave Heil k8mn@ovis.net
>Date: 2/25/01 11:34 PM Pacific Standard Time
>Message-id: <3A9A069B.79D70EB8@ovis.net>

>So when you do these things--using the German military terms, >assigning ranks
and coming up with the droll names, that is humor. >When someone else does it
to you, it is an attack or denigration. You >certainly have a dual standard.

Yes..He does. A double standard as wide as the 405 in Long Beach.

>I can sell beef and be a vegetarian. You aren't an FCC commissioner >or on
the FCC staff and don't regulate amateur or any other radio. You
>aren't even a participant in amateur radio.

Nor any OTHER kind of radio, acutally, Dave. He let his "lifetime" GROL
"expire" last October...remember?

>Good luck with that 5 wpm!

I'll be appointed Duke of Earl before THAT happens!

3819. Re: MARS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-26 09:18:27 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010226041827.04492.00002180@ng-ce1.aol.com>
Source record: 4169

>Subject: Re: MARS
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 2/25/01 9:11 PM Pacific Standard Time

I find it amusing that this was posted at 9:11...mostly because all of Lennie's stuff is in dire need of assistance...like some TRUTH.

>I guess all that stuff about the Tennessee STATE Guard is
>"not accurate.

There are some CURRENT changes that are NOT reflected on the Web Page, Lennie...which only PROVES my assertion that you CANNOT take what you read on ANY web page as verbatim fact.

>>You ASSUME the webpage contains all the information that is
>"essential".

>You betcha.

And proof positive that you assume the worst...the worst since you think this stuff is essential or even current.

>You seem to be claiming some webpage is "inaccurate" just
>because a newsgroup opponent presented it...while anything
>Robeson presents via webpage is absolutely truthful.

No...it's inaccurate because it's neither timely nor is it necessarily complete.

You assume it is both and present it as absolute fact.

An engineer should know better. But then, it is YOU we are talking about.....

>This is getting to be in the area of Oberst Heil's "definitions"
>where he and only he defines the "truth" in messaging.

Nope...just once again laying your rants to waste.

3820. Re: MARS (the end of...)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-26 09:25:21 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010226042521.04492.00002181@ng-ce1.aol.com>
Source record: 4170

>Subject: Re: MARS (the end of...)
>From: Dwight Stewart stewartx@sccoast.net
>Date: 2/25/01 8:58 PM Pacific Standard Time

> If the current situation continues, I think DoD will eliminate the MARS >program very soon. The organization is simply not meeting its >obligation. Most overseas military installations, even the largest ones, >have no MARS operation in place. Of those which do, most have a >difficult time staffing those facilities.

Agreed on the staffing, Dwight, but not the rest.

In most cases, the mission of MARS has shifted significantly. In the case of Air Force MARS, it is no longer centralized around H&W traffic, but in supporting various installations with "Base Support Teams", groups of Amatuers who can help with ancilliary communications ON the facility.

That, obviously, is almost impossible to do on an overseas facility.

> If you live near a military installation, consider conducting classes, >and exam sessions, targeted towards military personnel. Make sure to >introduce MARS during those classes. Offering classes to military >ROTC programs is also a good idea.

Excellent ideas.

Another program being used by NAVMARCORPS MARS and AFMARS is to incorporate the activities of the USCGAUX and the Civil Air Patrol. Army MARS is being used by various State's Guards and Defense Forces.....contrary to what Lennie might tell you......

73

Steve, K4YZ

3821. Re: FBI spy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-26 13:33:18 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010226083318.01380.00000137@nso-fj.aol.com>
Source record: 4174

In article <3A99D344.D2FCA281@IEEE.org>, Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>>
>> <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>> >Well, my parents can verify it and ex-W5FQC, who is now a preacher
>> >can verify it.
>>
>> They are not independent verification.
>
>Exactly what would constitute independent verification?

Something you had no control over.

>I was living
>closer than 125 miles to the FCC office at the time. Does that count?

Nope. You might not be "serious" about it.
>
>> >How do you know how fast I type before I hit the send key?
>>
>> By the sheer volume of your posts.
>
>You've got to remember that, unlike the average poster, I have 120+
>hours per week available for posting. However, last week I started
>day-trading so that number will decrease.

My Auto-AOL downloads every four hours, usually. Your volume of posting in four
hours is an indication of high typing speed.
>
>> So you say. Maybe you're serious, maybe not. You have repeatedly said you
>don't
>> post seriously to rrap.
>
>Wouldn't you agree that a CW spellchecker is fairly non-serious?

Yup. That's why I don't put much faith in anything you post.
>
>> You didn't call them at a specified time and frequency?
>
>Yep I did, Jim. I heard no answers.
>--
Maybe you need an antenna that works.

Wednesday, 0300Z, 7037 plus/minus. W3RV will be there. I will try to be.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3822. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-26 13:33:20 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010226083320.01380.00000138@nso-fj.aol.com>
Source record: 4177

In article <20010225214900.05358.00000435@nso-mh.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
(Len Over 21) writes:

>n article <20010225203342.06490.00000291@nso-fz.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>writes:
>
>>In article <3a97cea2.43470735@news.mindspring.com>, billsohl@mindspring.com
>>(Bill Sohl) writes:
>>
>>>On 24 Feb 2001 14:39:10 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>>>
>>>>In article <3a95e69f.5254787@news.mindspring.com>, billsohl@mindspring.com
>>>>(Bill Sohl) writes:
>>>>
>>>> It does not, however, forclose
>>>>the person attempting to get the requirements changed.
>>>>
>>>>Of course! That's what a representative democracy is all about.
>>>
>>>Absolutely agee.
>>>
>>>>But it also means that other people have the right to try to keep the
>>>>requirements, or change them in other ways.
>>>
>>>Agree again.
>>>
>>>>That is the point I believe many PCTA folks want...i.e.
>>>>accept the requiremnts the way they are..
>>>>
>>>>Sure. Nothing wrong with wanting to keep the good things, just because
>they
>>>are
>>>>old.
>>>>
>>>>.after all, I did it, so should you.
>>>>
>>>>Nope. That's not it, Bill. It's more like this:
>>>>
>>>>"If it's not broken, don't fix it".
>>>
>>>Seems you're not doing too well convincing the FCC of that.
>>
>>We all had our say. Just because the FCC took a certain action doesn't mean
>>it's logical or the best thing for the ARS.

>
>Do you know "what is best for the [US] ARS?" :-)

Of course.
>
>Hint: The FCC regulates US amateur radio.

We KNOW, Len. Is the FCC infallible in its regulatory decisions?

>It has done that since
>1934.

And before them, it was the FRC. Before the FRC, it was the DOC.

Doesn't mean they are infallible.

>The FCC doesn't require Commissioners or FCC Staff to
>hold amateur radio licenses in order to regulate US amateur
>radio.

So? What's your point?
>
>>My point was not to rehash the old arguments for or against code testing,
>but
>>simply to point out that the motivation of "after all, I did it, so should
>>you" was NOT part of my support for code testing. And there are plenty of
>folks
>>who agree with me.
>
>There are many in here who rationalize about all newcomers
>having to do just like they did.

Who? Not me. My point was that it's not one of MY reasons.

Show me where I've posted "I did it, so you must do it too" as a reason for
keeping code tests. The only place I've seen it is in the posts of nocodetest
folks who claim to know the motivations of others.

> In another post you seemed to
>want all newcomer to do Much More than you had to do...

That's YOUR misinterpretation. Show me where I wrote that American hams should
have to do what used to be required of Soviet amateurs.

And by the way, I did all of those things. And I can still do them. Not only
did I design and build my current HF ham station, and many of its predecesors,
I can explain its operation in detail. And it wasn't a copy of any published
design.

>Which is it?

Read my posts and set your biases aside, Len.
>
> <snip>
>

>>>Yet you readily admit that isn't the case for a passenger vehicle.
>>
>>Of course! But a passenger vehicle driver's license does not convey full
>>driving privileges by any means.
>
>When the FCC starts testing drivers, we can talk about
>that new development. The FCC has not done that since
>it started in 1934.

It's an analogy, Len.
>
> <snip>
>
>>>>The regular passenger driver's license is like the Technician license. The
>>>>various forms of CDL are like the General and Extra licenses.
>>>
>>>Sorry, no such equivalency exists.
>>
>>Sure it does.
>
>...only in an over-reaching imagination. :-)

The over-reaching imagination here is yours. Not mine.

>>I think my PA driver's license allows me to operate vehicles up to 10,000
>>pouinds GVWR. Beyond that, I need a CDL.(Weight is not the only criteria, of
>>course, but it is one of them). What happens at 10,000 pounds that suddenly
>>makes me unsafe to drive? Why am I safe for 9,500 but unsafe for 10,500?
>>
>>> No such similararity
>>>exists regarding the privileges between tech/gen/extra.
>>
>>Sure it does. Listen to the HF ham bands and see how much Morse you hear.
>
>Why not listen to ham bands above 10 m? Tell us how
>much morse code you hear there.

Morse is used far more on the HF and MF ham bands than on VHF and UHF.
>
>Commercial Driver Licenses are COMMERCIAL.

In the context of driver's licenses, the word does not mean "for money". To
legally drive a motor vehicle over 10,000 pounds GVWR in PA requires a CDL,
even if I drive it as an "amateur". But I can be paid to drive my car without
one.

>US amateur
>radio is defined as "a radio activity not having pecuniary
>interests." That's "amateur" in any definition.

Driving many vehicles "without pecuniary interest" still requires a CDL,
though.

>
>Do you want all amateurs to become commercial operators?

I want them to have the basic skills and knowledge of the amateur radio
service.
>
>>>Indeed,
>>>the lowest license (Tech) can build and play with the highest power
>>>levels at frequencies ANSI considers more dangerous than HF
>>>at the same power levels.
>>
>>Does that mean it's right? In other words, just because the FCC allows it,
>>does that mean noone should question it?
>
>Seems to me that was the PCTA position before the 98-143
>NPRM.

Not me. I suggested many chnages to the FCC. You didn't even bother to file
comments, Len - just "reply comments".

> A very strong position. "No one should question
>the Law" was a common PCTA comment then. :-)

By whom?
>
>>>That has ZERO bearing on the need for a code test or
>>>knowledge of code as a skill.
>>
>>It has all the bearing in the world, Bill. My use of a manual transmission
>>car vs. a similar model with automatic transmission has very little effect
>on
>>other drivers, the environment or resource depletion. My use of Morse vs.
>voice on
>>the ham bands has a BIG effect on other hams.
>
>Ah yes, "exclusivity!" :-)

Where do you see that? Show me where I advocate excluding anyone who has the
necessary qualifications.
>
>By keeping the morse code test for HF privileges, it insures
>that SOME newcomers will know morse (your favorite mode).

So? Is that a bad thing?

>It also insures that many newcomers will not accept or
>bother with HF-privilege class license testing, thereby insuring
>a minimum of operators.

How does it do that?

>Exclusivity.

Qualification.

> All for a "better" IN-
>group...to your personal liking.

To my judgement.
>
>Seems a pretty clear thing to me, old-timer.

Nope. You're projecting your biases onto others.

> It's not an
>"environmental" or "resource" thing at all..

Sure it is. Morse signals use less spectrum than voice signals.

>.just another
>manifestation of "that's the way you had to test and therefore
>every newcomer has to test the same way."
>
In your imagination, maybe. Not in fact.

I tested in front of the FCC. I didn't advocate going back to that because it's both inconvenient and impractical. I took 13 wpm to get a General, and the General written was one element. I didn't advocate that, either.

>Rationalize all you want.

I'm just telling it like it is. Why does that bother you so much?

> Keep on insuring that US amateur
>radio turns into the "US Amateur Radiotelegraphy Service"
>to keep the 1930s alive and well in a living radio museum
>of the air.
> Keep that "morse resource" alive long after its
>usefulness to the nation.

What ARE you talking about?

I recall that way back on January 19, 2000, you told us you were going for an Extra "right out of the box". Hasn't happened yet, though. Guess those new writtens are too tough, huh?

N2EY

3823. Re: FBI spy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-26 13:33:21 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010226083321.01380.00000140@nso-fj.aol.com>
Source record: 4171

In article <20010225214901.05358.00000436@nso-mh.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
(Len Over 21) writes:

>In article <20010225203343.06490.00000293@nso-fz.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>(N2EY)
>writes:
>
>>Could be. But - did you ever see the requirements for getting a Soviet ham
>>license? Makes us look like a bunch of weenies.
>>
>>Things like building a receiver (from scratch) of at least a certain
>>complexity, and present it for examination by a panel who will pass
>judgement
>>on its design and construction. You may be asked almost any question the
>>panel
>>can think up about it. After the receiver is approved, you have to use it
>to
>>receive a certain number of different stations and get confirmation (QSLs)
>of
>>same. Then you get to try for a transmitting license.
>
>Are you suggesting a major overhaul of the US amateur radio
>regulations in license requirements?!?

I'm just pointing out that the old Soviet requirements were much tougher than
anything US hams have been required to do.
>
>Why would you impose so many things on newcomers that
>you did not have to do?

Did I write that I wanted this sort of thing for a US ham license? No.

And how do you know what I had to do? As a matter of fact, I built my first SW
receiver and amateur transmitter. I also built many since then, including the
setup I use now.

I DON'T ask others to do what I haven't done.

>Are you trying to make US amateur
>radio more exclusive by excluding some newcomers?

Nope. Why do you think that?
>
>Why do you want ot make an avocation into some sort of
>Guild or Tradesman's occupation requirement?

Where do you get such ideas, Len?
>
>Is that all to keep US amateur radio from appearing to be
>"weenies?"
>
Is building one's own radio gear a bad thing?

N2EY

3824. Re: FBI spy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-26 13:33:21 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010226083321.01380.00000139@nso-fj.aol.com>
Source record: 4176

In article <3A99C55E.41CFF9C4@arrl.org>, Hans K0HB <k0hb@arrl.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>
>> And the claim is that this K9 guy "knows" the code, not that
>> he knew it at some time in the past.
>
>Whatever!
>
>It was a lighthearted comment, not a "claim".

So were my comments, Hans.
>
>I guess some people just like to pick fly shit out of the pepper pot.

Not me.
>
>I really don't care if the treasonous son of a bitch can copy code or not.

>Do you?

Nope. HE faces the death penalty, y'know.

But on a serious note, consider this: A while back the guy in Massachusetts who shot up his workplace and killed seven innocent people was mistakenly identified as a ham. Turned out there were two people with exactly the same name and similar descriptions living in the same town.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3825. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-26 13:33:22 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010226083322.01380.00000141@nso-fj.aol.com>
Source record: 4172

In article <3A99CE55.472A7448@IEEE.org>, Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>> My use of Morse vs. voice on the ham bands has a BIG effect on other hams.
>
>Assuming you are following the rules, how do you, as one ham out of
>hundreds of thousands of hams, manage to have a BIG effect on other hams?
>--
Simple:

If I use Morse, I use far less spectrum than any voice mode. That leaves lots more room for other hams.

If I use Morse, I can run far less power and still have the same S/N ratio at the receiving end. Less QRM for other hams.

Those are good things.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3826. Re: 11meters, freebanding, and the no-code tech ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-26 13:33:23 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010226083323.01380.00000144@nso-fj.aol.com>
Source record: 4173

In article <3A99D0B1.3D7226C7@IEEE.org>, Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Aaron Jones wrote:
>> I know you could challenge us to come give you a test,
>> but in reality that piece of info is just as unverifiable for
>> most of us as is Cecil's...
>
>Well, I proved I could score 100% on the Extra exam in March. :-)
>--
Maybe. The smiley tells me you're "not serious" about that....

73 de Jim, N2EY

3827. Re: 11meters, freebanding, and the no-code tech ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-26 13:33:23 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010226083323.01380.00000142@nso-fj.aol.com>
Source record: 4175

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.g9c5bx0.pminews@ca.news.verio.net>, "Phil Kane"
<Phil.Kane@nospam.spam> writes:

>On 26 Feb 2001 01:33:43 GMT, N2EY wrote:
>
>>> Please provide both your definition of what constitutes a "radio
>>>outlaw"
>>
>>Anyone (in the USA) who operates an unlicensed radio transmitter outside of
>the
>>provisions of FCC Part 15 and Part 95.
>
> There are other radio services which do not require specific
> FCC licenses and are covered by "blanket" authorizations
> contained in other parts of the FCC Rules. Examples are
> domestic-waters pleasure craft (Part 80), domestic-airspace
> private aircraft (Part 87), and cellular and other
> radiotelephones (Parts 22 and 24).

Thanks for the info, Phil. I wrote that part too fast.
>
> A better definition would be anyone who operates a radio
> transmitter not authorized by a specific or blanket rule
> authorization.
>
Agreed! I'll go with this definition:

"A 'radio outlaw' is anyone who operates a radio transmitter not authorized by
a specific or blanket rule authorization."

Always better to be accurate.

>>Specifically, the activities of "freebanders", and cbers who
>>violate FCC regs are examples of "radio outlaws".
>
>>I know plenty of hams who were "radio outlaws" at one time. Then
>>they got ham licenses, and most of them cleaned up their acts and
>>became legal. A few brought their "bad habits" with them - but
>>only a few.
>
> "Pirates" (a.k.a. "bootleggers") are an old amateur radio
> tradition, some will say. That doesn't make it proper.
>
Agreed!

73 de Jim, N2EY

3828. Re: 11meters, freebanding, and the no-code tech ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-26 13:33:23 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010226083323.01380.00000143@nso-fj.aol.com>
Source record: 4178

In article <97cglh21ee5@enews3.newsguy.com>, tlbryant@my-deja.com (T. L. Bryant) writes:

>In article <20010225083324.01707.00000190@nso-fp.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com >says...

>>
>>One of the main reasons the FCC has lowered the requirements for a ham >license,
>>and simplified the license structure, over the past 25 years is this: They >want
>>the "freebanders" and the non-commercial cbers to get ham licenses.
>>
>>73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>Do you have any quotes from any FCC that proves this?

Their actions speak louder than any words could.

73 de Jim, N2EY
>

3829. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-26 14:15:56 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A9A651B.35867119@IEEE.org>
Source record: 4179

Dave Heil wrote:
> There are enough holes in it to fly a 747 through.

Let's reduce the scope to keep it simple. Exactly where are the holes
in the following?

Premise:
All HF hams are required by circumstances to pass a Morse code exam.

From Webster's: "forced - required by circumstances".

Conclusion:
All HF hams are forced to pass a Morse code exam.

Please show me the holes in the above (and only the above) without muddying
the waters by resorting to diversionary tactics. I'm not going to respond
to any of your diversions. I will respond to any holes you find in the
above premise/conclusion.

> I gave you a fairly lengthy list of items, all of which you described as
> "required by circumstance". These were the kinds of things which a
> normal person would never say are forced on him like picking up a
> newspaper. But to you they all were. It is apparent that you do not
> believe in free will or choices open to man.

The reason you are unable to change your mind in the face of overwhelming
evidence is that you are predestined to have a closed mind that believes in
free will.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3830. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-26 14:21:23 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A9A6663.40F460BB@IEEE.org>
Source record: 4180

N2EY wrote:
> If I use Morse, I use far less spectrum than any voice mode. That leaves lots
> more room for other hams.
>
> If I use Morse, I can run far less power and still have the same S/N ratio at
> the receiving end. Less QRM for other hams.
>
> Those are good things.

I agree that those are good things but one single ham choosing one single
mode is not a BIG effect on the other 600,000 hams. I've never heard you
on any mode so it has had absolutely no effect on me.

Methinks you should change your statement from "my use of CW has a BIG
effect ..." to "thousands of ham's using CW has a BIG effect ..."
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3831. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-26 14:30:35 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A9A688B.DF51A44F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 4181

Dave Heil wrote:
> Well then, I sincerly thank you for accepting my view. If you were not
> "required by circumstance" to learn morse code, you'd be hard pressed to
> state that others were given that all had options to undertake it.

I am not accepting your view, Dave. Just because I and a few others are exceptions to the rule does not change the fact that MOST HF hams are required by circumstances to learn Morse code. I never said that ALL HF hams are required by circumstances to learn Morse code. I've said that most or the majority of HF hams are required by circumstances to learn Morse code. However, ALL HF hams are required by circumstances to pass a Morse code exam. Since you keep diverting away from that statement, you must believe it to be true.

> I take this as pretty much of an admission that your view of "forced
> learning of morse" are a Texas tall tale.

You take wrong. If they don't already know Morse code, HF hams are required by circumstances to learn Morse code. That there are a few people who already know Morse code is irrelevant.

On another thread, I presented a premise and a conclusion for you to use to indicate holes in my argument. Let's focus our discussion into one branch of a thread for obvious reasons. You can have the last word in all the threads except the premise/conclusion thread.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3832. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-26 14:39:18 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A9A6A96.7C7E2743@IEEE.org>
Source record: 4182

Dave Heil wrote:
> But you have insisted that even the most mundane and ordinary daily
> activity is, in some manner, "required by circumstance". Are you now
> stating that this isn't necessarily true?

Just because something is mundane and ordinary doesn't mean they are
not required by circumstances. Eating is an example. Seems more things
are required by circumstances than you realize. But some things are
not required by circumstances.

> ...not unless these characters were ordered by a judge to become HF
> hams.

Being ordered by a judge is not the only way to be required by
circumstances, Dave. I'm sure you realize that.

> No one is forced to enter amateur radio....absolutely no one.

I never said anyone is forced to enter amateur radio so your
statement is just another of your strawmen diversions.

> Produce a person who was forced to learn morse.

If I remember right, Larry was required by circumstances to learn
Morse code. Please switch the discussion to the premise/conclusion thread.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3833. Forced code exams?, was Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-26 14:46:57 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A9A6C61.7D36D8BB@IEEE.org>
Source record: 4183

Dave Heil wrote:
> > All HF hams are *required by circumstances* to know/learn Morse code.
>
> That's his present position. Stay tuned. It could change in a heart
> beat.

So you agree with my above position?

The sheer number of parallel threads have gotten out of hand. I am
starting a new thread entitled "Forced code exams?". You can have
the last word on the multitudes of "Pride" threads.

To simplify things, here is a premise and a conclusion. Please point
out any holes in it.

Premise: All HF hams are required by circumstances to pass a Morse
code exam.

Quote from Webster's: "forced - required by circumstances"

Conclusion: All HF hams are forced to pass a Morse code exam.

Please don't continue to muddy the waters with your plethora of
diversionary tactics.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3834. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-26 14:55:57 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A9A6E7D.5E945D88@IEEE.org>
Source record: 4184

Dave Heil wrote:
> I'm the one who maintains that no one is forced to
> learn morse code. It is only within the last few posts that you've come
> around to my way of thinking.

Read my lips, Dave. I have not come around to your way of thinking. A few HF hams were not forced to learn Morse code because they already knew it. MOST HF hams are indeed required by circumstances to learn Morse code. Please switch to the "Forced code exams?" thread.

> If a guy sez, "Ham radio still requires passage of a morse code exam.
> I'm not going to learn any stinking morse code", that is his choice.

That's true, Dave, but irrelevant. That guy is not an HF ham so my statement doesn't apply to him. HF hams who didn't already know Morse code were required by circumstances to learn Morse code. The reason that the above guy was not forced by circumstances to learn Morse code is that he is not an HF ham. Please switch to the "Forced code exams?" thread.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3835. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-26 14:59:01 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A9A6F35.D29A9035@IEEE.org>
Source record: 4185

Dave Heil wrote:
> You can't lose when you change the statement, dictate the definitions
> and set the conditions. Of course you'd have to have the aquiesence of
> your opponent. Unfortunately for you, I'm not agreeing to that.

Of course if you do not allow your opponent to fine tune his argument
you will usually win. But that's not a fair way to debate, Dave.
Please switch to the "Forced code exams?" thread.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3836. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-26 15:01:25 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A9A6FC5.D5E598FE@IEEE.org>
Source record: 4186

Dave Heil wrote:
> No one is forced to learn morse code. No one is forced to become a
> radio amateur.

Nobody has ever said that anybody is forced to become a radio amateur.
Why do you insist in reposting that red herring?

HF hams who didn't already know Morse code were forced by circumstances
to learn Morse code. Please switch to the "Forced code exams?" thread.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3837. Re: Forced code exams?, was Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-26 15:10:35 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net>
Message-ID: <3A9A71EB.1AD6AFBE@ovis.net>
Source record: 4188

Cecil wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > > All HF hams are *required by circumstances* to know/learn Morse code.
> >
> > That's his present position. Stay tuned. It could change in a heart
> > beat.
>
> So you agree with my above position?

It is a diversionary tactic. No one is forced to learn morse code.

> The sheer number of parallel threads have gotten out of hand. I am
> starting a new thread entitled "Forced code exams?". You can have
> the last word on the multitudes of "Pride" threads.
>
> To simplify things, here is a premise and a conclusion. Please point
> out any holes in it.
>
> Premise: All HF hams are required by circumstances to pass a Morse
> code exam.
>
> Quote from Webster's: "forced - required by circumstances"
>
> Conclusion: All HF hams are forced to pass a Morse code exam.
>
> Please don't continue to muddy the waters with your plethora of
> diversionary tactics.

It is diversionary. My statement was: No one is forced to learn morse
code. Please try to stay on track.

Dave K8MN

3838. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-26 15:16:52 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net>
Message-ID: <3A9A7364.65294D49@ovis.net>
Source record: 4187

Cecil wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > There are enough holes in it to fly a 747 through.
>
> Let's reduce the scope to keep it simple. Exactly where are the holes
> in the following?
> ----------------
> Premise:
> All HF hams are required by circumstances to pass a Morse code exam.
>
> From Webster's: "forced - required by circumstances".
>
> Conclusion:
> All HF hams are forced to pass a Morse code exam.
> ----------------
> Please show me the holes in the above (and only the above) without muddying
> the waters by resorting to diversionary tactics. I'm not going to respond
> to any of your diversions. I will respond to any holes you find in the
> above premise/conclusion.

Your entire premise is diversionary. My statement was: No one is forced
to learn morse. Please try to stay on track.

> > I gave you a fairly lengthy list of items, all of which you described as
> > "required by circumstance". These were the kinds of things which a
> > normal person would never say are forced on him like picking up a
> > newspaper. But to you they all were. It is apparent that you do not
> > believe in free will or choices open to man.
>
> The reason you are unable to change your mind in the face of overwhelming
> evidence is that you are predestined to have a closed mind that believes in
> free will.

Diversionary. You did not respond to what I wrote. You have told me
that even the most ordinary daily event is required by circumstance.
I disagree.

Dave K8MN

3839. Re: 11meters, freebanding, and the no-code tech ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-26 15:18:28 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A9A73C4.80FBAC34@IEEE.org>
Source record: 4189

Dave Heil wrote:
> Weren't the you the guy who told us that you
> would not ever take the Extra exam?

Yes, but I was wrong. I can see the problem you are having if you consider yourself to be so omniscient that you cannot ever be wrong and therefore you never change your mind for any reason whatsoever.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3840. Re: 11meters, freebanding, and the no-code tech ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-26 15:21:03 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A9A745F.58250F3F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 4192

N2EY wrote:
>
> <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> >Well, I proved I could score 100% on the Extra exam in March. :-)
> >--
> Maybe. The smiley tells me you're "not serious" about that....

Oh, it's the truth, Dave, but you're right, I wasn't very serious
about it.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3841. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-26 15:21:13 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net>
Message-ID: <3A9A7469.DAB2C1FA@ovis.net>
Source record: 4190

Cecil wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > Well then, I sincerly thank you for accepting my view. If you were not
> > "required by circumstance" to learn morse code, you'd be hard pressed to
> > state that others were given that all had options to undertake it.
>
> I am not accepting your view, Dave. Just because I and a few others are
> exceptions to the rule does not change the fact that MOST HF hams are
> required by circumstances to learn Morse code. I never said that ALL
> HF hams are required by circumstances to learn Morse code. I've said
> that most or the majority of HF hams are required by circumstances to
> learn Morse code. However, ALL HF hams are required by circumstances
> to pass a Morse code exam. Since you keep diverting away from that
> statement, you must believe it to be true.

...except it is not the statement you originally took issue with.
You can't win unless you can change the statement, provide the only
acceptable definition and are free to dismiss any statement provided by
me as irrelevant or diversionary. Sure wish I could take you seriously!

> > I take this as pretty much of an admission that your view of "forced
> > learning of morse" are a Texas tall tale.
>
> You take wrong. If they don't already know Morse code, HF hams are required
> by circumstances to learn Morse code. That there are a few people who already
> know Morse code is irrelevant.

That obtaining an HF ham ticket is not mandatory is certainly relevant.

> On another thread, I presented a premise and a conclusion for you to use
> to indicate holes in my argument. Let's focus our discussion into one
> branch of a thread for obvious reasons. You can have the last word in
> all the threads except the premise/conclusion thread.

That's awfully big of you in that it isn't yours to give.
Tell you what: I'm going to Cincinnati this morning and will return on
Thursday evening. That'll give you some time to stew about the issue.

No one is forced to learn morse code.

Dave K8MN

3842. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-26 15:26:25 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net>
Message-ID: <3A9A75A0.55929403@ovis.net>
Source record: 4191

Cecil wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > But you have insisted that even the most mundane and ordinary daily
> > activity is, in some manner, "required by circumstance". Are you now
> > stating that this isn't necessarily true?
>
> Just because something is mundane and ordinary doesn't mean they are
> not required by circumstances. Eating is an example. Seems more things
> are required by circumstances than you realize. But some things are
> not required by circumstances.

Which way is it now? Let's see--you were not required by circumstances to learn morse in the cub scouts but you were required to respond to my posts. I think I see a Cecilian pattern emerging. If you and I had options in learning morse code, we were not forced. I had options and you've told me that you have options. It would seem that everyone has options. No one is forced to learn morse code.

> > ...not unless these characters were ordered by a judge to become HF
> > hams.
>
> Being ordered by a judge is not the only way to be required by
> circumstances, Dave. I'm sure you realize that.

...nor did I say it was. I'm saying that I've never heard of such a thing and that we all have options to do or not do something.

> > No one is forced to enter amateur radio....absolutely no one.
>
> I never said anyone is forced to enter amateur radio so your
> statement is just another of your strawmen diversions.

Use that spell checker. It is "straw man" or "straw men". If you weren't forced to enter amateur radio, you weren't forced to learn morse.

> > Produce a person who was forced to learn morse.
>
> If I remember right, Larry was required by circumstances to learn
> Morse code. Please switch the discussion to the premise/conclusion thread.

I don't think you remember right.

Dave K8MN

3843. Re: FBI spy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-26 15:32:01 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A9A76F1.F14AEC9C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 4193

N2EY wrote:
> Maybe you need an antenna that works.

I have a 40m EDZ pointed toward AZ and QSO with my numerous friends
around Phoenix. It works great in that direction. Unfortunately, that
puts you off the end of my 40m EDZ. I have a 40m vertical with eight
buried radials but it is worse than the EDZ even toward your area.

> Wednesday, 0300Z, 7037 plus/minus. W3RV will be there. I will try to be.

Just to be sure - Wed 0300Z = Tues 10pm EST = Tues 9pm CST
When Brian said Wed 0230Z, I converted 0230Z to 8:30pm CST
but didn't convert from Wed to Tues.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3844. Forced code exam? was Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-26 15:35:54 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A9A77DA.493A38C3@IEEE.org>
Source record: 4198

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> Cecil wrote:
> > Let's reduce the scope to keep it simple. Exactly where are the holes
> > in the following?
> > ----------------
> > Premise:
> > All HF hams are required by circumstances to pass a Morse code exam.
> >
> > From Webster's: "forced - required by circumstances".
> >
> > Conclusion:
> > All HF hams are forced to pass a Morse code exam.
> > ----------------
> > Please show me the holes in the above (and only the above) without muddying
> > the waters by resorting to diversionary tactics. I'm not going to respond
> > to any of your diversions. I will respond to any holes you find in the
> > above premise/conclusion.
>
> Your entire premise is diversionary. My statement was: No one is forced
> to learn morse. Please try to stay on track.

That must mean that you agree with the above. Please switch this subject
to "Forced code exams?".
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3845. Re: 11meters, freebanding, and the no-code tech ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-26 15:41:26 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A9A7926.8A2498D8@IEEE.org>
Source record: 4199

AB2HR wrote:
>
> <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> >So you are saying that robbing two banks is no worse than robbing
> >one bank? I think that second bank manager would disagree with you.
>
> ...and I think that the first bank manager would tell you that it
> doesn't make any difference at all...

So averaging the attitudes of the two bank managers yields 50%
difference. Why am I not surprised that the math works? The
FBI certainly wishes there were 50% fewer bank robberies.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3846. Re: 11meters, freebanding, and the no-code tech ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-26 15:41:36 UTC
From: AB2HR <ab2hr@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <hjuk9tks6qqdqph94i64kt93v5mrfnh5f4@4ax.com>
Source record: 4196

On Sun, 25 Feb 2001 22:50:17 -0600, Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
wrote:

>Dick Carroll wrote:
>>
>> Cecil wrote:
>> > Being an outlaw half the time VS being an outlaw all the time
>> > sounds to me like a first step in the right direction.
>>
>> Cecil, your logic never ceases to amaze.
>> Not to make it sound equivalent, but bank robbers don't rob banks all
>> the time, either, they try to look and act as normal as possible - to
>> keep from drawing attention, of course.
>
>So you are saying that robbing two banks is no worse than robbing
>one bank? I think that second bank manager would disagree with you.

...and I think that the first bank manager would tell you that it
doesn't make any difference at all...

3847. Re: FBI spy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-26 15:42:25 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <97dth1$c41$0@208.206.142.112>
Source record: 4194

Cecil wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > Last action on his license was in 1997. That means he passed at least
> > > 13WPM.
> >
> > ******SO WHAT????*****
>
> Didn't you say that Morse code skill supposed to transform individuals
> into fine, upstanding citizens? :-)

No, I didn't and of course you know it, you just can't pass an
opportunity to twist words to suit your intentions.

3848. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-26 15:44:12 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <97dtkc$c41$1@208.206.142.112>
Source record: 4195

Cecil wrote:
>
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > Just what *is* the concept you're trying to convey in your postings?
> > What is all this quibbling over "force" supposed to prove, IYHO?
>
> Here's what it has proven:
>
> Hams are *required by circumstances* to pass a ham exam.
> HF hams are *required by circumstances* to pass a Morse code exam.
>
> From Webster's: "forced - required by circumstances"
>
> Conclusion: Hams are forced to pass a ham exam.
> HF hams are forced to pass a Morse code exam.

Just another in your long string of inaccurate conclusions.

3849. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-26 15:45:15 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <97dtmb$c41$2@208.206.142.112>
Source record: 4197

Cecil wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Don't you know, Larry? When Cecil gets on one of his sensational
> > wild-assed 'logical' debate tangents, subject matter loses all
> > importance. What is important then is that he "wins".
>
> This is not about winning, Dick. This is about truth, logic, and
> the American way of life.
>

And now he dives headfirst into politics.

3850. Re: 11meters, freebanding, and the no-code tech ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-26 15:48:04 UTC
From: AB2HR <ab2hr@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <7nuk9tk99jmgdardcrtlu5duihghfemrot@4ax.com>
Source record: 4200

On 26 Feb 2001 04:47:17 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

>
>
>"T. L. Bryant" wrote:
>>
>> In article <20010225083324.01707.00000190@nso-fp.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com says...
>>
>> >
>> >--
>> >
>> >One of the main reasons the FCC has lowered the requirements for a ham
>> license,
>> >and simplified the license structure, over the past 25 years is this: They
>> want
>> >the "freebanders" and the non-commercial cbers to get ham licenses.
>> >
>> >73 de Jim, N2EY
>>
>> Do you have any quotes from any FCC that proves this?
>
>
>Whatta ya want, a notarized statement from the Chairman?

Personally, I don't think the FCC gives a flying fig WHO gets a ham
license. They simplified the structure because the old 6-tiered
system was difficult to administer and a pain in the arse to enforce.
The FCC's only interests in the ham bands are the efficient
enforcement of existing regulations, modifying existing regulations to
make enforcement easier and more efficient, and to farm out, sell,
rent and other wise create revenue from under utilized portions of the
spectrum that just happen to be allocated to the amateur service on a
secondary (and sometimes primary) basis. The FCC is a governmental
agency charged with regulating the use of the RF spectrum. They have
no interest at all in the status of the Amateur Radio Service.

The ARRL, on the other hand, IS an advocancy (sp?) for the service,
and they certainly DO have some interest in what happens to the hobby.
I can assure you, as a member of the ARRL, that I do NOT look forward
to seeing freebanders, pirates, nor anyone else with an "outlaw"
attitude joining the hobby in ANY capacity. This is not official
dogma from the ARRL, just the opinion of ONE member...

73 de

Ray / AB2HR

3851. Forced code exams? was Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-26 15:51:54 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A9A7B9A.DA693214@IEEE.org>
Source record: 4251

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> Cecil wrote:
> > Hams are *required by circumstances* to pass a ham exam.
> > HF hams are *required by circumstances* to pass a Morse code exam.
> >
> > From Webster's: "forced - required by circumstances"
> >
> > Conclusion: Hams are forced to pass a ham exam.
> > HF hams are forced to pass a Morse code exam.
>
> Just another in your long string of inaccurate conclusions.

Your feelings are irrelevant, Dick. Please present a valid
rebuttal argument to the above conclusions.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3852. Re: FBI spy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-26 15:53:18 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A9A7BED.EB8DA336@IEEE.org>
Source record: 4252

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> Cecil wrote:
> > Didn't you say that Morse code skill is supposed to transform individuals
> > into fine, upstanding citizens? :-)
>
> No, I didn't and of course you know it, you just can't pass an
> opportunity to twist words to suit your intentions.

I just can't pass an opportunity to pull your leg.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3853. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-26 16:09:01 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010226110901.19072.00000033@ng-mq1.aol.com>
Source record: 4253

>Subject: Re: Pride
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 02/25/01 9:49 PM Eastern Standard Time

>Do you know "what is best for the [US] ARS?"

I am sure you will tell us.

>Hint: The FCC regulates US amateur radio. It has done that since
>1934. The FCC doesn't require Commissioners or FCC Staff to
>hold amateur radio licenses in order to regulate US amateur
>radio.

Which is NOT germane to ANY discussion in ANY thread vis-a-vis Amateur regulations. It is your ONLY "defense" against your putrid spewings.

>Why not listen to ham bands above 10 m? Tell us how
>much morse code you hear there.

Depends on where you listen...just like HF. There's a lot more than you'd think all the way up to 23cm. Of course, not being an active Amatuer Radio Operator yourself, nor being involved in any Amatuer programs, you wouldn't know this.

>Do you want all amateurs to become commercial operators?

Why not? You do.

>Seems a pretty clear thing to me, old-timer. It's not an
>"environmental" or "resource" thing at all...just another
>manifestation of "that's the way you had to test and therefore
>every newcomer has to test the same way."

Gratuitous name calling, Lennie? Besides THAT, there was nothing factual here.

>Rationalize all you want. Keep on insuring that US amateur
>radio turns into the "US Amateur Radiotelegraphy Service"
>to keep the 1930s alive and well in a living radio museum
>of the air. Keep that "morse resource" alive long after its
>usefulness to the nation

Morse's usefulless will outlive you, Lennie.

3854. Re: FBI spy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-26 16:22:48 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010226112248.18626.00000906@nso-md.aol.com>
Source record: 4254

In article <97bjf6$93e$0@208.207.71.167>, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
writes:

>
> Someone on Fox news made the statement the other day (didn't quote a
>source) that his idol since age 15 was the the Briton who spied for
>Russia for decades, was never caught and would up going there (Philbin?)
>and this character had wanted to emulate him.
> Definitly a loose screw.

Dick:

Philby, actually. Philbin is the guy from "Who Wants To Be A
Millionaire."

73 de Larry, K3LT

3855. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-26 16:22:48 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010226112248.18626.00000907@nso-md.aol.com>
Source record: 4255

In article <20010225203342.06490.00000291@nso-fz.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>
>I think my PA driver's license allows me to operate vehicles up to 10,000
>pouinds GVWR. Beyond that, I need a CDL.(Weight is not the only criteria, of
>course, but it is one of them). What happens at 10,000 pounds that suddenly
>makes me unsafe to drive? Why am I safe for 9,500 but unsafe for 10,500?
>

Jim:

If you have an ordinary (Class D) driver's license, you are authorized to operate vehicles up to 26,000 lbs. GVW and carrying up to 15 passengers (yourself, the driver, included in the count). To carry the 16th passenger, you would require at least a Class C CDL with passenger endorsement; to carry the 26,001 st. pound, a Class B CDL would be required. Of course, PA requirements may vary; but I think CDL's are supposed to be uniform in requirements throughout the 50 states.

73 de Larry, K3LT
CDL-B with Passenger and Air Brake Endorsements

3856. Re: 11meters, freebanding, and the no-code tech ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-26 16:33:45 UTC
From: billsohl@mindspring.com
Message-ID: <3a9a84fa.2134181@news.mindspring.com>
Source record: 4256

On 26 Feb 2001 13:33:23 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:

>In article <97cglh21ee5@enews3.newsguy.com>, tlbryant@my-deja.com (T. L.
>Bryant) writes:
>
>>In article <20010225083324.01707.00000190@nso-fp.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>>says...
>>>One of the main reasons the FCC has lowered the requirements for a ham
>>>license and simplified the license structure, over the past 25 years is this:
>>>They want the "freebanders" and the non-commercial cbers to get ham licenses. Y
>>
>>Do you have any quotes from any FCC that proves this?
>
>Their actions speak louder than any words could.

In what way do you make that assessment?

Just what actions by the FCC support your conclusion?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3857. Re: 11meters, freebanding, and the no-code tech ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-26 16:36:35 UTC
From: billsohl@mindspring.com
Message-ID: <3a9a858d.2281450@news.mindspring.com>
Source record: 4257

On Mon, 26 Feb 2001 09:21:03 -0600, Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
wrote:

>N2EY wrote:
>> <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>> >Well, I proved I could score 100% on the Extra exam in March. :-)
>> >--
>> Maybe. The smiley tells me you're "not serious" about that....
>
>Oh, it's the truth, Dave, but you're right, I wasn't very serious
>about it.

And why should anyone take it seriously anyway?
There is NO score attached to anyone's license. You pass
with a perfect score and you pass with just a 75% score
and no one ever has the details as part of the license
then issued.

The rubber meets the rode in what and how each person
does with the license granted.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3858. Re: 11meters, freebanding, and the no-code tech ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-26 16:44:59 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A9A880B.1B9ECF06@IEEE.org>
Source record: 4259

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Isn't this guy something? The only time he's ever wrong is when it helps
> make a point to help him prove he's right!

Dick, unlike you, I am not omniscient. Being a mere mortal,
I sometimes make mistakes.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3859. Re: 11meters, freebanding, and the no-code tech ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-26 16:49:40 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <97e1f4kms0@208.206.142.112>
Source record: 4258

Cecil wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> > Weren't the you the guy who told us that you
> > would not ever take the Extra exam?
>
> Yes, but I was wrong.

Isn't this guy something? The only time he's ever wrong is when it helps make a point to help him prove he's right!

3860. Re: CDL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-26 17:40:33 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccoll@radiks.net>
Message-ID: <5xwm6.137$K66.70665@nntp1.onemain.com>
Source record: 4260

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20010226112248.18626.00000907@nso-md.aol.com...
> In article <20010225203342.06490.00000291@nso-fz.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
(N2EY)
> writes:
>
> >
> >I think my PA driver's license allows me to operate vehicles up to
10,000
> >pouinds GVWR. Beyond that, I need a CDL.(Weight is not the only
criteria, of
> >course, but it is one of them). What happens at 10,000 pounds that
suddenly
> >makes me unsafe to drive? Why am I safe for 9,500 but unsafe for
10,500?
> >
>
> Jim:
>
> If you have an ordinary (Class D) driver's license, you are authorized
> to operate vehicles up to 26,000 lbs. GVW and carrying up to 15
> passengers (yourself, the driver, included in the count). To carry the
> 16th passenger, you would require at least a Class C CDL with
> passenger endorsement; to carry the 26,001 st. pound, a Class B
> CDL would be required. Of course, PA requirements may vary; but
> I think CDL's are supposed to be uniform in requirements throughout
> the 50 states.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
> CDL-B with Passenger and Air Brake Endorsements

Dead on Nebraska's

You haven't lived until you follow Methusala's nephew down the road as he
bops along in a moose Winnebago on his Class D. I would mention
coke-bottle glasses but all that means is that he is one who got his
cataracts fixed.

3861. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-26 17:43:44 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <97e4gv$8o0$1@news.service.uci.edu>
Source record: 4261

Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:3a97d053.43903599@news.mindspring.com...
> On Fri, 23 Feb 2001 13:51:29 -0800, Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
> wrote:
> >The point is that what someone is going to do after their license is
> >granted is irrelevant. The requirements are based upon the privileges
> >which are granted by the license, not the desires of the applicant.
>
> That is NOT the way it is. If that were the case, then
> Techs would be forbidden to use code because they haven't
> passed a code test...yet we all know that Techs are all allowed to
> use code even thogh they never were tested for it.

That's the way it is for those of us who have passed all of the tests, Mr.
Sohl.
The FCC doesn't expect folks who don't know the code to use the code. Do
you?

Who was it that recorded the song Mr. Soul. Was it the Byrds? ;-)

73 de ac6xg

3862. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-26 17:47:12 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <97e4ng$8tm$1@news.service.uci.edu>
Source record: 4262

Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:3a97d0f6.44066766@news.mindspring.com...
> On Fri, 23 Feb 2001 11:17:16 -0800, Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
> wrote:
> >So I find myself lead by this inescapable logic to the conclusion that
> >since carbuerator repair isn't required for a drivers license, Morse
> >code shouldn't be required for any other license. :-)
>
> Let's be very clear...the issue is the separate morse code
> test as a pass/fail element. I have said many times that code
> related questions code be integrated into the testing on the
> same basis that other subjects are now.

So have I. But your arguments never make any such distinction.

73, Jim AC6XG

3863. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-26 17:59:45 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A9A9991.A5E7CB96@IEEE.org>
Source record: 4264

Jim Kelley wrote:
> The FCC doesn't expect folks who don't know the code to use the code.

Neither do they prohibit it since nocode techs are allowed to use
the only CW-only frequencies in ham radio.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3864. Re: FBI spy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-26 18:03:30 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A9A9A72.F2CA178@IEEE.org>
Source record: 4266

"Brian Kelly, w3rv" wrote:
> To keep it on the safe side we'll make it 03:15Z on 7035-7040
> Wednesday calling until 03:30Z.

Just to be safe, is that 10:15pm - 10:30pm EST on Tuesday?
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3865. Re: FBI spy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-26 18:05:49 UTC
From: kelly@dvol
Message-ID: <3a9a95ea.370441@news2.dvol.com>
Source record: 4263

On Sun, 25 Feb 2001 22:01:38 -0600, Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
wrote:

>"Brian Kelly, w3rv" wrote:
>> Time to cut the crap CecilPoo, 02:30Z this coming Wednesday, you pick
>> the 40m cw freq +/- 2 and be just be there with your engine warmed up.
>
>I anchor the bass section in the First Baptist Church choir and I won't
>be back from choir practice by 02:30Z. I'll probably be back by 03:00Z.
>Jim's frequencies are as good as any, 7035-7040
>
To keep it on the safe side we'll make it 03:15Z on 7035-7040
Wednesday calling until 03:30Z.
>
>> I don't care how fast you send but you better be able to copy 13 wpm
>> and I get to define "13 wpm", whining and dictionary definitions are
>> disallowed.
>
>Please don't send me any QRP. My hearing is so bad I need pretty strong
>audio with a low S/N ratio.
>
No games. I'm setting up in a temporary QTH at the moment with a
weenie TS-50 ssb mobile rig but it kicks out 100w and the antenna is
decent. I worked eastern Siberia on 7.012 last nite, Texas should be a
pizza cake. Caveat on my end is S8 electrical noise which comes for
hours and stays for hours before it peters out. I can usually copy
thru it, though. Despite the barn-door ssb flter and the #@!**^! AGC.

>--
>http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca
>
. . . seeya on the airwaves . . .
>
w3rv

3866. Re: Visit today - www.SPAM.com -

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-26 18:13:34 UTC
From: Glenn <glenn.hansen@usa.net>
Message-ID: <i1xm6.477037$U46.14251745@news1.sttls1.wa.home.com>
Source record: 4265
Cross-posted to:
rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Peter,

Are you free to type? Are your kidnappers out of the room? How often do they have a gun to your head forcing you to read and reply to Charles Johnston's messages? It must be awful. It makes me cherish my freedom even more knowing I can killfile or just plain ignore a poster. I feel sorry for you comrade. I have watched you for a long time forced to read and comment on so many of Charles Johnston's messages. It must be hell for you. Be strong!

Glenn

USA

"Peter Lemken" <plemken@gmx.de> wrote in message
news:97e5g3$oi1i6$1@ID-31.news.dfncis.de...
> Charles Johnston wrote:
> >
>
> Don't you ever get tired of it? Usent is an information medium, not a TV
> station.
>
> Put the URL into a correctly separated .sig and be done with it.
>
> Peter Lemken
> Berlin
>
> --
> DeeeeeeeX'ing in the new Millenium. Scream for an hour and go
> check the online logs to see if you gotta scream for an hour again
> tomorrow nite. [KH2D in rec.radio.amateur.dx]

3867. Re: FBI spy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-26 18:24:38 UTC
From: kelly@dvol
Message-ID: <3a9a9c0e.1942441@news2.dvol.com>
Source record: 4267

On Sun, 25 Feb 2001 22:01:38 -0600, Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
wrote:

>"Brian Kelly, w3rv" wrote:
>
> . . I'll probably be back by 03:00Z.
>Jim's frequencies are as good as any, 7035-7040
>
Addendum to previous post: I'll start beeping "cq rrapnet" around
03:10Z somewhere between 7035 and 7040 and listen for check-ins.
>
w3rv NCS

3868. Re: CDL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-26 18:51:58 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nospam.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.g9df2z0.pminews@ca.news.verio.net>
Source record: 4268

On Mon, 26 Feb 2001 11:40:33 -0600, Richard McCollum wrote:

>You haven't lived until you follow Methusala's nephew down the road as he
>bops along in a moose Winnebago on his Class D. I would mention
>coke-bottle glasses but all that means is that he is one who got his
>cataracts fixed.

You're thinking,of glaucoma. When I got my cataract "fixed" I
got 20/25 vision with no glasses.....

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

Hams who live in glass houses
shouldn't throw carriers.....

3869. Re: 11meters, freebanding, and the no-code tech ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-26 18:51:59 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nospam.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.g9dfux1.pminews@ca.news.verio.net>
Source record: 4269

On 26 Feb 2001 13:33:23 GMT, N2EY wrote:

>> One of the main reasons the FCC has lowered the requirements
>> for a ham license, and simplified the license structure, over
>> the past 25 years is this: They want the "freebanders" and the
>> non-commercial cbers to get ham licenses.

>>Do you have any quotes from any FCC that proves this?
>
>Their actions speak louder than any words could.

Very true, but I do remember several Notices over the years
that dealt with the desire of the FCC to persuade violators
whose only crime was lack of license to "straighten up and fly
right" and get licensed.

The analogy was always made to someone who drives a car without
a license. We always lived in fear of some judge remarking to
a "pirate" whom we would catch and finally drag into court:
"OK, you operated a radio transmitter without a required
license. I sentence you to obey the law and get a license...."

Fortunately it never happened - the judges were more "with
the program" than most of the big-city Federal prosecutors of
that era.

We did have one case where a "big bad CBer" that we caught saw
the light and studied and took the test for his ham license.
His application came up for hearing before issuance, and he
claimed (rightfully) that since the time he was caught he
didn't commit any more violations. He got a one-year
probationary period on his license, and he turned out to be one
of the most responsible hams in the community.

The door can swing two ways.

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

3870. Re: FBI spy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-26 18:55:42 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010226135542.01731.00000224@nso-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 4275

In article <20010226083321.01380.00000140@nso-fj.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>In article <20010225214901.05358.00000436@nso-mh.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
>(Len Over 21) writes:
>
>>In article <20010225203343.06490.00000293@nso-fz.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>>(N2EY) writes:
>>
>>>Could be. But - did you ever see the requirements for getting a Soviet ham
>>>license? Makes us look like a bunch of weenies.
>>>
>>>Things like building a receiver (from scratch) of at least a certain
>>>complexity, and present it for examination by a panel who will pass
>>judgement
>>>on its design and construction. You may be asked almost any question the
>>>panel
>>>can think up about it. After the receiver is approved, you have to use it
>>to
>>>receive a certain number of different stations and get confirmation (QSLs)
>>of
>>>same. Then you get to try for a transmitting license.
>>
>>Are you suggesting a major overhaul of the US amateur radio
>>regulations in license requirements?!?
>
>I'm just pointing out that the old Soviet requirements were much tougher than
>anything US hams have been required to do.

Where are you going with that?

>>Why would you impose so many things on newcomers that
>>you did not have to do?
>
>Did I write that I wanted this sort of thing for a US ham license? No.

Then why post it?

>And how do you know what I had to do? As a matter of fact, I built my first
>SW receiver and amateur transmitter. I also built many since then, including
the
>setup I use now.

I am familiar with FCC radio operator test requirements. None
have required "bulding any equipment as test proof" for any
radio operator license in the last half century...

You are trying to equate a personal situation with something
not required in the USA. Bad equation. Bad, bad, sit in a
corner...

>I DON'T ask others to do what I haven't done.

OK. Keep that sentence in mind... :-)

>>Are you trying to make US amateur
>>radio more exclusive by excluding some newcomers?
>
>Nope. Why do you think that?

Because you mentioned an old test in a foreign country,
tried a faulty equation to justify mentioning it...

>Is building one's own radio gear a bad thing?

No. Why don't you broach the VEC QPC on making such
an amateur radio test condition? Otherwise, why post a
condition of past testing that isn't applicable today?
Especially so in a case of treason against the USA?

3871. Re: FBI spy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-26 18:55:43 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010226135543.01731.00000225@nso-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 4274

In article <20010226083321.01380.00000139@nso-fj.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>In article <3A99C55E.41CFF9C4@arrl.org>, Hans K0HB <k0hb@arrl.org> writes:
>
>>N2EY wrote:
>>
>>> And the claim is that this K9 guy "knows" the code, not that
>>> he knew it at some time in the past.
>>
>>Whatever!
>>
>>It was a lighthearted comment, not a "claim".
>
>So were my comments, Hans.

...strange sense of "lightheartedness"...

>>I guess some people just like to pick fly shit out of the pepper pot.
>
>Not me.

...see below...

>>I really don't care if the treasonous son of a bitch can copy code or not.
>
>>Do you?
>
>Nope. HE faces the death penalty, y'know.

In peacetime? See another treasonous son of a bitch still
alive in a federal prison who, unfortunately, was a USN
warrant officer when he committed treason.

>But on a serious note, consider this: A while back the guy in Massachusetts
>who
>shot up his workplace and killed seven innocent people was mistakenly
>identified as a ham. Turned out there were two people with exactly the same
>name and similar descriptions living in the same town.

...Living at the exact same address?!? Try reading the Affidavit
and the FCC database for addresses.

Denial is a strong emotion that defies logic and rational
thought. Try not to practice it.

3872. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-26 18:55:44 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010226135544.01731.00000227@nso-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 4270

In article <3A9A7469.DAB2C1FA@ovis.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net> writes:

>Cecil

>No one is forced to learn morse code.

...they are if they post in this newsgroup... :-)

3873. Re: Forced code exams?, was Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-26 18:55:44 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010226135544.01731.00000226@nso-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 4273

In article <3A9A71EB.1AD6AFBE@ovis.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net> writes:

>> Please don't continue to muddy the waters with your plethora of
>> diversionary tactics.
>
>It is diversionary. My statement was: No one is forced to learn morse
>code. Please try to stay on track.

You could try the "rodeo cowboy" ploy again -

>You'd probably have a tough time becoming a voting member of an
>organization of rodeo cowboys too unless you became a rodeo cowboy.
>Of course you could lobby the Federal government for changes in
>regulations dealing with rodeo cowboys.

...and Heil says others should "keep on track"...yee-haw! :-)

3874. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-26 18:55:46 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010226135546.01731.00000228@nso-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 4272

In article <20010226083320.01380.00000138@nso-fj.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>In article <20010225214900.05358.00000435@nso-mh.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
>(Len Over 21) writes:
>
>>n article <20010225203342.06490.00000291@nso-fz.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>(N2EY)
>>writes:
>>
>>>In article <3a97cea2.43470735@news.mindspring.com>, billsohl@mindspring.com
>>>(Bill Sohl) writes:

<snip>

>>Do you know "what is best for the [US] ARS?" :-)
>
>Of course.

It is difficult to converse with a god...

>>Hint: The FCC regulates US amateur radio.
>
>We KNOW, Len. Is the FCC infallible in its regulatory decisions?

To nearly every PCTA prior to 99-412 the FCC was absolutely
infallible in having the three-speed morse tier tied in with the
"incentive licensing plan." :-)

>Doesn't mean they are infallible.

If the FCC requires a code exam for a license they are
"infallible" according to the PCTA premise. Is that
premise "infallible?" :-)

>>The FCC doesn't require Commissioners or FCC Staff to
>>hold amateur radio licenses in order to regulate US amateur
>>radio.
>
>So? What's your point?

Somehow I just knew you were going to come up with "you
know what is best for [US] ham radio." :-)

You are licensed as a US radio amateur, at the "highest"
class...ergo, "you know what is best" and no one else
with a "lower" class (and certainly not anyone not having
a US amateur radio license) can "know what is best." :-)

>>There are many in here who rationalize about all newcomers
>>having to do just like they did.
>
>Who? Not me. My point was that it's not one of MY reasons.

My apologies...but be careful what you write in the future,
such may come along to haunt you later.

>Show me where I've posted "I did it, so you must do it too" as a reason for
>keeping code tests. The only place I've seen it is in the posts of nocodetest
>folks who claim to know the motivations of others.

The "only" place?!? Look at all the "real ham" mentions...
"real hams" know/tested-for morse code. For an
extreme, see the idiotic postings that go only
"Know code = know ham No code = no ham."

Do you need that sign illuminated to see it?

>>>Sure it does. Listen to the HF ham bands and see how much Morse you hear.
>>
>>Why not listen to ham bands above 10 m? Tell us how
>>much morse code you hear there.
>
>Morse is used far more on the HF and MF ham bands than on VHF and UHF.

Oh? Why is that? :-)

>In the context of driver's licenses, the word does not mean "for money". To
>legally drive a motor vehicle over 10,000 pounds GVWR in PA requires a CDL,
>even if I drive it as an "amateur". But I can be paid to drive my car without
>one.

How about leaving US civil radio regulation to the FCC and
driving licensing up to the individual states? I still can't see
any similarity between the two.

>>Do you want all amateurs to become commercial operators?
>
>I want them to have the basic skills and knowledge of the amateur radio
>service.

Then the "fallible" FCC gave that power to the VECs as part of
99-412. The VEC Question Pool Committee can decide "the
basic skills and knowledge of amateur radio" through selection
of the appropriate questions. The VECs are composed of
licensed US radio amateurs. If you want to comment on that,
please address the VEC QPC, not me.

>>Seems to me that was the PCTA position before the 98-143
>>NPRM.
>
>Not me. I suggested many chnages to the FCC. You didn't even bother to file
>comments, Len - just "reply comments".

Ah, so 14 pages of text single-spaced (wrong format) was "not
bothering?" Insignificant?

There's over 2600 documents in the NPRM 98-143 public file.
Perhaps you could go through all of them and note which ones
are "significant" or "insignificant."

>>By keeping the morse code test for HF privileges, it insures
>>that SOME newcomers will know morse (your favorite mode).
>
>So? Is that a bad thing?

Yes, to newcomers. The FCC has gone on public record in
1990 and again in 1999 that it does not consider a morse
code test to be relevant to its task of determining who should
or should not get an amateur radio license. It must continue
to do so for external factors, namely ITU-R S25.5.

>>Seems a pretty clear thing to me, old-timer.
>
>Nope. You're projecting your biases onto others.

You can project your biases freely but others cannot? :-)

>I recall that way back on January 19, 2000, you told us you were going for an
>Extra "right out of the box". Hasn't happened yet, though. Guess those new
>writtens are too tough, huh?

Heh, I don't recall that. What I recall saying is that I *MIGHT* do
that. I don't recall any promise no guarantee to do that.

Since 13 months ago, I've seen no lessening of the "superior"
attitude of many already-licensed individuals who depreciate,
denigrate, and insult those not having amateur radio licenses.
Why should any professional bother with testing for a hobby
where the existing hobbyists have such a "superior" attitude?

I don't consider the US amateur radio written test elements
"too tough." I have them on file, have done practice tests.
The point is WHY BOTHER to seek self-glory in title, rank,
status, something that far too many display to others?

Amateur radio is a hobby, not a profession, not a (non-
regulatory term) service to anyone but the licensee.
Amateur radio activities radiate RF, hence such activities
need regulation. As part of that regulation, the regulatory
agency issues licenses. The viewpoint of many who turn
down amateur radio is that too many within the hobby
make far more of their license than the activities...they
make themselves far more than they really are...and they
seem to spend an inordinate amount of time defending
their position due to delusions of self-grandeur.

I have no quarrel with the "writtens" for any class of
license. I've faced far, far worse "exams" in my career

and "passed" all of them...including an FCC-given First Class Radiotelephone license test that so many denigrate and dismiss as "nothing" or "irrelevant."

Why should anyone enter a hobby where they are abused verbally by self-professed "experts" in amateur radio?

3875. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-26 18:55:47 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010226135547.01731.00000229@nso-fm.aol.com>
Source record: 4271

In article <3A99FD33.3212191B@ovis.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net> writes:

>I've already accepted that and I've been living with it. I'm still
>looking for the explosion in growth. According to some, many of the
>newcomers will be professionals who will dazzle us with technological
>advances. I'm waiting for that too.

The "explosion in growth" already happened, but some are deaf
to plosive conditions. US amateur radio licensees are now a
third of all US amateur licensees, exclusive of the Tech-Plus
"transfers." To have the total licensees grow by 50 percent in
only 11 years sounds like growth to anyone reasonable.

Who insisted that there "must" be an explosion in growth?
Seems like that was the PCTAs who were looking for any
excuse to denigrate anyone not taking a code test. Such
denigration was common in this newsgroup about the FCC
98-143 NPRM. It is still continuing long after the FCC 99-
412 Report and Order.

It must be that no-code-test Technicians aren't "real hams"
and therefore they "cannot be counted," hence there is "no"
explosion in growth.

As to "professionals advancing the state of the art," there
are plenty of examples in QST, QEX, even a few in 73 and
CQ magazines. G3PLX's innovative PSK31 (lots of good
thinking on devising that) is a shining example, but of
course Peter is a Brit and probably doesn't count? It isn't
about morse code so it shouldn't count?

Of course you will discount this entire message since it
was written by someone not licensed in amateur radio.
:-)

3876. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-26 19:11:04 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nospam.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.g9dgu73.pminews@ca.news.verio.net>
Source record: 4276

On Mon, 26 Feb 2001 11:59:45 -0600, Cecil wrote:

>Jim Kelley wrote:
>> The FCC doesn't expect folks who don't know the code to use the code.
>
>Neither do they prohibit it since nocode techs are allowed to use
>the only CW-only frequencies in ham radio.

In all other services where manual Morse is permitted,
operators using that mode must hold commercial Radiotelegraph
Operators' licenses (20 wpm text, 16 wpm code groups minimum).

Ham radio IS different.

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

3877. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-26 19:19:29 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A9AAC41.EE880322@uci.edu>
Source record: 4277

Cecil wrote:
> Hams are *required by circumstances* to pass a ham exam.
> HF hams are *required by circumstances* to pass a Morse code exam.

So what?

ac6xg

3878. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-26 19:22:29 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A9AACF5.E44C5336@uci.edu>
Source record: 4280

Cecil wrote:
>
> Jim Kelley wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil wrote:
> > > I strongly disagree. I further state that the if implies
> > > options.
> >
> > Could the word 'when' be used instead of 'if'?
>
> Any number of word combinations logically equate to the 'if'
> function of an if/then statement. The 'if' function is often
> implied in the syntax. The following statement:
>
> An HF ham is forced (required by circumstances) to pass a
> Morse code exam.
>
> has the 'if' function implied. This is what Dave is missing or
> ignoring. An HF ham has HF privileges. How did he get them? He
> passed a Morse code exam. He cannot have HF privileges without
> passing a Morse code exam. Therefore, if a ham has HF privileges
> he was forced (required by circumstances) to pass a Morse code
> exam. There is no other way the FCC will legally allow a ham
> on HF. The Morse code requirement is required by the circumstances
> which exist at the FCC. That's the definition of "forced".

So the word 'when' could be used instead of the word 'if'?

ac6xg

3879. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-26 19:26:54 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A9AADFE.7B355D6D@uci.edu>
Source record: 4279

Cecil wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Far as I can tell that's where Cecil's argument breaks down. When one
> > forces himself to do something is he really being forced? Not at all. He
> > has a choice to not force himself, but he declines.That's self
> > inducement instead of force.
>
> But that's not my argument, Dick, that is Jim's statement. Of course,
> since you cannot refute my argument, you choose to divert attention
> away from my argument to Jim's statement.

As much as I'd like to take credit for it, Cecil, you were the one who first introduced me to the idea. And I agree. I had to force myself to learn code instead of watch TV or talk on the radio. Do you now disagree with the first definition you used?

de ac6xg

3880. Re: FBI spy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-26 19:27:49 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nospam.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.g9dhj84.pminews@ca.news.verio.net>
Source record: 4278

On 26 Feb 2001 18:55:43 GMT, Len Over 21 wrote:

>>>I really don't care if the treasonous son of a bitch can copy code or not.
>>
>>>Do you?
>>
>>Nope. HE faces the death penalty, y'know.
>
>In peacetime?

The law was amended that if the info that is passed results in
the death of someone who is exposed as a double agent, he is
liable for the death penalty. Apparently two such doubles were
executed by Russia, so that liabiulity does exist in this case.

>See another treasonous son of a bitch still
>alive in a federal prison who, unfortunately, was a USN
>warrant officer when he committed treason.

His knowledge of Morse will serve him well for the time while
he sits in K-Block at Marion where Mister Walker is also
confined.....they can knock-beep at each other.

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

3881. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-26 19:34:08 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A9AAFB0.44EE134F@uci.edu>
Source record: 4282

Cecil wrote:
>
> Jim Kelley wrote:
> > One is forced to meet ALL of the requirements, because only one type of
> > license is offered.

> Which brings us back to the question. Why is Morse code skill required of
> people who don't use it while manual transmission skill is not required of
> people who don't use it?

I think the question is irrelevant, because whether a person even wants
to get on the radio is irrelevant at test time. No one is asking what
somebody intends to do with their license. The only question being
asked is whether they meet the qualifications for licensure.

You will now state your views about the qualification requirements.

73, ac6xg

3882. Re: 11meters, freebanding, and the no-code tech ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-26 19:36:29 UTC
From: John O'Flaherty <oflahert@toast.net>
Message-ID: <3A9AB03D.70A26368@toast.net>
Source record: 4281

Dick Carroll wrote:

> Cecil wrote:
> >
>
> > > Add: 5) They can always "double dip",revertint to type to return to
> > > their old "haunts" -incognito- anytune they want. 'Bipolar' has a who
> > > new meaning.
> >
> > Being an outlaw half the time VS being an outlaw all the time
> > sounds to me like a first step in the right direction.
>
> Cecil, your logic never ceases to amaze.
>
> Not to make it sound equivalent, but bank robbers don't rob banks all
> the time, either, they try to look and act as normal as possible - to
> keep from drawing attention, of course.

You know, you're right. They're just trying to be efficient by robbing the bank. I saves them from having to steal a burger from Macdonald's, and then having to steal a Pepto-Bismol from the drug store.

john

3883. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-26 19:37:02 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A9AB05E.842EBC3@uci.edu>
Source record: 4284

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3A96DB61.8E3E4274@uci.edu>, Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> writes:
>
> >The point is that what someone is going to do after their license is
> >granted is irrelevant. The requirements are based upon the privileges
> >which are granted by the license, not the desires of the applicant.
>
> Is that the point? All along I thought the requirements were
> established by the licensing authority.

The two points are coincident, Len.

> As far as US amateur radio is concerned, an amateur license
> is granted by the FCC, not the desires of the already-licensed.

Right. Neither the desires of the applicant, nor any third party (such
as yourself) are relevant. :-)

Jim

3884. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-26 19:40:52 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A9AB144.358ECEA4@uci.edu>
Source record: 4283

Phil Kane wrote:
>
> On Mon, 26 Feb 2001 11:59:45 -0600, Cecil wrote:
>
> >Jim Kelley wrote:
> >> The FCC doesn't expect folks who don't know the code to use the code.
> >
> >Neither do they prohibit it since nocode techs are allowed to use
> >the only CW-only frequencies in ham radio.
>
> In all other services where manual Morse is permitted,
> operators using that mode must hold commercial Radiotelegraph
> Operators' licenses (20 wpm text, 16 wpm code groups minimum).
>
> Ham radio IS different.

It's different in that we are licensed generally according to frequency restrictions, rather than by mode restrictions. The license requirements are based however on, among other things, the modes we can use.

73, Jim aC6XG

3885. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-26 19:46:25 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A9AB291.C51988F0@uci.edu>
Source record: 4286

"T. L. Bryant" wrote:
>
> In article <3A96DB61.8E3E4274@uci.edu>, jwkelley@uci.edu says...
> >
>
> >> I would have no problem with that, but the pro-code group might think
> there's
> >> still a reason to know it if you want to use HF phone. I've yet to see any
> goo
> >d
> >> reason.
> >
> >The point is that what someone is going to do after their license is
> >granted is irrelevant. The requirements are based upon the privileges
> >which are granted by the license, not the desires of the applicant.
> >
> >73, ac6xg
>
> IOW, regardless of the relevancy of the requirement, as long as they show
> that they can beep, they can do whatever they want afterwords.

Well, not exactly. We have to show quite a number of other things as
well (as I'm sure you're aware, but have conveniently forgotten.)

ac6xg

3886. Re: 11meters, freebanding, and the no-code tech ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-26 19:46:53 UTC
From: John O'Flaherty <oflahert@toast.net>
Message-ID: <3A9AB2AD.9469DFA2@toast.net>
Source record: 4285

N2EY wrote:

> In article <cuvyxnansvbet.g9a8md1.pminews@ca.news.verio.net>, "Phil Kane"
> <Phil.Kane@nospam.spam> writes:
>
> >On 24 Feb 2001 01:32:52 GMT, N2EY wrote:
> >
> >>>I've never
> >>>heard the term 'first harmonic' before, althought the meaning is
> >>>unambiguous.
> >>>
> >>You never heard it because it's not used.
> >
> > My son is my first harmonic, my daughter is my second
> > harmonic, and then the harmonica store was closed..... <ggg>
> >
> >
> HAR!! That's a good one!
>
> But in purely technical terms, shouldn't we refer to them as "heterodynes"
> rather than "harmonics" because of the process that produces them?

Those from extracurricular activity could be called spurs.

john

3887. Re: FBI spy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-26 19:46:57 UTC
From: kelly@dvol
Message-ID: <3a9ab135.7357741@news2.dvol.com>
Source record: 4287

On Mon, 26 Feb 2001 12:03:30 -0600, Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
wrote:

>
>Just to be safe, is that 10:15pm - 10:30pm EST on Tuesday?
>
Correct. Unless you're close to or in El Paso it would be 9:30pm CST
by your watch.
>--
>http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca
>
w3rv

3888. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-26 19:51:16 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A9AB3B4.B210E95@uci.edu>
Source record: 4288

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Far as I can tell that's where Cecil's argument breaks down. When one
> forces himself to do something is he really being forced?

I think so. One of his definitions said somthing about "requires
effort". It required effort to learn code. I have to force the chair
away from my desk if I want to get up, etc, etc,.

73, Jim AC6XG

3889. Re: FBI spy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-26 20:12:57 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <n1el9t0r8juhr2srif6tq340rhc1s5o1b5@4ax.com>
Source record: 4289

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>Your [Cecil's] volume of posting in four hours
> is an indication of high typing speed.

What typing speed do I use when I post??

Just testing your telepathy... :-)

3890. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-26 20:13:51 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A9AB8FF.7323CE24@uci.edu>
Source record: 4290

Cecil wrote:

> HF hams who didn't already know Morse code were forced by circumstances
> to learn Morse code. Please switch to the "Forced code exams?" thread.

Even now as we speak, HF hams are being forced to study the element 4
question pool. ;-)

ac6xg

3891. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-26 20:30:26 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A9ABCE2.19AD3063@uci.edu>
Source record: 4291

Cecil wrote:
> I'm naturally talking about U.S. HF hams, Hans. Where are the U.S. HF
> hams who used their free will to decide not to take a Morse code exam?
> The fact that there is not a single one should raise a red flag that
> taking a Morse code exam is NOT a voluntary act for HF hams.

Wouldn't this mean that taking written FCC exams is also NOT a voluntary act, and therefore there's no difference between the Morse test and the written test in this regard?

73, Jim AC6XG

3892. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-26 20:38:40 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <4kfl9tssmmmb00k0592ppo3djka2h2k9vt@4ax.com>
Source record: 4292

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
>Why should anyone enter a hobby where they are
>abused verbally by self-professed "experts" in amateur
>radio?

Don't let them bullies kick sand in your face Len,
take a Charles Atlas course and you can lick em... :-)

3893. Re: Open Source Trusted E-QSL System proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-26 21:24:54 UTC
From: JT <nobody@nospam.edu>
Message-ID: <97ehj6$nnk@dispatch.concentric.net>
Source record: 4293
Cross-posted to:
alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"cotter pins" <thisiscream@aol.com> wrote in message
news:tZcl6.117$oX3.6293@newsread1.prod.itd.earthlink.net...
> Now let me get this straight Darryl....
>
> We now need a system of "E-QSL's" because (really) hams are
> too stinking *cheap* to spend 34 cents postage to put their QSL
> in a envelope..??
>

No, it's because the foreign QSL cards now cost so much. In order to get a QSL card from Germany, I've got to put 80 cents worth of postage on the envelope and 2 dollars inside. $2.80 for one QSL card. Yeah, I know a radio costs a thousand bucks, blah blah blah. Still, 2-3 dollars for each QSL card that I want from a DX station gets expensive. And these days, 90% of these guys have email!

JT

3894. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-26 21:29:34 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A9ACABE.2EF2D270@uci.edu>
Source record: 4294

Aaron Jones wrote:
>
> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
> >Why should anyone enter a hobby where they are
> >abused verbally by self-professed "experts" in amateur
> >radio?
>
> Don't let them bullies kick sand in your face Len,
> take a Charles Atlas course and you can lick em... :-)

A Dale Carnegie course wouldn't hurt either. ;-)

ac6xg

3895. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-26 21:46:27 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A9ACEB3.76DD5A46@IEEE.org>
Source record: 4295

Jim Kelley wrote:
> You will now state your views about the qualification requirements.

You're wrong. :-)
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3896. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-26 21:50:58 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A9ACFC2.A4F86034@IEEE.org>
Source record: 4296

Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> Cecil wrote:
> > Hams are *required by circumstances* to pass a ham exam.
> > HF hams are *required by circumstances* to pass a Morse code exam.
>
> So what?

So Dave says they are not. Please reference the "Forced code exams?"
thread.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3897. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-26 21:52:07 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A9AD007.9A18C9C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 4297

Jim Kelley wrote:
> As much as I'd like to take credit for it, Cecil, you were the one who
> first introduced me to the idea. And I agree. I had to force myself to
> learn code instead of watch TV or talk on the radio. Do you now
> disagree with the first definition you used?

Nope, but I have fine tuned the argument since then.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3898. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-26 21:57:00 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A9AD12C.72BBD8A8@IEEE.org>
Source record: 4298

Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> Cecil wrote:
>
> > HF hams who didn't already know Morse code were forced by circumstances
> > to learn Morse code. Please switch to the "Forced code exams?" thread.
>
> Even now as we speak, HF hams are being forced to study the element 4
> question pool. ;-)

Is element 4 the Extra question pool? If so, your statement is not
entirely correct. It should read: Amateur radio users of 7.010 MHz
were required by circumstances (forced) to pass an Extra exam.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3899. Re: FBI spy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-26 22:03:21 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A9AD2A9.7F0C499A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 4299

"Brian Kelly, w3rv" wrote:
>
> <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote:
> >Just to be safe, is that 10:15pm - 10:30pm EST on Tuesday?
> >
> Correct. Unless you're close to or in El Paso it would be 9:30pm CST
> by your watch.

Actually, El Paso is on MST. We are in the CST zone in East Texas
so it will be 9:30pm for me. I have made schedules before where
the guy showed up at the correct Zulu time but not on the correct
Zulu day. Just wanted to be sure.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3900. Re: FBI spy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-26 22:04:49 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A9AD301.90405139@IEEE.org>
Source record: 4300

"Brian Kelly, w3rv" wrote:
> Addendum to previous post: I'll start beeping "cq rrapnet" around
> 03:10Z somewhere between 7035 and 7040 and listen for check-ins.

That'll be my first CW net.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3901. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-26 22:17:30 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A9AD5FA.2D2A2C2D@uci.edu>
Source record: 4102

Cecil wrote:
>
> Jim Kelley wrote:
> > You will now state your views about the qualification requirements.
>
> You're wrong. :-)

Well, that's what matters after all. :-)

I'm going to take the tax refund to Vegas. Been winning roulette on the computer long enough. I'll be betting that I can avoid those 4 sigma events long enough to get out of town with some cash. If not, it'll be fun while it lasts. I showed the system to my dad (he's a blackjack player) and he was pretty impressed with how much he could win on the computer. I can't think of the name of the program now - it's one of those casino games you can buy. Looks just like the video games in Vegas.

73, Jim

3902. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-26 22:19:58 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A9AD68E.6BEFE7B@uci.edu>
Source record: 4101

Cecil wrote:
>
> Jim Kelley wrote:
> >
> > Cecil wrote:
> >
> > > HF hams who didn't already know Morse code were forced by circumstances
> > > to learn Morse code. Please switch to the "Forced code exams?" thread.
> >
> > Even now as we speak, HF hams are being forced to study the element 4
> > question pool. ;-)

> Is element 4 the Extra question pool? If so, your statement is not
> entirely correct. It should read: Amateur radio users of 7.010 MHz
> were required by circumstances (forced) to pass an Extra exam.

Amateur radio users of 7.010 MHz are HF hams, are they not? The point I
make is correct nevertheless. Thank you for making the statement more
accurately than I.

ac6xg

3903. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-26 22:22:11 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A9AD713.2B803FFE@uci.edu>
Source record: 4103

Cecil wrote:
>
> Jim Kelley wrote:
> > As much as I'd like to take credit for it, Cecil, you were the one who
> > first introduced me to the idea. And I agree. I had to force myself to
> > learn code instead of watch TV or talk on the radio. Do you now
> > disagree with the first definition you used?

> Nope, but I have fine tuned the argument since then.

Then quit palming your argument off on me. e.g.

"But that's not my argument, Dick, that is Jim's statement. Of course,
since you cannot refute my argument, you choose to divert attention away
from my argument to Jim's statement."

3904. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-26 22:31:39 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A9AD94B.47AF9631@uci.edu>
Source record: 4104

Cecil wrote:

> Jim Kelley wrote:
> >
> > Cecil wrote:
> > > Hams are *required by circumstances* to pass a ham exam.
> > > HF hams are *required by circumstances* to pass a Morse code exam.
> >
> > So what?

> So Dave says they are not.

No. I mean what's the big deal? Dave isn't making your point. You are.

> Please reference the "Forced code exams?"
> thread.

Set your follow-ups to "Forced code exams" if that's where you want the
follow-ups to go, or start a new thread. It's your idea, not mine.

73 ac6xg

3905. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-26 23:53:01 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010226185301.03023.00000154@ng-md1.aol.com>
Source record: 4105

>Subject: Re: Pride
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 02/26/01 1:55 PM Eastern Standard Time

>...they are if they post in this newsgroup... :

Name names, Lennie. WHO has been forced to do ANYTHING?

3906. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-26 23:55:51 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010226185551.03023.00000157@ng-md1.aol.com>
Source record: 4106

>Subject: Re: Pride
>From: Aaron Jones nomail@nomail.com
>Date: 02/26/01 3:38 PM Eastern Standard Time

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
>>Why should anyone enter a hobby where they are
>>abused verbally by self-professed "experts" in amateur
>>radio?

Sure, when we can be verbally abused by self-professed "experts" in
commercial radio.

>Don't let them bullies kick sand in your face Len,
> take a Charles Atlas course and you can lick em..

He doesn't need Charles Atlas' course to like what I have in mind for him.

=0

3907. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-26 23:58:38 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A9AEDAE.5D8C37A4@uci.edu>
Source record: 4107

Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> Cecil wrote:
> >
> > Jim Kelley wrote:

> > > > HF hams who didn't already know Morse code were forced by circumstances
> > > > to learn Morse code. Please switch to the "Forced code exams?" thread.

> > > Even now as we speak, HF hams are being forced to study the element 4
> > > question pool. ;-)

> > Is element 4 the Extra question pool? If so, your statement is not
> > entirely correct. It should read: Amateur radio users of 7.010 MHz
> > were required by circumstances (forced) to pass an Extra exam.

> Amateur radio users of 7.010 MHz are HF hams, are they not? The point I
> make is correct nevertheless. Thank you for making the statement more
> accurately than I.

The point in making that statement is to illustrate that singling out
Morse code in this debate is silly. If it's true that hams are forced
to learn code, then by extension of the same logic they are likewise
forced to learn the rest of the material that fulfills the
requirements.

73, Jim AC6XG

3908. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-27 00:05:18 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A9AEF3E.C554A184@uci.edu>
Source record: 4108

apologies to the group for this QRM. message was intended as private email.

jim

Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> Cecil wrote:
> >
> > Jim Kelley wrote:
> > > You will now state your views about the qualification requirements.
> >
> > You're wrong. :-)
>
> Well, that's what matters after all. :-)
>
> I'm going to take the tax refund to Vegas. Been winning roulette on the
> computer long enough. I'll be betting that I can avoid those 4 sigma
> events long enough to get out of town with some cash. If not, it'll be
> fun while it lasts. I showed the system to my dad (he's a blackjack
> player) and he was pretty impressed with how much he could win on the
> computer. I can't think of the name of the program now - it's one of
> those casino games you can buy. Looks just like the video games in
> Vegas.
>
> 73, Jim

3909. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-27 01:46:26 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A9B06F2.35D6078F@uci.edu>
Source record: 4109

Cecil wrote:
>
> Jim Kelley wrote:
> > The FCC doesn't expect folks who don't know the code to use the code.

> Neither do they prohibit it since nocode techs are allowed to use
> the only CW-only frequencies in ham radio.

Be kinda silly for a federal agency to write a rule prohibiting someone from doing something they were unable to do, doncha think? Their purpose for creating the Tech license was to allow people to get on the bands without having to learn, or operate, code.

ac6xg

3910. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-27 01:56:08 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A9B0938.D883EC66@IEEE.org>
Source record: 4110

Jim Kelley wrote:
> Be kinda silly for a federal agency to write a rule prohibiting someone
> from doing something they were unable to do, doncha think?

Not at all. That's why they have rules prohibiting someone from
flying an airplane when they are unable to do so.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3911. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-27 01:59:13 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A9B09F1.A0352EEB@IEEE.org>
Source record: 4111

Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> Cecil wrote:
> > Nope, but I have fine tuned the argument since then.
>
> Then quit palming your argument off on me. e.g.
>
> "But that's not my argument, Dick, that is Jim's statement. Of course,
> since you cannot refute my argument, you choose to divert attention away
> from my argument to Jim's statement."

Well, that *was* your argument. I haven't argued that someone forces
himself to learn. You said you forced yourself to learn. I've argued
that *circumstances* require hams to learn (or already know).
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3912. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-27 02:01:51 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A9B0A8F.93F29DFB@IEEE.org>
Source record: 4112

Jim Kelley wrote:
> Amateur radio users of 7.010 MHz are HF hams, are they not?

Yes, but not all HF hams are allowed on 7.010 MHz. Only the HF hams
authorized to operate on 7.010 MHz were required by circumstances
to pass an Extra exam. One has to be accurate about such matters.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3913. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-27 02:18:31 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010226211831.29597.00009531@nso-mi.aol.com>
Source record: 4117

In article <3A99DA11.69926875@IEEE.org>, Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>Well Larry, if what you say is true, then there are some HF hams who
>weren't *required by circumstances* to pass a Morse code exam. Those
>guys would not have anything to whine about so why are they whining?
>
>I sure would like to talk to any HF ham who wasn't *required by
>circumstances* to pass a Morse code exam. Can you give me the
>name of one of them?

Glad to. Cecil Moore, W6RCecilA. BTW -- is it pronounced
"Seecil" or "Cessil?"

73 de Larry, K3LT

3914. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-27 02:18:32 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010226211832.29597.00009533@nso-mi.aol.com>
Source record: 4113

In article <3A99DD3A.EF87447F@IEEE.org>, Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>> I don't give a damn whether both statements are true or not.
>> Why don't you come up with something intelligent to discuss, instead
>> of playing your silly, childish, logic-trap games?
>
>That's the whole problem with our society. Nobody gives a damn
>anymore. All they do is sit around and whine about postings that
>they don't comprehend.

Cecil:

That's obviously the pot calling the kettle black. You can't comprehend the fact that no radio amateurs are "forced" to take Morse code (or any other) exams. They do so on a purely voluntary basis. End of story.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3915. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-27 02:18:32 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010226211832.29597.00009532@nso-mi.aol.com>
Source record: 4116

In article <3A99DB36.5EAAB447@IEEE.org>, Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>> >I'm naturally talking about U.S. HF hams, Hans. Where are the U.S. HF
>> >hams who used their free will to decide not to take a Morse code exam?
>> >The fact that there is not a single one should raise a red flag that
>> >taking a Morse code exam is NOT a voluntary act for HF hams.
>>
>> Here's one, in the flesh!
>
>Careful, Larry. You are admitting that you are an HF ham who used
>his free will to decide NOT to take any Morse code exam. Since you have
>an HF ham license and have never taken a Morse code exam, you are a
>criminal. Hollingsworth would be very interested in your confession.

Cecil:

I've confessed to no such thing -- that's merely a figment of your
psychosis. Mr. Hollingsworth can examine my license credentials
to his satisfaction, at his convenience, and he will find nothing
wrong with them. And if he doubts my ability to pass a 20 WPM
Morse code exam, I'll gladly take one for him, any time -- as long
as he can create circumstances which require me to do so! If he
does, I'll take the exam voluntarily -- so I won't be being "forced!"

73 de Larry, K3LT

3916. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-27 02:18:33 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010226211833.29597.00009535@nso-mi.aol.com>
Source record: 4115

In article <3A99DFF3.73B7C1A1@IEEE.org>, Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>> I've often thought about getting into long-haul
>> trucking, but adopting the "trucker culture," which is the culture of
>> slack-jawed, toothless, knuckle-dragging, CB-lingo spewing
>> "country" types, is the only factor getting in the way.
>
>If all those guys whom you are insulting were to go on an indefinite
>strike, it would be no time at all until you were on your knees
>begging them to truck in your required necessities of life.

They can very easily be replaced by intelligent, educated,
cultured, and dignified people willing to do the job as well or
better than it is being done now. Anyway, as usual, it is
just a small minority of all truckers who give the rest of the
lot a poor image. Those who don't fit the negative stereotype
should exert some influence to clean up the overall image
of truck drivers.

These days, truck driving is a complicated, demanding
business which requires more out of the individual than just
the ability to sit behind the wheel for extended periods of
time. Here in Delaware, we've recently had a spate of
fatal accidents involving truck drivers who were obviously
operating outside the limits of ICC regulations and common
sense. I blame it on the fact that the drivers involved were
not intelligent enough to recognize the importance of
operating within their limits, and exceeded them in the
interest of making themselves look good among their
peers and superiors, giving no thought to the consequences.
This is pure ignorance born of low intelligence. Not all
truckers are like that, but unfortunately, enough are to
cause grave concern among the motoring public.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3917. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-27 02:18:33 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010226211833.29597.00009534@nso-mi.aol.com>
Source record: 4118

In article <3A99DF01.23ACDD3@IEEE.org>, Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>> Just what *is* the concept you're trying to convey in your postings?
>> What is all this quibbling over "force" supposed to prove, IYHO?
>
>Here's what it has proven:
>
>Hams are *required by circumstances* to pass a ham exam.
>HF hams are *required by circumstances* to pass a Morse code exam.
>
>From Webster's: "forced - required by circumstances"
>
>Conclusion: Hams are forced to pass a ham exam.
>HF hams are forced to pass a Morse code exam.

Cecil:

Well, that may be comforting to you, but here's the monkey
wrench in the works: I'm an "HF ham," and nobody "forced" me
to do a damn thing! I met the licensing requirements purely as
a volunteer! It was my choice, my decision, my effort involved.
Nobody else influenced me, cajoled me, and certainly, nothing
I would define as "force" was applied at any time. Therefore, I
must logically conclude that the definition of force, i.e. "required
by circumstances," is somehow defective.

I would think that the definition "required by circumstances" would
better fit a word such as "inevitable." I would define "forced" as
"motivated by coercive influence or threat of negative consequences."

73 de Larry, K3LT

3918. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-27 02:18:34 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010226211834.29597.00009536@nso-mi.aol.com>
Source record: 4114

In article <3A9A6A96.7C7E2743@IEEE.org>, Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>Being ordered by a judge is not the only way to be required by
>circumstances, Dave. I'm sure you realize that.
>
>> No one is forced to enter amateur radio....absolutely no one.
>
>I never said anyone is forced to enter amateur radio so your
>statement is just another of your strawmen diversions.

Cecil:

It is only by attempting to enter the ARS that one becomes obliged
to meet the licensing requirements. However, this entry itself is
entirely voluntarily; and the decision to enter the ARS can be
unilaterally rescinded by the prospective ham without any
consequences which would affect his ability to lead a normal,
happy, healthy life. Therefore, he is never "forced" (required by
circumstances) to do anything he doesn't voluntarily agree to do.

>> Produce a person who was forced to learn morse.
>
>If I remember right, Larry was required by circumstances to learn
>Morse code. Please switch the discussion to the premise/conclusion thread.

I may have been "required by circumstances" to learn the Morse code,
but being in those circumstances was entirely my own choice. Therefore,
in spite of the fact that I was, admittedly, "required by circumstances" to
learn the Morse code, I was not at all "forced." I think (methinks?)
your Webster's Unabridged Dictionary may be defective...

73 de Larry, K3LT

3919. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-27 02:21:29 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A9B0F29.5891F5A4@IEEE.org>
Source record: 4119

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> >I sure would like to talk to any HF ham who wasn't *required by
> >circumstances* to pass a Morse code exam. Can you give me the
> >name of one of them?
>
> Glad to. Cecil Moore, W6RCecilA.

I was *required by circumstances* to pass two Morse code exams, Larry.
The circumstances were the FCC requirements. All HF hams were *required
by circumstances* to pass a Morse code exam. Only nocode techs and
non-hams were not *required by circumstances* to pass a Morse code exam.
You, as an HF ham, were required by the FCC requirements to pass a Morse
code exam. Otherwise, you wouldn't be an HF ham.

> BTW -- is it pronounced "Seecil" or "Cessil?"

In Texas, it's pronounced "SEE'sul". In Japan, it's pronounced "SEE'saw".
The native Japanese don't handle 'L's very well.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3920. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-27 02:24:14 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A9B0FCE.173A0B6F@IEEE.org>
Source record: 4120

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> In article <3A99DB36.5EAAB447@IEEE.org>, Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>
> >> >I'm naturally talking about U.S. HF hams, Hans. Where are the U.S. HF
> >> >hams who used their free will to decide not to take a Morse code exam?
> >> >The fact that there is not a single one should raise a red flag that
> >> >taking a Morse code exam is NOT a voluntary act for HF hams.
> >>
> >> Here's one, in the flesh!
> >
> >Careful, Larry. You are admitting that you are an HF ham who used
> >his free will to decide NOT to take any Morse code exam. Since you have
> >an HF ham license and have never taken a Morse code exam, you are a
> >criminal. Hollingsworth would be very interested in your confession.
>
> I've confessed to no such thing --

Yes you did, Larry. Read it again. You confessed to being an HF ham
who used his free will to decide NOT to take a Morse code exam. Being
on HF ham bands without taking a Morse code exam is a crime. Therefore,
you are a confessed criminal.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3921. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-27 02:37:03 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A9B12CF.F165AD36@IEEE.org>
Source record: 4123

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> It is only by attempting to enter the ARS that one becomes obliged
> to meet the licensing requirements. However, this entry itself is
> entirely voluntarily;

The attempt is voluntary, Larry, but the entry is not. All HF hams
are required by circumstances (existing at the FCC) to pass a Morse
code exam. What is it about "required" that you don't understand?

Requirements are not voluntary. Requirements MUST be met. Voluntary
implies a choice. HF hams have no choice when it comes to passing a
Morse code exam. HF hams cannot volunteer NOT to meet the Morse code
requirements. Only non-HF hams and non-hams can volunteer NOT to
meet the Morse code requirements. HF hams have absolutely no choice.
Please tell me the name of just one HF ham who volunteered NOT to
pass a Morse code exam.

> Therefore, he is never "forced" (required by
> circumstances) to do anything he doesn't voluntarily agree to do.

If that is true, there has to exist some HF hams who weren't required
by circumstances (existing at the FCC) to pass a Morse code exam.
Where are those guys, Larry? I don't know of any. HF hams who
volunteered NOT to take a Morse code exam are criminals.

> >> Produce a person who was forced to learn morse.
> >
> >If I remember right, Larry was required by circumstances to learn
> >Morse code. Please switch the discussion to the premise/conclusion thread.
>
> I may have been "required by circumstances" to learn the Morse code,

Thanks, Larry. "Required by circumstances" is the Webster's definition
of "forced". You have earlier said that your Morse code skill was
"produced with effort". That's another Webster's definition of "forced".
That one is in your cheap dictionary.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3922. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-27 02:38:13 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A9B1315.58534463@IEEE.org>
Source record: 4124

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> >That's the whole problem with our society. Nobody gives a damn
> >anymore. All they do is sit around and whine about postings that
> >they don't comprehend.
>
> That's obviously the pot calling the kettle black.

That's obviously a joke, Larry. Go buy yourself a sense of humor.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3923. Re: CDL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-27 02:39:26 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010226213926.29597.00009541@nso-mi.aol.com>
Source record: 4121

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.g9df2z0.pminews@ca.news.verio.net>, "Phil Kane"
<Phil.Kane@nospam.spam> writes:

>
> Hams who live in glass houses
> shouldn't throw carriers.....
>

I thought that was hams who lived in houses with aluminum siding!

73 de Larry, K3LT

3924. Re: Forced code exams? was Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-27 02:39:26 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010226213926.29597.00009540@nso-mi.aol.com>
Source record: 4122

In article <3A9A7B9A.DA693214@IEEE.org>, Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>> > Conclusion: Hams are forced to pass a ham exam.
>> > HF hams are forced to pass a Morse code exam.
>>
>> Just another in your long string of inaccurate conclusions.
>
>Your feelings are irrelevant, Dick. Please present a valid
>rebuttal argument to the above conclusions.

Cecil:

Dick and I have already done that. BTW -- Dick didn't express
a feeling, he made a statement of fact. If you can't discern the
difference, you should discontinue your participation in this
discussion, as you are obviously way out of your intellectual
depth.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3925. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-27 02:52:15 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A9B165F.D21661CD@IEEE.org>
Source record: 4125

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> Well, that may be comforting to you, but here's the monkey
> wrench in the works: I'm an "HF ham," and nobody "forced" me
> to do a damn thing!

You have already admitted that you were *required by circumstances*
(FCC regulations) to take a Morse code exam. "Required by circumstances"
is the Webster's definition of "forced". You previously admitted that
your Morse code skill was *produced with effort*. "Produced with effort"
is another definition of "forced". You as much as admitted that you had
to *force* yourself to learn Morse code.

> I met the licensing requirements purely as a volunteer!

As an HF ham, could you have volunteered NOT to take the Morse code
exam? Nope, you couldn't, Larry. Nocode techs and non-hams are the
only ones who can volunteer NOT to take the Morse code exam. Sorry,
but HF hams have no choice except to yield to the conditions required
by circumstances (FCC regulations).

> Therefore, I
> must logically conclude that the definition of force, i.e. "required
> by circumstances," is somehow defective.

Then your argument is not with me, it is with the Webster's dictionary.
Please take it up with Barnes & Noble.

> I would define "forced" as
> "motivated by coercive influence or threat of negative consequences."

That's one definition of "forced" but certainly not the only one. English
words often have multiple definitions all of which are valid.

You can say, "I was not motivated by threat of negative consequences
when I became a ham".

I can say, "You were required by circumstances to pass a Morse code
exam".

Both statement can be true because of the different definitions of
"forced".
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3926. Re: Forced code exams? was Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-27 02:58:54 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A9B17EE.D6E1CBE9@IEEE.org>
Source record: 4126

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> Dick and I have already done that. BTW -- Dick didn't express
> a feeling, he made a statement of fact. If you can't discern the
> difference, you should discontinue your participation in this
> discussion, as you are obviously way out of your intellectual
> depth.

I have graphically diagrammed my argument using symbolic logic and
the rules of classical logic. There is nothing wrong with it.

Please produce just one HF ham who used his free will NOT to take
a Morse code exam, Larry. That's the only way you can prove that
you are right.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3927. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-27 03:20:58 UTC
From: tlbryant@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <97f6eq01nt7@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 4129

In article <3A99FD33.3212191B@ovis.net>, k8mn@ovis.net says...

>> All this shows is that you like using morse as a means of communication. It
>> proves nothing.
>
>How do you know what my views of morse testing or use were during those
>years? Pretty dismissive comment coming from a fellow armed with few
>facts.

You views have been stated here several times. Is your memory so short that you
can't remember what you've posted over the past couple of months?

>> >During the period of the debate over whether morse testing should be
>> >continued, I've weighed the evidence and found the views of your side to
>> >be wanting. I've observed that generally, things which are deregulated
>> >do not improve whether the things are telephone service, airline service
>> >or amateur radio.
>>
>> That is a blanket assumption, that cannot be proven. After one year, I've
not
>> seen any changes, for better or worse.
>
>Telephones, cable service, airlines and the like have been deregulated

Personally, I'm satisfied with my telephone and cable service. They're far from
perfect, but in all honesty I can say that they're better than they were five
and ten years ago. As for airlines, I can't comment, since I haven't flown
anywhere for about 15 years.

>for some time. Prices continue to go up; service goes down. As far as
>amateur radio, I've noted a number of newer ops, mostly using voice
>modes who have some pretty bad operating habits and a pronounced
>"accent". It hasn't kept me from working some of 'em.

So now you're attacking accents? That is a very veiled and subtle racist
statement. The fact that you work such stations dosen't change this.

>> >I don't share your view of ham radio utopia and probably never will.
>> >Live with it.
>> >
>> >Dave K8MN
>>
>> All that I hae to say to that is 5 WPM is here to stay. Live with it.
>
>I've already accepted that and I've been living with it. I'm still
>looking for the explosion in growth. According to some, many of the

>newcomers will be professionals who will dazzle us with technological
>advances. I'm waiting for that too.
>
>Dave K8MN

No one has ever made such a statement that ham radio would have an "explosion in growth" with professionals and technical types. This is your distortion of the facts. But I suppose if there was such an "explosion" they wouldn't count because they didn't pass the "real" code test.

3928. Re: 11meters, freebanding, and the no-code tech ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-27 03:25:26 UTC
From: tlbryant@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <97f6n611nt7@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 4132

In article <97cn2v$336$0@208.207.71.174>, dixie@townsqr.com says...

> Why should they stay unlicensed when it's so easy to get licensed? Then
>they have access to the ham bands as well as whatever they're doing
>outside the law-they use ham rigs and amps anyway, for the most part-
>and don't think they feel constrained to operating legally within the
>ham bands, either.
> Plus as licensed hams they now have access to voting membership in ARRL
>and hey, we can run THAT, too.....You read his post, didn't you? This is
>not news. There is and has always been a large element of them who will
>never conform. They "just don't want to". (Where have we heard that
>before?)

This shows that you don't know the difference between flagrantly violating the law, and working through proper legal means in an effort to change the law.

3929. Re: 11meters, freebanding, and the no-code tech ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-27 03:28:40 UTC
From: tlbryant@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <97f6t821nt7@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 4133

In article <97cn4l$336$1@208.207.71.174>, dixie@townsqr.com says...

>> >One of the main reasons the FCC has lowered the requirements for a ham
>> license,
>> >and simplified the license structure, over the past 25 years is this: They
>> want
>> >the "freebanders" and the non-commercial cbers to get ham licenses.
>> >
>> >73 de Jim, N2EY
>>
>> Do you have any quotes from any FCC that proves this?
>
>
>Whatta ya want, a notarized statement from the Chairman?

Posting an opinion is one thing. Posting an opinion under the guise of it being
an actual fact is quite another. In such cases, I expect to see some proof.

3930. Re: Thanks and Good Bye re. 11m, Tech Ticket, & The ARRL.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-27 03:35:01 UTC
From: ssb411d@cs.com
Message-ID: <20010226223501.23759.00000151@ng-mg1.news.cs.com>
Source record: 4127

Well put Mark,

I see nothing wrong with a friendly e-mail to your particular area(division) representative(director) to inquire about their position re. 11 meters. Should they respond that there is no ARRL position; Politely refer them to RM-9807 and let them know that this is considered by many 11 meter interests to have been league involvement in an issue for which they claim to have "no position." This is no longer acceptable and they now have another aspect of "league involvment" to consider for your vote.

I do NOT, however, agree with trying to get the ARRL to lobby the FCC on behalf of 11 meter interests, merely NOT to involve themselves in 11 meter rule making proposals by and of legal 11 meter interest groups/individuals.

Other than that, good luck and BRAVO on a "heads up" call.

73 de Bert
SSB411D

3931. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-27 03:38:09 UTC
From: tlbryant@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <97f7f131nt7@enews2.newsguy.com>
Source record: 4135

In article <3A9AB291.C51988F0@uci.edu>, jwkelley@uci.edu says...

>> IOW, regardless of the relevancy of the requirement, as long as they show
>> that they can beep, they can do whatever they want afterwords.
>
>Well, not exactly. We have to show quite a number of other things as
>well (as I'm sure you're aware, but have conveniently forgotten.)
>
>ac6xg

I'm quite aware of the other requirements. I'm also quite aware, evidenced by the subtle postings of many in this newsgroup, of the caste system that exists with in amateur radio, with regards to newer licensees.

3932. Re: FBI spy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-27 04:18:55 UTC
From: Hans K0HB <k0hb@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <3A9B2AAF.C8F76279@arrl.org>
Source record: 4128

Len Over 21 wrote:

> Are you suggesting a major overhaul of the US amateur radio
> regulations in license requirements?!?

I think submitting a home-built receiver for examination is
a much more appropriate measure of ability, rather than demonstrating
the ability to deconde long and short beeps at some arbitrary speed.

dit dit

de Hans, K0HB

3933. Re: Thanks and Good Bye re. 11m, Tech Ticket, & The ARRL.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-27 04:21:27 UTC
From: ssb411d@cs.com
Message-ID: <20010226232127.23759.00000162@ng-mg1.news.cs.com>
Source record: 4131

Dwight, Dwight, Dwight...,

I have to go easy on you because you were a coastie...well, sort of anyway. This'll get flamed something terrible by the "Dick & Dwight Comedy Show" but here we go.

>There is no animosity towards CB'ers. Instead, there is animosity >towards what some in the CB community do (and, yes, those people are >very much the majority).

You, Dwight are as wrong as two left feet! Yes, there IS animosity toward CBer's. Yes, SOME engage in behaviour that is offensive to MOST hams as well as MOST CBer's. NO, NO, NO, Dwight...these people are very much NOT the majority. Your broad generalizations bear out that you have NOT the slightest idea of what you're talking about re. 11 meters. You may cite your 25 years of experience and allude to how you "know of" and have monitored the "whole" band...but your inaccuracy shows that you really haven't got a clue.

>In other words, the resistence in the ham community towards CB'ers is >nothing more than similar efforts in "real" communities to keep the >criminal element out.

In other words, you're an rf bigot.

>We have a nice community and we don't want to see the streets >(frequencies) in that community taken over by criminals (freebanders, >linear freaks, rude operators, or whatever).

In other words, you're an rf bigot.

>Of course, just like in "real" communities, "decent" people are always >welcome (including those from the CB community). However, just like in >"real" communities, that CB'er will not be immediately accepted just >because he expresses an interest in joining this community. Since even >the "decent" CB'er has spent time hanging around bad people, he is >going to viewed with suspicion, and mistrust, until he has proven himself >(has that license, acts like a ham, etc).

M O R E R F B I G O T R Y ! ! !, but at least you threw in:

>"decent" people are always welcome (including those from the CB >community).

.....but felt it necessary to qualify it with.....

>Since even the "decent" CB'er has spent time hanging around bad >people, he is going to viewed with suspicion, and mistrust, until he has >proven himself (has that license, acts like a ham, etc).

Yeah and some of my best friends are CBer's...yada, yada, yada...! I've gotta tell you though, you two make a good tag team! Your neat little explanation of the "imagined" animosity and your "expert" knowledge on the behavioural habits of the "general" CB populace may fly with those who want to believe that. But to those who have "been there and done that," your know-it-all claims are as transparant as saran wrap.

73 de Bert
SSB411D

3934. Re: Open Source Trusted E-QSL System proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-27 04:24:18 UTC
From: Hans K0HB <k0hb@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <3A9B2BF2.8F5B716A@arrl.org>
Source record: 4130

Darryl Wagoner wrote:

> Hmmm? This is where a system like LOTW and eQSL.cc breaks down.
> It requires a connection.

LOTW could be implemented without a connection.

3935. Re: Open Source Trusted E-QSL System proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-27 04:27:11 UTC
From: Hans K0HB <k0hb@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <3A9B2C9F.648F3406@arrl.org>
Source record: 4136
Cross-posted to:
alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

JT wrote:

> In order to get a QSL card from Germany, I've got to put 80 cents
> worth of postage on the envelope and 2 dollars inside. $2.80 for one
> QSL card.

Naw, just wait 3 months, and you'll get 15 cards from Germany in
your "Buro" envelope, 34cents for the whole stack. You're just too
eager to spend money.

73, Hans, K0HB

3936. Re: Open Source Trusted E-QSL System proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-27 04:27:15 UTC
From: Gilbert Baron <gbaron@mailandnews.com>
Message-ID: <D0Gm6.23096$t67.380587@news1.rdc1.il.home.com>
Source record: 4134
Cross-posted to:
alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Hans K0HB" <k0hb@arrl.org> wrote in message
news:3A9B2C9F.648F3406@arrl.org...
> JT wrote:
>
> > In order to get a QSL card from Germany, I've got to put 80 cents
> > worth of postage on the envelope and 2 dollars inside. $2.80 for one
> > QSL card.
>
> Naw, just wait 3 months, and you'll get 15 cards from Germany in
> your "Buro" envelope, 34cents for the whole stack. You're just too
> eager to spend money.
>

And it takes too damn long and Germany is an easy one to work. The hard ones
WANT DEMAND more. The whole thing is a racket. EQsl Must and soon WILL
exist. If ARRL does not do it soon some will and start independent awards
that will destroy the ARRL monopoly. Yes the Dxers will have to find another
way to make money, BUT , they will save a LOT by not printing cards.

> 73, Hans, K0HB

3937. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-27 04:35:58 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010226233558.21405.00003249@nso-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 4138

In article <3A9AB05E.842EBC3@uci.edu>, Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> writes:

>> As far as US amateur radio is concerned, an amateur license
>> is granted by the FCC, not the desires of the already-licensed.
>
>Right. Neither the desires of the applicant, nor any third party (such
>as yourself) are relevant. :-)

On the contrary, the FCC welcomes comment from any citizen
on FCC regulations for any radio service, does not exclude
anyone. They say so in their "FCC Manual." Check it out...free
download on the Internet or pay a small fee to the US GPO for a
printed copy.

3938. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-27 04:35:59 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010226233559.21405.00003250@nso-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 4137

In article <4kfl9tssmmmb00k0592ppo3djka2h2k9vt@4ax.com>, Aaron Jones
<nomail@nomail.com> writes:

>Don't let them bullies kick sand in your face Len,
> take a Charles Atlas course and you can lick em... :-)

Ahem...you might want to amend one word in the "advice."

Once a pugnacious drunk wandered into a gay bar and
announced "I can lick anyone in the house!" You can
guess the rest... :-)

Do I need a Charles Atlas course? In Internet terms I am
8' 4" and 560 pounds with 3% body fat and can bench-
press a Schwarzenegger. Almost as strong as others
claim they are. :-)

Please let it be without music...no violins. :-)

Meanwhile, back to accepted amateur radio policy
subjects like Commercial Drivers Licenses, politics,
drugs, firearms, and espionage...all approved by
amateurs for amateur radio policy discussion. :-)

3939. Re: CDL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-27 04:35:59 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010226233559.21405.00003251@nso-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 4139

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.g9df2z0.pminews@ca.news.verio.net>, "Phil Kane"
<Phil.Kane@nospam.spam> writes:

>On Mon, 26 Feb 2001 11:40:33 -0600, Richard McCollum wrote:
>
>>You haven't lived until you follow Methusala's nephew down the road as he
>>bops along in a moose Winnebago on his Class D. I would mention
>>coke-bottle glasses but all that means is that he is one who got his
>>cataracts fixed.
>
> You're thinking,of glaucoma. When I got my cataract "fixed" I
> got 20/25 vision with no glasses.....

Glaucoma seldom results in "coke bottle" eyeglasses. Glaucoma
is an increase in internal eye pressure resulting in eventual
retinal damage. While there is some defocussing of the lens, it
is not to the extent of needing extreme correction via "coke
bottle" glasses. Usual correction procedure is a topical liquid
medication to reduce internal eye pressure. That is what I have.

There are no symptoms of the onset of glaucoma. A simple
painless pressure check will determine it. No check may
result in advanced glaucoma that can result in blindness.

3940. Re: Open Source Trusted E-QSL System proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-27 04:41:38 UTC
From: Bill Meacham <NOSPAMexray@coqui.net>
Message-ID: <3A9B3002.70D107C9@coqui.net>
Source record: 4140
Cross-posted to:
alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Gilbert Baron wrote:
>
> "Hans K0HB" <k0hb@arrl.org> wrote in message
> news:3A9B2C9F.648F3406@arrl.org...
> > JT wrote:
> >
> > > In order to get a QSL card from Germany, I've got to put 80 cents
> > > worth of postage on the envelope and 2 dollars inside. $2.80 for one
> > > QSL card.
> >
> > Naw, just wait 3 months, and you'll get 15 cards from Germany in
> > your "Buro" envelope, 34cents for the whole stack. You're just too
> > eager to spend money.
> >
>
> And it takes too damn long and Germany is an easy one to work. The hard ones
> WANT DEMAND more. The whole thing is a racket. EQsl Must and soon WILL
> exist. If ARRL does not do it soon some will and start independent awards
> that will destroy the ARRL monopoly. Yes the Dxers will have to find another
> way to make money, BUT , they will save a LOT by not printing cards.
>
> > 73, Hans, K0HB

A lot of those rare dx-peditions might not wanna use a freebie
service because some of the excess 'green stamp' proceeds aid in
defraying the cost of the expedition.
-BM, WX4A

3941. Re: 11meters, freebanding, and the no-code tech ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-27 05:17:24 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <97fd94$9dl$0@208.207.71.129>
Source record: 4141

AB2HR wrote:
>
> On 26 Feb 2001 04:47:17 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>
> >
> >
> >"T. L. Bryant" wrote:
> >>
> >> In article <20010225083324.01707.00000190@nso-fp.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com says...
> >>
> >> >
> >> >--
> >> >
> >> >One of the main reasons the FCC has lowered the requirements for a ham
> >> license,
> >> >and simplified the license structure, over the past 25 years is this: They
> >> want
> >> >the "freebanders" and the non-commercial cbers to get ham licenses.
> >> >
> >> >73 de Jim, N2EY
> >>
> >> Do you have any quotes from any FCC that proves this?
> >
> >
> >Whatta ya want, a notarized statement from the Chairman?
>
> Personally, I don't think the FCC gives a flying fig WHO gets a ham
> license.

With the morass that CB becams, spawning the "freeband" movement that
has continuously boten more and more brazen as time advances, you don't
see any reason for FCC to wish that most of them would give it up in
favor of a easy ham license? It's only logical and certainly an easy way
out of difficult enforcement headaches. Or wishful thinking.

They simplified the structure because the old 6-tiered
> system was difficult to administer and a pain in the arse to enforce.
> The FCC's only interests in the ham bands are the efficient
> enforcement of existing regulations, modifying existing regulations to
> make enforcement easier and more efficient,

Anything to make life as an FCC staffer more accomodating in the face of
a recaltricant congress...and after while thiniking more of those issues
instead of focusing on the work at hand naturally causes that work to
suffer from neglect.

and to farm out, sell,
> rent and other wise create revenue from under utilized portions of the
> spectrum that just happen to be allocated to the amateur service on a
> secondary (and sometimes primary) basis. The FCC is a governmental
> agency charged with regulating the use of the RF spectrum. They have
> no interest at all in the status of the Amateur Radio Service.

Naw, it has been made pretty clear by them that anything they can do to
eliminate need for direct oversight of the ARS is beneficial to them and
likely to becomne fact. Regardless of the possibility, even liklihood,
of negative effects resulting.

>
> The ARRL, on the other hand, IS an advocancy (sp?) for the service,
> and they certainly DO have some interest in what happens to the hobby.
> I can assure you, as a member of the ARRL, that I do NOT look forward
> to seeing freebanders, pirates, nor anyone else with an "outlaw"
> attitude joining the hobby in ANY capacity. This is not official
> dogma from the ARRL, just the opinion of ONE member...

But don't bet the farm on the ARRL heirarchy sharing your view.

3942. Re: FBI spy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-27 05:21:50 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010227002150.21405.00003252@nso-mj.aol.com>
Source record: 4142

In article <3A9B2AAF.C8F76279@arrl.org>, Hans K0HB <k0hb@arrl.org> writes:

>> Are you suggesting a major overhaul of the US amateur radio
>> regulations in license requirements?!?
>
>I think submitting a home-built receiver for examination is
>a much more appropriate measure of ability, rather than demonstrating
>the ability to deconde long and short beeps at some arbitrary speed.

That is an example of construction-assembly ability and
would pose an inordinate burden on the VECs, both for
time and capital equipment for testing.

All the PCTAs have posted that the US amateur radio license
is for an OPERATOR so no assembly or construction skills
are needed. :-)

3943. Re: 11meters, freebanding, and the no-code tech ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-27 05:30:59 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <97fe2jbtu0@208.207.71.129>
Source record: 4143

Phil Kane wrote:
>
> On 26 Feb 2001 13:33:23 GMT, N2EY wrote:
>
> >> One of the main reasons the FCC has lowered the requirements
> >> for a ham license, and simplified the license structure, over
> >> the past 25 years is this: They want the "freebanders" and the
> >> non-commercial cbers to get ham licenses.
>
> >>Do you have any quotes from any FCC that proves this?
> >
> >Their actions speak louder than any words could.
>
> Very true, but I do remember several Notices over the years
> that dealt with the desire of the FCC to persuade violators
> whose only crime was lack of license to "straighten up and fly
> right" and get licensed.
>
> The analogy was always made to someone who drives a car without
> a license. We always lived in fear of some judge remarking to
> a "pirate" whom we would catch and finally drag into court:
> "OK, you operated a radio transmitter without a required
> license. I sentence you to obey the law and get a license...."
>
> Fortunately it never happened - the judges were more "with
> the program" than most of the big-city Federal prosecutors of
> that era.
>
> We did have one case where a "big bad CBer" that we caught saw
> the light and studied and took the test for his ham license.
> His application came up for hearing before issuance, and he
> claimed (rightfully) that since the time he was caught he
> didn't commit any more violations. He got a one-year
> probationary period on his license, and he turned out to be one
> of the most responsible hams in the community.
>
> The door can swing two ways.

I absolutely agree and have seen it work many times.Its a shame all of
they don't and won't.

3944. Re: 11meters, freebanding, and the no-code tech ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-27 05:33:39 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010227003339.12119.00000405@nso-mg.aol.com>
Source record: 4146

In article <3A9A745F.58250F3F@IEEE.org>, Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>>
>> <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>> >Well, I proved I could score 100% on the Extra exam in March. :-)
>> >--
>> Maybe. The smiley tells me you're "not serious" about that....
>
>Oh, it's the truth,

How do we know that? Maybe you are "just kidding" - like about the Prozac.

>Dave,

Who is Dave? Dave's not here, man.

> but you're right, I wasn't very serious
>about it.

Uh huh.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3945. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-27 05:33:40 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010227003340.12119.00000407@nso-mg.aol.com>
Source record: 4144

In article <20010226112248.18626.00000907@nso-md.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>Jim:
>
>If you have an ordinary (Class D) driver's license, you are authorized
>to operate vehicles up to 26,000 lbs. GVW and carrying up to 15
>passengers (yourself, the driver, included in the count). To carry the
>16th passenger, you would require at least a Class C CDL with
>passenger endorsement; to carry the 26,001 st. pound, a Class B
>CDL would be required. Of course, PA requirements may vary; but
>I think CDL's are supposed to be uniform in requirements throughout
>the 50 states.

Larry,

Thanks for the info! Looks like I can drive more vehicles than I thought.

So I'll rephrase my rhetorical question: What happens at 26,000 pounds that suddenly makes me unsafe to drive? Why am I safe for 26,000 but unsafe for 26,001? Why am I qualified to carry 15 passengers but not 16?

Answer: Because the DMV had to set the dividing line somewhere.

73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>73 de Larry, K3LT
>CDL-B with Passenger and Air Brake Endorsements
>
Betcha he aced the exams for 'em, too.

3946. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-27 05:33:40 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010227003340.12119.00000406@nso-mg.aol.com>
Source record: 4145

In article <3A9A6663.40F460BB@IEEE.org>, Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>> If I use Morse, I use far less spectrum than any voice mode. That leaves
>lots
>> more room for other hams.
>>
>> If I use Morse, I can run far less power and still have the same S/N ratio
>at
>> the receiving end. Less QRM for other hams.
>>
>> Those are good things.
>
>I agree that those are good things but one single ham choosing one single
>mode is not a BIG effect on the other 600,000 hams.

It's a BIG effect on those hams who decide to use the same band as me.

> I've never heard you
>on any mode so it has had absolutely no effect on me.

You must not be on 40 CW much, then.
>
>Methinks you should change your statement from "my use of CW has a BIG
>effect ..." to "thousands of ham's using CW has a BIG effect ..."

Every ham's mode choice has an effect. Listen to 7035-7040 some evening.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3947. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-27 05:57:22 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <scgm9tc6pjgkksklfincdfjgsvmsku0ocr@4ax.com>
Source record: 4147

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote:
>I'll gladly take one [code exam] for him, any time -- as long
>as he can create circumstances which require me to do so! If he
>does, I'll take the exam voluntarily --

Makes sense. And if I ever do anything that makes a cop want to give
me a ticket, I'll of course take it voluntarily... :-)

3948. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-27 06:06:15 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <97fg4njbg0@208.207.71.129>
Source record: 4148

Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Far as I can tell that's where Cecil's argument breaks down. When one
> > forces himself to do something is he really being forced?
>
> I think so. One of his definitions said somthing about "requires
> effort". It required effort to learn code. I have to force the chair
> away from my desk if I want to get up, etc, etc,.

Yes, but the necesary force requires trivial effort. Now Cecil will
analyze that aspect of it all.

3949. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-27 06:08:19 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <53hm9to9i4a6k5i231ma30h1dv9u0406jp@4ax.com>
Source record: 4149

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
>Do I need a Charles Atlas course? In Internet terms I am
>8' 4" and 560 pounds with 3% body fat and can bench-
>press a Schwarzenegger. Almost as strong as others
>claim they are. :-)

Well then, you shouldn't have any problems
taking on those abusive hams after you
get your license... :-)

3950. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-27 06:12:54 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <97fgh6jbg1@208.207.71.129>
Source record: 4150

Cecil wrote:
>
> Jim Kelley wrote:
> >
> > Cecil wrote:
> >
> > > HF hams who didn't already know Morse code were forced by circumstances
> > > to learn Morse code. Please switch to the "Forced code exams?" thread.
> >
> > Even now as we speak, HF hams are being forced to study the element 4
> > question pool. ;-)
>
> Is element 4 the Extra question pool? If so, your statement is not
> entirely correct. It should read: Amateur radio users of 7.010 MHz
> were required by circumstances (forced) to pass an Extra exam.
>

Bottom line: You have totally trivialized the term "forced" into
something much less 'forceful', indeed very ordinary. You have made it
the exact equal of "required". In so doing, you have lost the entire
impetus of your argument.

3951. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-27 06:29:25 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <97fhg5pcm0@208.207.71.129>
Source record: 4051

"T. L. Bryant" wrote:
>
> No one has ever made such a statement that ham radio would have an "explosion
> in growth" with professionals and technical types. This is your distortion of
> the facts. But I suppose if there was such an "explosion" they wouldn't count
> because they didn't pass the "real" code test.

So you haven't been paying attention again.

3952. Re: 11meters, freebanding, and the no-code tech ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-27 06:33:09 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <97fhn5prp0@208.207.71.129>
Source record: 4052

"T. L. Bryant" wrote:
>
> In article <97cn2v$336$0@208.207.71.174>, dixie@townsqr.com says...
>
> > Why should they stay unlicensed when it's so easy to get licensed? Then
> >they have access to the ham bands as well as whatever they're doing
> >outside the law-they use ham rigs and amps anyway, for the most part-
> >and don't think they feel constrained to operating legally within the
> >ham bands, either.
> > Plus as licensed hams they now have access to voting membership in ARRL
> >and hey, we can run THAT, too.....You read his post, didn't you? This is
> >not news. There is and has always been a large element of them who will
> >never conform. They "just don't want to". (Where have we heard that
> >before?)
>
> This shows that you don't know the difference between flagrantly violating the
> law, and working through proper legal means in an effort to change the law.

TL, you're sshowing yourself to be more and more lacking in your
ability to see what's there. There is a fair sized segment of
freebanders who now hold ham licenses but continue to do their nefarous
deeds outside the bands. If you don't acknowledge that don't assume we
will automatically presume you aren't familiar with it. Possibly very
familiar.

3953. Re: 11meters, freebanding, and the no-code tech ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-27 06:34:29 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <97fhplprp1@208.207.71.129>
Source record: 4053

"T. L. Bryant" wrote:
>
> In article <97cn4l$336$1@208.207.71.174>, dixie@townsqr.com says...
>
> >> >One of the main reasons the FCC has lowered the requirements for a ham
> >> license,
> >> >and simplified the license structure, over the past 25 years is this: They
> >> want
> >> >the "freebanders" and the non-commercial cbers to get ham licenses.
> >> >
> >> >73 de Jim, N2EY
> >>
> >> Do you have any quotes from any FCC that proves this?
> >
> >
> >Whatta ya want, a notarized statement from the Chairman?
>
> Posting an opinion is one thing. Posting an opinion under the guise of it being
> an actual fact is quite another. In such cases, I expect to see some proof.

If you had been paying attention you would have seen a good amount of
evidence.
So far there has been no trial nor conviction.

3954. Re: Thanks and Good Bye re. 11m, Tech Ticket, & The ARRL.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-27 06:39:43 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <97fi3f$qk3$0@208.207.71.129>
Source record: 4054

SSB411D wrote:
>
> >In other words, the resistence in the ham community towards CB'ers is
> >nothing more than similar efforts in "real" communities to keep the >criminal
> element out.
>
> In other words, you're an rf bigot.

Now this is novel. A ham who insists that radio operators should follow
the regulations, get licensed and operate legally are condemned as
"bigots". Not too susrprising, considering the source.

> >We have a nice community and we don't want to see the streets
> >(frequencies) in that community taken over by criminals (freebanders, >linear
> freaks, rude operators, or whatever).
>
> In other words, you're an rf bigot.

You sound just like some radial zealots who insist that decrying the
rampant illegality by members of some minority groups is 'bigotry'. Same
lame claim.

3955. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-27 06:41:08 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <97fi64$qk3$1@208.207.71.129>
Source record: 4055

"T. L. Bryant" wrote:
>
> In article <3A9AB291.C51988F0@uci.edu>, jwkelley@uci.edu says...
>
> >> IOW, regardless of the relevancy of the requirement, as long as they show
> >> that they can beep, they can do whatever they want afterwords.
> >
> >Well, not exactly. We have to show quite a number of other things as
> >well (as I'm sure you're aware, but have conveniently forgotten.)
> >
> >ac6xg
>
> I'm quite aware of the other requirements. I'm also quite aware, evidenced by
> the subtle postings of many in this newsgroup, of the caste system that exists
> with in amateur radio, with regards to newer licensees.

WHERE'S YOUR PROOF?????

3956. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-27 08:37:45 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <97fot8$ka9$1@news.service.uci.edu>
Source record: 4056

Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3A9B0938.D883EC66@IEEE.org...
> Jim Kelley wrote:
> > Be kinda silly for a federal agency to write a rule prohibiting someone
> > from doing something they were unable to do, doncha think?
>
> Not at all. That's why they have rules prohibiting someone from
> flying an airplane when they are unable to do so.

I flew an airplane when I was 12. But I guess they weren't talking about
me. I was able to fly it.

Just glad I didn't have to land it. :-)

73, jim

3957. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-27 08:41:00 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <97fp3bkbr1@news.service.uci.edu>
Source record: 4057

Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3A9B0A8F.93F29DFB@IEEE.org...
> Jim Kelley wrote:
> > Amateur radio users of 7.010 MHz are HF hams, are they not?
>
> Yes, but not all HF hams are allowed on 7.010 MHz. Only the HF hams
> authorized to operate on 7.010 MHz were required by circumstances
> to pass an Extra exam.

Yes. I seem to recall hearing something about that.

> One has to be accurate about such matters.

:-)

jim

3958. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-27 08:57:22 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <97fq21lcv1@news.service.uci.edu>
Source record: 4058

Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:97fg4njbg0@208.207.71.129...

> Jim Kelley wrote:
> >
> > Dick Carroll wrote:
> > > Far as I can tell that's where Cecil's argument breaks down. When one
> > > forces himself to do something is he really being forced?
> >
> > I think so. One of his definitions said somthing about "requires
> > effort". It required effort to learn code. I have to force the chair
> > away from my desk if I want to get up, etc, etc,.

> Yes, but the necesary force requires trivial effort.

You're acting like he insulted your mother or something. What's so bad
about saying that learning code requires a trivial effort? I think that's a
good thing. Though Cecil is now pretending he didn't say that.

73, Jim AC6XG

3959. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-27 09:01:32 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <97fq9q$ln3$1@news.service.uci.edu>
Source record: 4059

Len Over 21 <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20010226233558.21405.00003249@nso-mj.aol.com...
> In article <3A9AB05E.842EBC3@uci.edu>, Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
writes:
>
> >> As far as US amateur radio is concerned, an amateur license
> >> is granted by the FCC, not the desires of the already-licensed.
> >
> >Right. Neither the desires of the applicant, nor any third party (such
> >as yourself) are relevant. :-)
>
> On the contrary, the FCC welcomes comment from any citizen
> on FCC regulations for any radio service, does not exclude
> anyone.

Not on the 610 they don't. You know, as in the subject of this discussion?

ac6xg

3960. Re: Forced code exams? was Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-27 10:10:22 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010227051022.02102.00000921@nso-fi.aol.com>
Source record: 4060

In article <3A9B17EE.D6E1CBE9@IEEE.org>, Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>Please produce just one HF ham who used his free will NOT to take
>a Morse code exam, Larry. That's the only way you can prove that
>you are right.

Cecil:

I can't because there aren't any. That is not an issue with me. The
issue at hand is whether or not anyone was actually "forced" to take
a Morse code test in order to gain HF amateur radio privileges. I
contend that they were not. You contend that they were. Prove to
me that you're right -- you have NOT done that yet.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3961. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-27 10:31:17 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010227053117.01469.00000236@nso-fk.aol.com>
Source record: 4061

In article <3A9B0F29.5891F5A4@IEEE.org>, Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

> All HF hams were *required
>by circumstances* to pass a Morse code exam.

Not in Japan. 4th class JA hams don't pass a code test.

It's important to be acurate in such matters.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3962. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-27 10:52:30 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccoll@radiks.net>
Message-ID: <BFLm6.1586$qh5.3954683@nntp3.onemain.com>
Source record: 4062

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20010227053117.01469.00000236@nso-fk.aol.com...
> In article <3A9B0F29.5891F5A4@IEEE.org>, Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
writes:
>
> > All HF hams were *required
> >by circumstances* to pass a Morse code exam.
>
> Not in Japan. 4th class JA hams don't pass a code test.
>
> It's important to be acurate in such matters.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Our hearts, they'll be quickenin',
With each drop of strichinin,
We're poisoning the pigeons in the park.

3963. Re: Thanks and Good Bye re. 11m, Tech Ticket, & The ARRL.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-27 11:21:55 UTC
From: Richard McCollum <rmccoll@radiks.net>
Message-ID: <96Mm6.436$K66.305943@nntp1.onemain.com>
Source record: 4063

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:97fi3f$qk3$0@208.207.71.129...
>
>
> SSB411D wrote:
> >
> > >In other words, the resistence in the ham community towards CB'ers is
> > >nothing more than similar efforts in "real" communities to keep the
>criminal
> > element out.
> >
> > In other words, you're an rf bigot.
>
>
> Now this is novel. A ham who insists that radio operators should follow
> the regulations, get licensed and operate legally are condemned as
> "bigots". Not too susrprising, considering the source.
>
>
>
>
> > >We have a nice community and we don't want to see the streets
> > >(frequencies) in that community taken over by criminals (freebanders,
>linear
> > freaks, rude operators, or whatever).
> >
> > In other words, you're an rf bigot.
>
>
> You sound just like some radial zealots who insist that decrying the
> rampant illegality by members of some minority groups is 'bigotry'. Same
> lame claim.

Now, Dick. You just ain't giving them the respect their neat hardware deserves. Kind of like the kids with the Tommy shirts, the latest Air Jordan shoes, the Nike hat on backwards and little wisps of what looks like pubic hair on the chin. I'm cool man, why don't you think I'm cool. See my Chevy Blazer -- cool man. It is all a status game and us nasty old hams don't give them status for all that money they spent. Bigot, man, bigot.

My own experience is that a lot of freebanders, almost universally the sidebanders, make pretty good amateurs. Guess it depends on whether a convict who does his time is entitled to a pardon -- or whether you are a good Baptist and believe in deathbed conversions. :-)

Dick N&#65533;BK

3964. Re: 11meters, freebanding, and the no-code tech ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-27 12:48:43 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A9BA22B.92DDEFCA@IEEE.org>
Source record: 4064

Dick Carroll wrote:
> TL, you're sshowing yourself to be more and more lacking in your
> ability to see what's there. There is a fair sized segment of
> freebanders who now hold ham licenses but continue to do their nefarous
> deeds outside the bands. If you don't acknowledge that don't assume we
> will automatically presume you aren't familiar with it. Possibly very
> familiar.

If they "continue to do their defarous? deeds outside the (ham) bands"
then nothing has changed. Why should what continues to happen "outside
the (ham) bands" be of concern to or have an effect on hams? Seems to
me, the real problem for hams is when those guys, for instance, use AM/SSB
in the CW/digital portion of the 10m ham band. Then they are violating
the conditions of their ham license and having an effect on hams.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3965. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-27 12:50:54 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A9BA2AE.372BCA9C@IEEE.org>
Source record: 4066

N2EY wrote:
>
> In article <3A9B0F29.5891F5A4@IEEE.org>, Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>
> > All HF hams were *required
> >by circumstances* to pass a Morse code exam.
>
> Not in Japan. 4th class JA hams don't pass a code test.
>
> It's important to be acurate in such matters.

I said a couple of postings ago that I was talking about U.S. hams.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3966. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-27 12:57:05 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A9BA421.B7AF8124@IEEE.org>
Source record: 4067

Aaron Jones wrote:
>
> yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote:
> >I'll gladly take one [code exam] for him, any time -- as long
> >as he can create circumstances which require me to do so! If he
> >does, I'll take the exam voluntarily --
>
> Makes sense. And if I ever do anything that makes a cop want to give
> me a ticket, I'll of course take it voluntarily... :-)

:-) Yep, and the point is that "voluntarily" doesn't matter. U.S.
HF hams are required by circumstances to pass a Morse code exam.
Whether it is voluntary or involuntary is irrelevant. 100% of U.S.
HF hams who don't voluntarily take the Morse code exam are *required
by circumstances* to take it involuntarily.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3967. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-27 13:01:01 UTC
From: Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A9BA50D.6BEA378B@IEEE.org>
Source record: 4068

Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> Cecil wrote:
> > I'm naturally talking about U.S. HF hams, Hans. Where are the U.S. HF
> > hams who used their free will to decide not to take a Morse code exam?
> > The fact that there is not a single one should raise a red flag that
> > taking a Morse code exam is NOT a voluntary act for HF hams.
>
> Wouldn't this mean that taking written FCC exams is also NOT a voluntary
> act, and therefore there's no difference between the Morse test and the
> written test in this regard?

Yep, that's true. All U.S. hams are required by circumstances to pass
a written ham exam. U.S. hams who don't voluntarily take the exams
are required by circumstances to take them involuntarily. Whether
the exam is taken voluntarily or involuntarily is irrelevant to the
FCC. Either way, it is required by circumstances.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3968. Re: Open Source Trusted E-QSL System proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-27 13:01:46 UTC
From: Gilbert Baron <gbaron@mailandnews.com>
Message-ID: <_yNm6.25366$t67.394580@news1.rdc1.il.home.com>
Source record: 4065
Cross-posted to:
alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Bill Meacham" <NOSPAMexray@coqui.net> wrote in message
news:3A9B3002.70D107C9@coqui.net...
> Gilbert Baron wrote:
> >
> > "Hans K0HB" <k0hb@arrl.org> wrote in message
> > news:3A9B2C9F.648F3406@arrl.org...
> > > JT wrote:
> > >
> > > > In order to get a QSL card from Germany, I've got to put 80 cents
> > > > worth of postage on the envelope and 2 dollars inside. $2.80 for one
> > > > QSL card.
> > >
> > > Naw, just wait 3 months, and you'll get 15 cards from Germany in
> > > your "Buro" envelope, 34cents for the whole stack. You're just too
> > > eager to spend money.
> > >
> >
> > And it takes too damn long and Germany is an easy one to work. The hard
ones
> > WANT DEMAND more. The whole thing is a racket. EQsl Must and soon WILL
> > exist. If ARRL does not do it soon some will and start independent
awards
> > that will destroy the ARRL monopoly. Yes the Dxers will have to find
another
> > way to make money, BUT , they will save a LOT by not printing cards.
> >
> > > 73, Hans, K0HB
>
>
> A lot of those rare dx-peditions might not wanna use a freebie
> service because some of the excess 'green stamp' proceeds aid in
> defraying the cost of the expedition.

Yes, that is true and the MAIN reason it does not exist.

> -BM, WX4A
>

3969. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-27 20:41:23 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A9C10F3.327C80E8@uci.edu>
Source record: 4071

Cecil wrote:

> Jim Kelley wrote:

> > Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message

> > > The US government forces amateur radio operators to obtain
> > > an amateur radio operators license. The US government forces HF amateur
> > > radio operators to pass a Morse code exam. That's what governments do.

> > Right. Is this is a bad thing?

> Nope,

Ok good. Glad to hear it. Back 3 years ago, you sure made it sound like
it was a bad thing. So the bad thing now is that some US amateur radio
operators don't think there is force involved?

73, Jim AC6XG

3970. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-27 20:45:13 UTC
From: W6RCecilA <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A9C11D9.96D98933@IEEE.org>
Source record: 4070

Jim Kelley wrote:
> You said they have rules against doing something you're _unable_ to do.
> I was able to fly the plane, so it must have been legal. ;-)

The government finds out if one is unable to fly a plane by giving
him/her a set of exams.

> So I wondering if you think the FCC should outlaw the use of CW by those
> who don't know how to use CW as exemplified by the many other examples
> in law?

Since it is not a life and death situation, I don't see any reason why
nocode techs shouldn't use the only CW-only frequencies in US amateur
radio for the purpose of learning Morse code.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3971. Re: 11meters, freebanding, and the no-code tech ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-27 20:50:14 UTC
From: W6RCecilA <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A9C1306.511A3A@IEEE.org>
Source record: 4069

"T. L. Bryant" wrote:
> You can make light of it all you want, but the fact remains that if you're
> going to accuse someone of an illegal act, you'd best be prepared to back up
> such statements. Most people don't like to be accused of something they
> didn't do. All it takes is one ambitious lawyer to see your words and interpret
> them as being malicious.

It's very difficult to prove anything about netnews. It appears that
half the time, Dick's bratty 8-year old idiot nephew is doing the
posting to his internet account.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3972. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-27 20:58:34 UTC
From: K0HB@qwest.net
Message-ID: <97h4dqlar1@news.netmar.com>
Source record: 4072

In article <20010226233559.21405.00003250@nso-mj.aol.com>, Len Over 21 <lenover21@aol.com> writes:

>Do I need a Charles Atlas course? In Internet terms I am
>8' 4" and 560 pounds with 3% body fat and can bench-
>press a Schwarzenegger.

Just because you like to growl, posture, and piss in all the corners, it doesn't necessarily prove that you're a tough-minded king of the newsgroup: On the Internet, no one can tell you're a chihuahua.

dit dit

Hans, K0HB

----- Posted via NewsOne.Net: Free (anonymous) Usenet News via the Web -----
http://newsone.net/ -- Free reading and anonymous posting to 60,000+ groups
NewsOne.Net prohibits users from posting spam. If this or other posts
made through NewsOne.Net violate posting guidelines, email abuse@newsone.net

3973. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-27 21:35:07 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A9C1D8B.C6660441@uci.edu>
Source record: 4074

W6RCecilA wrote:
>
> Jim Kelley wrote:
> > You said they have rules against doing something you're _unable_ to do.
> > I was able to fly the plane, so it must have been legal. ;-)

> The government finds out if one is unable to fly a plane by giving
> him/her a set of exams.

> > So I wondering if you think the FCC should outlaw the use of CW by those
> > who don't know how to use CW as exemplified by the many other examples
> > in law?

> Since it is not a life and death situation, I don't see any reason why
> nocode techs shouldn't use the only CW-only frequencies in US amateur
> radio for the purpose of learning Morse code.

Right. But the fact remains that the test requirements are based at
least in part, on the privileges afforded to radio amateurs. There is
no presupposition that everything must be covered in element 2.

73, Jim AC6XG

3974. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-27 21:44:41 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A9C1FC9.ED1DD4FC@uci.edu>
Source record: 4073

Jim Kelley wrote:
>
> Len Over 21 <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20010226233558.21405.00003249@nso-mj.aol.com...
> > In article <3A9AB05E.842EBC3@uci.edu>, Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
> writes:
> >
> > >> As far as US amateur radio is concerned, an amateur license
> > >> is granted by the FCC, not the desires of the already-licensed.

> > >Right. Neither the desires of the applicant, nor any third party (such
> > >as yourself) are relevant. :-)

> > On the contrary, the FCC welcomes comment from any citizen
> > on FCC regulations for any radio service, does not exclude
> > anyone.

Did anyone else notice that I agreed with Len, and then he came back
contradicted himself in order to disagree with me?

73, ac6xg

3975. Re: 28.085 New channel 19 ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-27 22:03:37 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nospam.spam>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.g9fjij4.pminews@ca.news.verio.net>
Source record: 4075

On Tue, 27 Feb 2001 09:37:04 -0500, Dwight Stewart wrote:

> Geesh, if I asked my congressman about his position on radio related
>issues, he would probably start talking about Rush (or conservative talk
>radio in general). In other words, communications radio is not exactly high
>on his agenda.

You have hit the nail on the head.

--
73 de Phil Kane - K2ASP

3976. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-27 22:29:15 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A9C2A3B.1C99C159@uci.edu>
Source record: 4076

W6RCecilA wrote:
>
> Jim Kelley wrote:
> > You said they have rules against doing something you're _unable_ to do.
> > I was able to fly the plane, so it must have been legal. ;-)

> The government finds out if one is unable to fly a plane by giving
> him/her a set of exams.

So to be accurate, one might say that the government has rules against
doing things one is unlicensed to do?

73, Jim AC6XG

3977. Re: 11meters, freebanding, and the no-code tech ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-27 22:42:35 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010227174235.01707.00000277@nso-fp.aol.com>
Source record: 4077

In article <3a9a84fa.2134181@news.mindspring.com>, billsohl@mindspring.com (Bill Sohl) writes:

>On 26 Feb 2001 13:33:23 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>
>>In article <97cglh21ee5@enews3.newsguy.com>, tlbryant@my-deja.com (T. L. >>Bryant) writes:
>>
>>>In article <20010225083324.01707.00000190@nso-fp.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com >>>says...
>>>>One of the main reasons the FCC has lowered the requirements for a ham >>>>license and simplified the license structure, over the past 25 years is >this:
>>>>They want the "freebanders" and the non-commercial cbers to get ham >licenses. Y
>>>
>>>Do you have any quotes from any FCC that proves this?
>>
>>Their actions speak louder than any words could.
>
>In what way do you make that assessment?

I looked over how the FCC has changed the license requirements in the last 30 years. And taking a broad view of the problems the FCC faces in enforcing the rules on unlicensed stations.
>
>Just what actions by the FCC support your conclusion?
>
Compare the requirements for a US ham license in 1971 and in 2001. Pay particular attention to what was and is required for a license that allows lots of HF/MF privileges on a variety of modes. Also look at the requirements for a full-privileges license. I can post a detailed list, if you want.

Please understand, I'm not saying this was the ONLY reason for the changes - just that it was one of them. And I'm not saying that these changes were all bad, either. I'm just explaining my view of part of the FCC's motivation and thinking on the subject, and how it has changed from the heyday of "incentive licensing" to now.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3978. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-27 22:42:37 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010227174237.01707.00000280@nso-fp.aol.com>
Source record: 4078

In article <3A9BA2AE.372BCA9C@IEEE.org>, Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>>
>> In article <3A9B0F29.5891F5A4@IEEE.org>, Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
>writes:
>>
>> > All HF hams were *required
>> >by circumstances* to pass a Morse code exam.
>>
>> Not in Japan. 4th class JA hams don't pass a code test.
>>
>> It's important to be acurate in such matters.
>
>I said a couple of postings ago that I was talking about U.S. hams.

But you didn't write it in the post I quoted. Maybe you changed your mind
between posts.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3979. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-27 22:42:37 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010227174237.01707.00000279@nso-fp.aol.com>
Source record: 4079

In article <3A9BA56C.706EF156@IEEE.org>, Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>> > I've never heard you
>> >on any mode so it has had absolutely no effect on me.
>>
>> You must not be on 40 CW much, then.
>
>I am often on or around 7122.

Maybe. Or maybe you're just kidding about that.

How about posting a log of your last 5 QSOs on 40 CW?

> Never heard you there.

I'm there sometimes. Usually I'm down lower in the band, ragchewing around 7040, BA'ing around 7050 or chasing DX on the low end.

Besides, you probably wouldn't know it was me if you did hear me because of the code speed used.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3980. Re: 11meters, freebanding, and the no-code tech ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-27 22:42:37 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010227174237.01707.00000278@nso-fp.aol.com>
Source record: 4080

In article <7nuk9tk99jmgdardcrtlu5duihghfemrot@4ax.com>, AB2HR <ab2hr@arrl.net>
writes:

>On 26 Feb 2001 04:47:17 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>
>>
>>
>>"T. L. Bryant" wrote:
>>>
>>> In article <20010225083324.01707.00000190@nso-fp.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>says...
>>>
>>> >
>>> >--
>>> >
>>> >One of the main reasons the FCC has lowered the requirements for a ham
>>> license,
>>> >and simplified the license structure, over the past 25 years is this:
>They
>>> want
>>> >the "freebanders" and the non-commercial cbers to get ham licenses.
>>> >
>>> >73 de Jim, N2EY
>>>
>>> Do you have any quotes from any FCC that proves this?
>>
>>
>>Whatta ya want, a notarized statement from the Chairman?
>
>Personally, I don't think the FCC gives a flying fig WHO gets a ham
>license.

In general, I agree - just pass the tests and the license is yours. There are,
however, certain notable exceptions, where the prospective licensee has
demonstrated (in the opinion of the FCC) that he/she is not trustworthy of the
license.

> They simplified the structure because the old 6-tiered
>system was difficult to administer and a pain in the arse to enforce.

That's another reason to simplify the license structure (note that I didn't say
that
getting the "freebanders" and the non-commercial cbers to get ham licenses was
the ONLY reason, just that it was a big reason).

But the enforcement issue isn't part of it, I think. FCC enforcement of the ham bands is mostly complaint-driven nowadays.

>The FCC's only interests in the ham bands are the efficient
>enforcement of existing regulations, modifying existing regulations to
>make enforcement easier and more efficient, and to farm out, sell,
>rent and other wise create revenue from under utilized portions of the
>spectrum that just happen to be allocated to the amateur service on a
>secondary (and sometimes primary) basis. The FCC is a governmental
>agency charged with regulating the use of the RF spectrum. They have
>no interest at all in the status of the Amateur Radio Service.

I agree with most of what you're saying - but add into that thought the following: There are an unknown number of "freebanders" and cbers who operate illegally on the air. Some of these operations are a source of interference and complaints to the FCC, who don't have nearly enough resources to adequately enforce the rules against such activity.

It's much easier to enforce the rules on a licensed station than an unlicensed one, if for no reason other than you know who the licensees are, and where they are. So making the ARS more attractive to "freebanders" and non-commercial cbers makes them easier to control. FCC cannot admit that maybe 27 MHz was not the best place to put cb 40+ years ago, and they certainly can't just shut down the service or move it. The "freebanders" don't even limit themselves to the 40 allocated channels, too.

By offering an alternative, the problem is partly solved.
>
>The ARRL, on the other hand, IS an advocancy (sp?) for the service,
>and they certainly DO have some interest in what happens to the hobby.

Agreed! Which is why some folks hate the ARRL so badly.

>I can assure you, as a member of the ARRL, that I do NOT look forward
>to seeing freebanders, pirates, nor anyone else with an "outlaw"
>attitude joining the hobby in ANY capacity. This is not official
>dogma from the ARRL, just the opinion of ONE member...

If they can leave their "addytood" (Philadelphia lingo) behind, they are welcome! But if not, they are big trouble for the ARS. But as you said, the FCC doesn't care all that much. Main thing is that it makes the FCC's life easier, because going after a ham with an addytood problem is easier than going after an unlicensed person with one.

In general, most of the new hams I know don't have addytood problems, regardless of their background. It's only a few who cause problems.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3981. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-27 22:43:53 UTC
From: W6RCecilA <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A9C2DA9.65349F27@IEEE.org>
Source record: 4081

Jim Kelley wrote:
> Back 3 years ago, you sure made it sound like it was a bad thing.

3 years ago, we didn't have a 5wpm only Morse code exam.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3982. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-27 22:52:55 UTC
From: W6RCecilA <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A9C2FC7.288E2178@IEEE.org>
Source record: 4082

N2EY wrote:
> How about posting a log of your last 5 QSOs on 40 CW?

Sorry, I don't keep a log. On my scratch paper I have KB5WZI and KB1EVA
but I can't remember if I QSOed them or not.

> Besides, you probably wouldn't know it was me if you did hear me because of the
> code speed used.

I can copy call letters at 25wpm. It's just ten character words that
I have trouble with. By the time the seventh character rolls by, I've
forgotten the first three characters. Something to do with my short
term memory or lack thereof.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3983. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-27 22:55:33 UTC
From: W6RCecilA <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A9C3065.5268B572@IEEE.org>
Source record: 4083

Jim Kelley wrote:
> So to be accurate, one might say that the government has rules against
> doing things one is unlicensed to do?

Yep and governments use force to stop unlicensed people from doing
whatever.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
------== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3984. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-27 23:21:15 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <3A9C366B.8D8FF9A2@uci.edu>
Source record: 4084

W6RCecilA wrote:
>
> Jim Kelley wrote:
> > So to be accurate, one might say that the government has rules against
> > doing things one is unlicensed to do?

> Yep and governments use force to stop unlicensed people from doing
> whatever.

So then would force also be needed to stop people from doing what they
are unable to do? :-)

ac6xg

3985. Re: Forced code exams? was Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-27 23:58:50 UTC
From: W4JLE <Fred@w4jle.com>
Message-ID: <97hf1vhsb1@iac5.navix.net>
Source record: 4085

And don't forget the newest reference book, now available from your local bookseller -

"Picking fly shit out of pepper"
By Cecil A. Moore

"Cecil" <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3A9BAF66.8F65B4DF@IEEE.org...
>
> Axiom/definition: From "Webster's New Universal Unabridged Dictionary",
> Barnes & Noble/Random House, ©1966 "forced - required by circumstances"
>
> Premise: U.S. HF hams are required by circumstances to pass a Morse
> code exam.
>
> Proof: U.S. HF hams must meet the Morse code testing requirements
> defined by the circumstances of an FCC regulation.
>
> "Required by circumstances" is the definition of "forced".
>
> The requirement circumstances indeed do exist at the FCC.
>
> Conclusion: U.S. HF hams are forced to pass a Morse code exam.
>
> Larry, you have previously admitted that you were forced by
> circumstances to pass a Morse code exam. You have previously
> admitted that if it were not for those required circumstances
> that you would not have learned Morse code. That was the reason
> you gave for wanting to continue with the Morse code requirement.
> If you had not been required by circumstances to learn Morse code,
> you would not have learned it. My argument was (is) that hams
> will learn Morse code without it being required by the FCC.
> Remember?
> --
> http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca
>
>
> -----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
> http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
> -----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3986. Re: Thanks and Good Bye re. 11m, Tech Ticket, & The ARRL.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-28 00:56:48 UTC
From: ssb411d@cs.com
Message-ID: <20010227195648.23617.00000273@ng-mg1.news.cs.com>
Source record: 4086

Hello Dwight

>Bert, are you really going to sit there and tell >me that the majority of CB'ers don't use >linears, modified radios, noise toys, "foul" >language, or occasionally get into "cat fights" >with others on the radio?

No Dwight, I'm standing up and telling you.

>I doubt you could find more than a small >percentage of CB'ers who have not done at >least one, or more, of those things on a >relatively routine basis.

Dwight, I HAVE..."been there, done that," and I'm not talking about the illegal things either.(lest I arouse your fetish for zoning in on the illegal aspect) I HAVE operated on 11 meters since 1977...I believe that's one year less than you, but I'd bet the farm that I've "actually operated" there far far more than you have. I do monitor the "freeband" on a regular basis for the reason mentioned earlier...you find pretty darn good sideband operators there and they're pretty interesting to listen too. Don't hear much from you regarding the "Extra" lids on 75m.

>And, I'm sorry, there is no animosity towards >CB'ers.

Don't be sorry. I'll stand by my assertions. I've seen it, heard it, and have tasted it. When it's applied in a general manner "across the board," much like you do...it's no longer about the doing, it's just about who.

>Didn't anyone ever tell you that name
>calling is nothing more than the weapon of choice for the person who has no >true defense of his position?

Uh, Dwight...that wasn't you that called that poor kid a troll just because he posted his reply at the end of the thread...hmmm???!!!

>Bigotry has to do with an extreme
>intolerance to another person's creed, >belief, or opinion. Since crime, or >criminal behavor, is not a creed, belief, or >opinion, it is not bigotry to want to keep the >criminal element out of your community

You dropped your pants here, Pvt. Stewart...give me twenty! The fact that you apply your blanket of guilt to all CBer's and even mention "guilt by association" in one of your replies demonstrates your intolerance to the opinion of even legal CBer's. Geez, Dwight, because even the legal CBer's have operated in close proximity with the "criminals," they to should be treated with suspicion until they demonstrate that they are "good hams." Sounds like you're guilty until proven innocent. You blew that one.

Lastly, let me assure you that although the issues discussed herein are serious in nature...I do mean for our discussion never to get too serious or heavy as

to offend one another. If the term RF bigot offended you, I do offer you my apology. That certainly was not my intent. Also, if it makes you feel any better...I think I know what a Tommy shirt is, but it'd be supposition at best. I think it's the shirt the lads are wearing that are 22 sizes too big...sue me, I saw this in a local mall, crazy.

73 de Bert
SSB411D

3987. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-28 01:07:44 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <97hj10$51q$0@208.207.71.166>
Source record: 4087

Cecil wrote:
>
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > "T. L. Bryant" wrote:
> > >
> > > No one has ever made such a statement that ham radio would have an "explosion
> > > in growth" with professionals and technical types. This is your distortion of
> > > the facts. But I suppose if there was such an "explosion" they wouldn't count
> > > because they didn't pass the "real" code test.
> >
> > So you haven't been paying attention again.
>
> Guess you haven't been paying attention, Dick. For years, I held nocode
> tech classes at Intel in Chandler, AZ. Of the more than 100 new techs,
> the great majority were professional and technical types. Multiply that
> one campus of one company by thousands of companies and you will see
> that there was indeed an "explosion in growth" with professionals and
> technical types. Dr. Williamson, PhD in EE, was one of them. Many of
> my original tech students have gone on to obtain higher licenses all
> the way to extra.
>

Oh, I've been paying attention, and about all I've seen is the reams of
BS from you. If you're not truly full of fecal stuff the world has yet
to see one who is. You've worked poor tired old Dr. Williamson so hard
he's surely way past ready for retirement. Don't you have at least ONE
other example??

What we've really been waiting for is the technical output from all
your hordes of techies. But Nothin' has been forthcoming whatever.

--
> http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca
>
> -----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
> http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
> -----== Over 80,000 Newsgroups - 16 Different Servers! =-----

3988. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-28 01:12:27 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <97hj9r$51q$1@208.207.71.166>
Source record: 4088

Cecil wrote:
>

Some hams have said that US HF hams are NOT required by
> circumstances to pass a Morse code exam. I say they are. "Required
> by circumstances" is the dictionary definition of "forced".

And you are STILL spouting untruths. You are NOT required by
circumstances to get a ham radio license, whatever the qualifications,
even if there are no requirements to meet.

The
> federal government forces amateur radio operators to meet the
> requirements for an amateur radio operator's license.

But you already said that no government requires you to get that
license. So your ass-ertion is still wrong on its face.

3989. Re: 11meters, freebanding, and the no-code tech ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-28 01:22:14 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <97hjs6$857$0@208.207.71.166>
Source record: 4089

"T. L. Bryant" wrote:
>
> In article <97gq93$12u$0@208.206.142.94>, dixie@townsqr.com says...
>
> >> >deeds outside the bands. If you don't acknowledge that don't assume we
> >> >will automatically presume you aren't familiar with it. Possibly very
> >> >familiar.
> >>
> >> Making libelous insinuations about someone being involved in illegal
> activity,
> >> especially in a public forum, and without proof, can get you into a lot of
> >> trouble.
> >
> >
> >I guess to be perfectly safe I should have said "You may fully
> >assume...."?
> >
> >You all THAT libel? YOU need a better dictionary.
>
> You can make light of it all you want, but the fact remains that if you're
> going to accuse someone of an illegal act, you'd best be prepared to back up
> such statements. Most people don't like to be accused of something they
> didn't do. All it takes is one ambitious lawyer to see your words and interpret
> them as being malicious.

A little touchy are we TL? Wonder what might be behind all that
sensitivity to the merest suggestion that your activities might not be
assumed to be pure as the morning sun, given your attitudes that distill
out as in sympathetic leaning toward a certain cause.
In any event, you'd best brush up on your tort law. Threatening to sue
someone for some imagined slight can get you more action than you
bargained for.

3990. Re: 11meters, freebanding, and the no-code tech ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-28 01:32:47 UTC
From: tlbryant@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <97hkfv02ed4@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 4097

In article <3A9C1306.511A3A@IEEE.org>, Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org says...
>
>"T. L. Bryant" wrote:
>> You can make light of it all you want, but the fact remains that if you're
>> going to accuse someone of an illegal act, you'd best be prepared to back up
>> such statements. Most people don't like to be accused of something they
>> didn't do. All it takes is one ambitious lawyer to see your words and
interpre
>t
>> them as being malicious.
>
>It's very difficult to prove anything about netnews. It appears that
>half the time, Dick's bratty 8-year old idiot nephew is doing the
>posting to his internet account.
>--
>http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

This is true. In reality, all one has to say is, "I didn't write that. Someone must have hacked my account". I was merely speaking from the standpoint of having worked at a newspaper 20 years ago, when an article was published accusing a local high school football coach of recruiting violations. (The town takes it's HS football way too seriously) The article was based on one family's hearsay. This lead to an investigation, state play-off suspensions, firings, fines, and a lawsuit against the paper by the school district.

While the net is different, someone somewhere will eventually test the limits of this medium of free speech. It's just a matter of time.

3991. Re: 11meters, freebanding, and the no-code tech ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-28 01:34:23 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010227203423.01718.00000253@nso-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 4090

In article <3A99CF6A.E5210295@IEEE.org>, Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>> I'm not passing judgement on any of this. I'm just saying it's part of the
>> FCC's agenda.
>
>They should use a similar agenda on the non-violent users of drugs.
>--
What does the FCC have to do with drug users?

73 de Jim, N2EY

3992. Re: 11meters, freebanding, and the no-code tech ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-28 01:34:23 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010227203423.01718.00000252@nso-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 4094

In article <v5ei9t8gdt02kqsrcue1s55smjnd56h2sl@4ax.com>, Aaron Jones
<nomail@nomail.com> writes:

>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>>Most of the stuff you post, Cecil, involves stuff that is
>>unverifiable by anyone other than you.
>
>That's true of much of the stuff anyone posts here including you...

Some of what I post is not independently verifiable. But most of it is. Check
out my articles in QST and Electric Radio, my contest results in QST since
1968, my posts to other newsgroups. Set up a sked with me on-the-air or drop by
for a shack visit. Ask other hams who know me personally.
>
>>I'm not concerned about being retested - I'll easily pass any
>>test for a ham license the FCC has used for the past 50 years.
>
>I know you could challenge us to come give you a test,
>but in reality that piece of info is just as unverifiable for
>most of us as is Cecil's...

But it IS verifiable if someone wants to take the trouble.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3993. Re: 11meters, freebanding, and the no-code tech ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-28 01:34:24 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010227203424.01718.00000254@nso-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 4095

In article <3a99f157.1593587@news.mindspring.com>, billsohl@mindspring.com (Bill Sohl) writes:

>>Let me clarify, Bill.
>>
>>I know plenty of hams who were "radio outlaws" at one time. Then they got
>ham
>>licenses, and most of them cleaned up their acts and became legal. A few
>>brought their "bad habits" with them - but only a few.
>
>Sounds like a good thing to me.

It would be a better thing if nobody developed those "bad habits" in the first place.

>Even the "non-prior outlaw" group
>of hams has it share of "bad-habit" characters.

Agreed! But I think they are very rare.
>
>>Many of these folks would have become hams straightaway, but they perceived
>the
>>license requirements as being too difficult. So they did their outlaw thing
>for
>>a time. Then the requirements for a ham license were eased, and they got ham
>>licenses.
>
>Sounds like a good thing to me.

IF they leave their "bad habits" behind, I agree 100%.
>
>>I'm not passing judgement on any of this - just reporting what has happened.
>
>The impression you gave originally implied bad things.

How? I simply reported the idea and the FCC's actions. Nowhere did I say it was a bad thing - in fact, I repeatedly stated that I wasn't passing judgement on this course of action.

The only possible bad thing I see is those who don't leave their bad habits behind.

>Your clarification indicates pretty good results.
>
I would think most hams would agree on them, too.

--

So, Bill, does this whole idea sound reasonable to you now?

73 de Jim, N2EY

3994. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-28 01:34:25 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010227203425.01718.00000256@nso-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 4091

In article <3A9BECF4.96616F5E@IEEE.org>, Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>Jim Kelley wrote:
>>
>> Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
>> news:3A9BC7DD.6AC54A03@IEEE.org...
>> > The US government forces amateur radio operators to obtain
>> > an amateur radio operators license. The US government forces HF amateur
>> > radio operators to pass a Morse code exam. That's what governments do.
>>
>> Right. Is this is a bad thing?
>
>Nope,

Ah - so you think requiring code tests for an amateur licenses is not a bad
thing.

>some requirements are good,

Agreed..

> but some hams say the US government
>doesn't force HF amateur radio operators to pass a Morse code exam.

They don't. The US government doesn't do anything to Japanese HF amateur radio
operators who have not passed a Morse code exam.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3995. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-28 01:34:25 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010227203425.01718.00000255@nso-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 4092

In article <97gauk153u@enews3.newsguy.com>, tlbryant@my-deja.com (T. L. Bryant) writes:

>Twixt the pessimist and the optimist,
>the difference is droll.
>The optimist sees the donut,
>the pessimist sees the hole.
>
Enough! You want poetry, I got yer poetry right here...

(ahem)
>
A poem about something you may have experienced....

He laid her on the table
So white, so clean and bare.
His forehead wet with beads of sweat,
He rubbed her here and there.
He touched her neck and then her breast,
And then, drooling, felt her thigh.
The slit was wet and all was set, He gave a joyous cry.
The hole was wide...he looked inside,
All was dark and murky.
He rubbed his hands, stretched out his arms,

And then.....

he stuffed the turkey!

73 de Jim, N2EY

3996. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-28 01:34:26 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010227203426.01718.00000257@nso-fo.aol.com>
Source record: 4093

In article <97gnqjqhl1@news.netmar.com>, K0HB@arrl.org writes:

>>> All HF hams were *required
>>>by circumstances* to pass a Morse code exam.
>>
>>Not in Japan. 4th class JA hams don't pass a code test.
>>
>
>Cecil is ignoring them because they ruin his rant. After all, there have
>only
>been about 2.7 million of those HF licenses issued without "forced" Morse
>testing!

Exactly, Hans. In fact they probably outnumber all other ham licenses, in all other countries, combined.

But look at the numbers of JA ham stations since 1995. Not a pretty picture.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3997. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-28 02:02:44 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010227210244.01283.00000916@nso-fc.aol.com>
Source record: 4096

In article <97fq9q$ln3$1@news.service.uci.edu>, "Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu>
writes:

>> >> As far as US amateur radio is concerned, an amateur license
>> >> is granted by the FCC, not the desires of the already-licensed.
>> >
>> >Right. Neither the desires of the applicant, nor any third party (such
>> >as yourself) are relevant. :-)
>>
>> On the contrary, the FCC welcomes comment from any citizen
>> on FCC regulations for any radio service, does not exclude
>> anyone.
>
>Not on the 610 they don't. You know, as in the subject of this discussion?

Are you now ordering all discussion to narrow in on a FORM?

Is the discussion to be about the appearance of the FORM, the
typeface used, arrangement of words, fancy scrolling around the
edges, artwork/engraving illustration, background color?

The FCC said openly that it welcomes comment from anyone.
The FCC regulates US amateur radio. Ergo, the FCC chooses
the various license forms. Comments on the FORM are just as
welcome to the FCC as anything else...from anyone...

Problem is, you have suddenly become petty and narrowminded
and wish to control discussion and topics. Talking about "papers"
sounds like the beginning of a bad WW2 movie scene...

A "license" exists as a permission/grant to emit RF in a regulated
manner. The license FORM is a certificate attesting to a
permission/grant but the FORM itself is not the "license." A
licensed amateur might have his/her 610 (or whatever number)
destroyed and such will not affect their legality or permission or
grant from the regulating agency.

3998. Re: 11meters, freebanding, and the no-code tech ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-28 02:16:09 UTC
From: tlbryant@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <97hn19024da@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 4098

In article <97hjs6$857$0@208.207.71.166>, dixie@townsqr.com says...
>

>> You can make light of it all you want, but the fact remains that if you're
>> going to accuse someone of an illegal act, you'd best be prepared to back up
>> such statements. Most people don't like to be accused of something they
>> didn't do. All it takes is one ambitious lawyer to see your words and
interpre
>t
>> them as being malicious.
>
>
> A little touchy are we TL? Wonder what might be behind all that
>sensitivity to the merest suggestion that your activities might not be
>assumed to be pure as the morning sun, given your attitudes that distill
>out as in sympathetic leaning toward a certain cause.

So tell me what "sympathetic leanings" do you think I have? Do you think it's
for freebanders? I believe I've already accused them of being criminals, so it
couldn't be that. Please enlighten me as to where you think my loyalties are.

> In any event, you'd best brush up on your tort law. Threatening to sue
>someone for some imagined slight can get you more action than you
>bargained for.

A statement of facts does not constitute a threat

3999. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-28 02:53:26 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010227215326.09821.00001475@nso-cg.aol.com>
Source record: 4099

In article <20010227003340.12119.00000407@nso-mg.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>
>Larry,
>
>Thanks for the info! Looks like I can drive more vehicles than I thought.
>
>So I'll rephrase my rhetorical question: What happens at 26,000 pounds that
>suddenly makes me unsafe to drive? Why am I safe for 26,000 but unsafe for
>26,001? Why am I qualified to carry 15 passengers but not 16?
>
>Answer: Because the DMV had to set the dividing line somewhere.

Jim:

The dividing line seems pretty logical to me. The CDL general knowledge
test covers topics which are specific to larger, heavier vehicles -- covering
differences in handling, braking, and the nature of the payload (cargo,
passengers). The endorsements require additional knowledge on
special vehicle characteristics such as passenger-carrying, hazardous
material, air brakes, etc. The dividing line seems well geared toward
excluding the type of vehicles which would normally be operated by
non-commercial entities such as automobiles, light truck/trailer
combinations with a GVWR less than 26,000 lbs, and smaller cargo-
carrying vehicles (such as the U-Haul/Ryder/Penske etc. rental moving
vans).

>73 de Jim, N2EY
>>
>>73 de Larry, K3LT
>>CDL-B with Passenger and Air Brake Endorsements
>>
>Betcha he aced the exams for 'em, too.

I wish I could make that claim, but I can't! Let's just say I scored very
high on them all, but I didn't "ace" them, unfortunately!

73 de Larry, K3LT

4000. Re: 11meters, freebanding, and the no-code tech ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-28 03:43:14 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <01to9tsi497t0p14p9cbv0776e8rhbtm6r@4ax.com>
Source record: 4100

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:

>Aaron Jones nomail@nomail.com> writes:

>>>I'm not concerned about being retested - I'll easily pass any
>>>test for a ham license the FCC has used for the past 50 years.
>>
>>I know you could challenge us to come give you a test,
>>but in reality that piece of info is just as unverifiable for
>>most of us as is Cecil's...
>
>But it IS verifiable if someone wants to take the trouble.

Where would we find "any test for a ham license that the FCC has used for the past 50 years"? I am pretty sure that most of the tests are unavailable and you know it. Who is buying the plane tickets for us to come give you the tests for verification of your claim? I'm betting you are pretty sure we won't, so no worries on that account. And even if you did pass, how would we know that it was "easily" passed? Maybe it was hard for you, but you wouldn't admit it. How could we tell for sure? No Jim, I'd say that you (and the rest of us, especially me...) are pretty safe from any verification when posting personal stories and claims, and we *all* know it..... :-)

4001. Re: FBI spy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-28 03:57:05 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010227225705.00597.00000267@nso-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 4201

In article <3a9bbb16.75428053@news2.dvol.com>, kelly@dvol (Brian Kelly, w3rv) writes:

>On 27 Feb 2001 05:21:50 GMT, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
>
>>That is an example of construction-assembly ability
>>
>Gawd forbid a ham should have to be able to solder.

Why?

>>and
>>would pose an inordinate burden on the VECs, both for
>>time and capital equipment for testing.
>>
>"Test equipment"?? What test equipment? I had to build a rcvr to get
>my Radio Merit Badge. I showed up with a two-tube regen, the counselor
>plugged it into one of hs antennas and the radio worked. Took 30
>seconds, a pair of ears and a hunk of wire.

You are a credit to metrologists everywhere. You should do
consulting for NIST on developing primary standards.

You have now equated US amateur radio to the Boy Scouts.

Here, have a Brownie...

4002. Re: Thanks and Good Bye re. 11m, Tech Ticket, & The ARRL.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-28 03:57:05 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010227225705.00597.00000266@nso-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 4204

In article <3A9BD3A4.10072315@toast.net>, John O'Flaherty <oflahert@toast.net>
writes:

>> You sound just like some radial zealots who insist that decrying the
>> rampant illegality by members of some minority groups is 'bigotry'. Same
>> lame claim.
>
>These would be the people that insist on burying wires in the ground?

Wayyyy too sneaky a comment...this group is humor
challenged.... :-)

4003. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-28 03:57:06 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010227225706.00597.00000268@nso-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 4203

In article <3A9C1FC9.ED1DD4FC@uci.edu>, Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> writes:

>> > >> As far as US amateur radio is concerned, an amateur license
>> > >> is granted by the FCC, not the desires of the already-licensed.
>
>> > >Right. Neither the desires of the applicant, nor any third party (such
>> > >as yourself) are relevant. :-)
>
>> > On the contrary, the FCC welcomes comment from any citizen
>> > on FCC regulations for any radio service, does not exclude
>> > anyone.
>
>Did anyone else notice that I agreed with Len, and then he came back
>contradicted himself in order to disagree with me?

Did anyone else notice that Jimmie likes to confuse the
issues by nit-picking, phrase-arguing, and general trolling?

Tell us, oh Lawgiver, that the FCC does not welcome comment
from any citizen on anything, amateur radio included.

Tell us that only already-licensed US radio amateurs are
allowed to judge, rule, and otherwise establish all criteria
on and about amateur radio.

4004. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-28 03:57:06 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010227225706.00597.00000269@nso-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 4205

In article <97h4dqlar1@news.netmar.com>, K0HB@qwest.net writes:

>>Do I need a Charles Atlas course? In Internet terms I am
>>8' 4" and 560 pounds with 3% body fat and can bench-
>>press a Schwarzenegger. [Almost as big as some who
post in here...you forgot to quote the last part...:-)]
>
>Just because you like to growl, posture, and piss in all the
>corners, it doesn't necessarily prove that you're a tough-minded
>king of the newsgroup: On the Internet, no one can tell you're a
>chihuahua.

Yo quiero, super chief, you are singularly without humor this
day. :-)

Or....(!).....maybe YOU were the drunk who wandered into
the gay bar?!?!?

Lighten up, massa, yo is startin to resemble dem ice holes
yo is fishin from... :-)

4005. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-28 03:57:07 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010227225707.00597.00000270@nso-fy.aol.com>
Source record: 4202

In article <97gpk9$f4s$1@news.service.uci.edu>, "Jim Kelley" <jwkelley@uci.edu> writes:

>I get flack from everybody. It's because I go looking for trouble I guess. >;-)

Quite true.

4006. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-28 04:24:52 UTC
From: W6RCecilA <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A9C7D93.CA4DF553@IEEE.org>
Source record: 4206

N2EY wrote:
> Ah - so you think requiring code tests for an amateur licenses is not a bad
> thing.

I'm satisfied with the present requirements.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

4007. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-28 04:33:06 UTC
From: W6RCecilA <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A9C7F82.E73342D4@IEEE.org>
Source record: 4209

Dick Carroll wrote:
> You are NOT required by
> circumstances to get a ham radio license, whatever the qualifications,
> even if there are no requirements to meet.

All amateur radio operators are required by circumstances to qualify
for an amateur radio license. Are you saying hams don't have to satisfy
any requirements? Hams have to satisfy the requirements, Dick. "Have to"
is another way of saying "forced".

> > The
> > federal government forces amateur radio operators to meet the
> > requirements for an amateur radio operator's license.
>
> But you already said that no government requires you to get that
> license. So your ass-ertion is still wrong on its face.

One more time, Dick. Read it slowly this time. Amateur radio operators
are forced by the federal government to meet the requirements for
an amateur radio operator's license. That's what governments do.
Please list the names of any hams who were not forced by the FCC to
meet the requirements for entry into the amateur radio service. The
only people who are not required to meet those requirements are not
hams.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

4008. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-28 04:36:36 UTC
From: W6RCecilA <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A9C8054.2518ABCD@IEEE.org>
Source record: 4210

Dick Carroll wrote:
> What we've really been waiting for is the technical output from all
> your hordes of techies. But Nothin' has been forthcoming whatever.

They're just following the example that you set for them.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

4009. Re: 11meters, freebanding, and the no-code tech ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-28 04:39:14 UTC
From: billsohl@mindspring.com
Message-ID: <3a9c805f.1917380@news.mindspring.com>
Source record: 4207

On 27 Feb 2001 22:42:35 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:

>In article <3a9a84fa.2134181@news.mindspring.com>, billsohl@mindspring.com
>(Bill Sohl) writes:
>
>>On 26 Feb 2001 13:33:23 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>>
>>>In article <97cglh21ee5@enews3.newsguy.com>, tlbryant@my-deja.com (T. L.
>>>Bryant) writes:
>>>
>>>>In article <20010225083324.01707.00000190@nso-fp.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>>>>says...
>>>>>One of the main reasons the FCC has lowered the requirements for a ham
>>>>>license and simplified the license structure, over the past 25 years is
>>this:
>>>>>They want the "freebanders" and the non-commercial cbers to get ham
>>licenses. Y
>>>>
>>>>Do you have any quotes from any FCC that proves this?
>>>
>>>Their actions speak louder than any words could.
>>
>>In what way do you make that assessment?
>
>I looked over how the FCC has changed the license requirements in the last 30
>years. And taking a broad view of the problems the FCC faces in enforcing the
>rules on unlicensed stations.

Fair enough. Differnet people may conclude otherwise.

>>Just what actions by the FCC support your conclusion?
>>
>Compare the requirements for a US ham license in 1971 and in 2001. Pay
>particular attention to what was and is required for a license that allows lots
>of HF/MF privileges on a variety of modes. Also look at the requirements for a
>full-privileges license. I can post a detailed list, if you want.

Look at the General (full HF) requirements for the 50s and 60s
and tell us how that compares.

>Please understand, I'm not saying this was the ONLY reason for the changes -
>just that it was one of them. And I'm not saying that these changes were all
>bad, either. I'm just explaining my view of part of the FCC's motivation and
>thinking on the subject, and how it has changed from the heyday of "incentive
>licensing" to now.

As above, different people see different reasons behind
FCC actions.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4010. Re: 11meters, freebanding, and the no-code tech ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-28 04:41:52 UTC
From: billsohl@mindspring.com
Message-ID: <3a9c818d.2219256@news.mindspring.com>
Source record: 4208

On 27 Feb 2001 22:42:35 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:

>In article <3a9a84fa.2134181@news.mindspring.com>, billsohl@mindspring.com
>(Bill Sohl) writes:
>
>>On 26 Feb 2001 13:33:23 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>>
>>>In article <97cglh21ee5@enews3.newsguy.com>, tlbryant@my-deja.com (T. L.
>>>Bryant) writes:
>>>
>>>>In article <20010225083324.01707.00000190@nso-fp.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>>>>says...
>>>>>One of the main reasons the FCC has lowered the requirements for a ham
>>>>>license and simplified the license structure, over the past 25 years is
>>this:
>>>>>They want the "freebanders" and the non-commercial cbers to get ham
>>licenses. Y
>>>>
>>>>Do you have any quotes from any FCC that proves this?
>>>
>>>Their actions speak louder than any words could.
>>
>>In what way do you make that assessment?
>
>I looked over how the FCC has changed the license requirements in the last 30
>years. And taking a broad view of the problems the FCC faces in enforcing the
>rules on unlicensed stations.

Fair enough. Differnet people may conclude otherwise.

>>Just what actions by the FCC support your conclusion?
>>
>Compare the requirements for a US ham license in 1971 and in 2001. Pay
>particular attention to what was and is required for a license that allows lots
>of HF/MF privileges on a variety of modes. Also look at the requirements for a
>full-privileges license. I can post a detailed list, if you want.

Look at the General (full HF) requirements for the 50s and 60s
and tell us how that compares.

>Please understand, I'm not saying this was the ONLY reason for the changes -
>just that it was one of them. And I'm not saying that these changes were all
>bad, either. I'm just explaining my view of part of the FCC's motivation and
>thinking on the subject, and how it has changed from the heyday of "incentive
>licensing" to now.

As above, different people see different reasons behind
FCC actions.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4011. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-28 04:46:58 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <97hvog$f7i$1@news.service.uci.edu>
Source record: 4212

Len Over 21 <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20010227225706.00597.00000268@nso-fy.aol.com...

> Tell us that only already-licensed US radio amateurs are
> allowed to judge, rule, and otherwise establish all criteria
> on and about amateur radio.

We're certainly in a decent position to be able to comment on it from first
hand experience.

ac6xg

4012. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-28 04:50:45 UTC
From: W6RCecilA <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A9C83A5.5CE3114E@IEEE.org>
Source record: 4213

N2EY wrote:
> And then.....
> he stuffed the turkey!

That's enough to turn one into a vegetarian.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

4013. First official RRAP CW net on 7038.7 kHz

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-28 04:51:39 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <97i04r$oa0$0@208.207.71.166>
Source record: 4211

Hey, that was fun! Been a long time since I've participated in a CW "roundtable". We gotta do that again some time.

At 1010PM EST Feb 27 W3RV called the first session of the RRAP CW Net.

Checking in were;
W3RV Brian- NCS
W0EX Dick
AC6XG Jim
K0HB Hans
N2EY Jim
W6RCA Cecil

All signals were good in spite of considerable QRM and some QRN from early spring thunderstorms in the South. Cecil W6RCA reported thunderstorms in his area (southeast Texas), with sparks in the hamshack! That had to be noisy, and risky too. Gutsy guy, our Cecil. None of that for me!

Jim AC6XG initially was weak (549 here) and W6RCA wasn't able to copy through the storm static, but the skip distance on 40 meters changed and his signals improved (to 569 here) and all stations made direct contact with each other.

The same band change caused N2EY and W3RV (both in E.Pa.) to shift signal levels. Initially W3RV had been considerably stronger than N2EY but changing band conditions nearly reversed their signal levels as received in Missouri. That's a phenomena that occurrs on 40 meters when two close stations work a distant station and propagation shifts occur.

Anyone who thinks that "CW is dead" should have heard the clamor between 7035 and 7040, with a PACTOR signal occupying 7038-7040 for a time. I wondered for awhile, before the announced time, whether or not we would be able to find a free slot in the activity. Fortunately the PACTOR station left the air and we took that frequency.

Hey Jones, why didn't you check in??? <g>

4014. Re: 11meters, freebanding, and the no-code tech ticket

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-28 04:53:01 UTC
From: W6RCecilA <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A9C842D.3454CD48@IEEE.org>
Source record: 4215

N2EY wrote:
>
> In article <3A99CF6A.E5210295@IEEE.org>, Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
>
> >N2EY wrote:
> >> I'm not passing judgement on any of this. I'm just saying it's part of the
> >> FCC's agenda.
> > >
> > >They should use a similar agenda on the non-violent users of drugs.

> What does the FCC have to do with drug users?

They (the feds) should use a similar agenda on the non-violent users
of drugs.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

4015. Re: Thanks and Good Bye re. 11m, Tech Ticket, & The ARRL.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-28 05:05:18 UTC
From: W6RCecilA <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A9C870E.1A94A46B@IEEE.org>
Source record: 4216

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> Cecil wrote:
> > Dick, you rag on CBers all the time. You rarely say "a few CBers". You
> > just say "CBers" implying that you are talking about all or most of them.
>
> They know who is who. So do you.

Poll some of the readers of r.r.a.p, Dick. I'll bet they agree that
you rag on CBers in general.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

4016. Re: FBI spy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-28 05:10:34 UTC
From: Hans K0HB <k0hb@arrl.org>
Message-ID: <3A9C884A.B8E842EA@arrl.org>
Source record: 4214

Cecil wrote:
>
> "Brian Kelly, w3rv" wrote:
> > Addendum to previous post: I'll start beeping "cq rrapnet" around
> > 03:10Z somewhere between 7035 and 7040 and listen for check-ins.
>
> That'll be my first CW net.

Nice to put a "fist" to all the calls/names here on rrap. We ought to make it a regular thing. K0CKB tried to check in at end, but Brian had to go get a drink. She thinks he's stuck up.

dit dit

de Hans, K0HB

4017. Re: First official RRAP CW net on 7038.7 kHz

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-28 05:16:57 UTC
From: W6RCecilA <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A9C89C9.714D3D18@IEEE.org>
Source record: 4217

Dick Carroll wrote:
> Cecil W6RCA reported
> thunderstorms in his area (southeast Texas), with sparks in the
> hamshack! That had to be noisy, and risky too.

And I don't understand what the sparks are all about. I have a set of knife switches mounted on a piece of plexiglas in my hamshack window. Those switches arc like crazy during a thunderstorm. During the roundtable, I could hear a flock of Canadian Geese flying around in the storm in the dark. The actual thunder was so loud it drowned out some of the signals.

That was my first CW net. I use a brickwall filter and everyone wasn't on the same frequency. I had to keep tuning everyone in which changed my TX frequency. How is that problem handled on real life nets?
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

4018. Re: FBI spy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-28 05:34:23 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010228003423.01469.00000288@nso-fk.aol.com>
Source record: 4221

In article <9rlj9to9u60cq6ricvjkcb13tfs5ss1smb@4ax.com>, Aaron Jones
<nomail@nomail.com> writes:

>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>>did you ever see the requirements for getting a Soviet ham license?
>
>That would be no problem for our spy if he had been able to defect. He
>could have just traded a few more double agents for a ham license. I'm
>sure the KGB would have issued him one... :-)
>
One thing about double agents - they are never really trusted by the "other
side". If he had managed to escape to Russia, they would watch him very
carefully.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4019. Re: FBI spy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-28 05:34:23 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010228003423.01469.00000289@nso-fk.aol.com>
Source record: 4222

In article <n1el9t0r8juhr2srif6tq340rhc1s5o1b5@4ax.com>, Aaron Jones
<nomail@nomail.com> writes:

>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>>Your [Cecil's] volume of posting in four hours
>> is an indication of high typing speed.
>
>What typing speed do I use when I post??

I don't know. Your posts are not nearly so numerous as Cecil's.

They also contain lots of evidence of being well-thought-out, which requires
time.
>
>Just testing your telepathy... :-)

7035-7040....

73 de Jim, N2EY

4020. Re: FBI spy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-28 05:34:24 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010228003424.01469.00000290@nso-fk.aol.com>
Source record: 4219

In article <20010226135542.01731.00000224@nso-fm.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
(Len Over 21) writes:

>>>In article <20010225203343.06490.00000293@nso-fz.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>>>(N2EY) writes:
>>>
>>>>Could be. But - did you ever see the requirements for getting a Soviet ham
>>>>license? Makes us look like a bunch of weenies.
>>>>
>>>>Things like building a receiver (from scratch) of at least a certain
>>>>complexity, and present it for examination by a panel who will pass
>>>judgement
>>>>on its design and construction. You may be asked almost any question the
>>>>panel
>>>>can think up about it. After the receiver is approved, you have to use it
>>>to
>>>>receive a certain number of different stations and get confirmation (QSLs)
>>>of
>>>>same. Then you get to try for a transmitting license.
>>>
>>>Are you suggesting a major overhaul of the US amateur radio
>>>regulations in license requirements?!?
>>
>>I'm just pointing out that the old Soviet requirements were much tougher
>than
>>anything US hams have been required to do.
>
>Where are you going with that?

General information for rrap readers. Admiration of the skill, knowledge and
determination of radio amateurs who persevere in order to get on the air,
regardless of where they happen to live.

Nowhere do I propose making such requirements a part of any US radio licensing
process.
>
>>>Why would you impose so many things on newcomers that
>>>you did not have to do?
>>
>>Did I write that I wanted this sort of thing for a US ham license? No.
>
>Then why post it?

See above. Did YOU know about those requirements before I posted them?
>

>>And how do you know what I had to do? As a matter of fact, I built my first
>>SW receiver and amateur transmitter. I also built many since then, including
>the
>>setup I use now.
>
>I am familiar with FCC radio operator test requirements. None
>have required "bulding any equipment as test proof" for any
>radio operator license in the last half century...

Never been required in this country at all. I find it admirable that hams build
things, that's all.
>
>You are trying to equate a personal situation with something
>not required in the USA.

I am simply stating that I don't say others should do what I have not done. I
think hams should build their own gear if possible. I have done so myself since
before I got a license. You seem to be bent on minimizing the accomplishments
of others.

>Bad equation.

Why? Is it "bad" to build radio equipment for one's own use?

> Bad, bad, sit in a corner...

HAH! That's a good one!
>
>>I DON'T ask others to do what I haven't done.
>
>OK. Keep that sentence in mind... :-)

Why?
>
>>>Are you trying to make US amateur
>>>radio more exclusive by excluding some newcomers?
>>
>>Nope. Why do you think that?
>
>Because you mentioned an old test in a foreign country,
>tried a faulty equation to justify mentioning it...

Nope. You simply don't like the idea that hams are not all "appliance
operators".
>
>>Is building one's own radio gear a bad thing?
>
>No.

Then why do you criticize it so much?

>Why don't you broach the VEC QPC on making such
>an amateur radio test condition?

Maybe I should. I doubt very much you could pass such a test. I know I could.
;-)

> Otherwise, why post a
>condition of past testing that isn't applicable today?

See above. General information.

N2EY

4021. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-28 05:34:25 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010228003425.01469.00000293@nso-fk.aol.com>
Source record: 4218

In article <3A9C2FC7.288E2178@IEEE.org>, W6RCecilA <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>> How about posting a log of your last 5 QSOs on 40 CW?
>
>Sorry, I don't keep a log.

Uh huh.

>On my scratch paper I have KB5WZI and KB1EVA
>but I can't remember if I QSOed them or not.

I doubt you worked them on 40 CW.
>
>> Besides, you probably wouldn't know it was me if you did hear me because of
>the
>> code speed used.
>
>I can copy call letters at 25wpm.

Maybe. Or maybe you're just pulling my leg.

>It's just ten character words that
>I have trouble with. By the time the seventh character rolls by, I've
>forgotten the first three characters. Something to do with my short
>term memory or lack thereof.

I understand how 300,000 ft tall space aliens could have that trouble ;-)
That's why all the abbreviations on CW.
>--

73 de Jim, N2EY

4022. Re: FBI spy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-28 05:34:25 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010228003425.01469.00000291@nso-fk.aol.com>
Source record: 4220

In article <20010226135543.01731.00000225@nso-fm.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) writes:

>In article <20010226083321.01380.00000139@nso-fj.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>(N2EY)
>writes:
>
>
>>>I really don't care if the treasonous son of a bitch can copy code or not.
>>
>>>Do you?
>>
>>Nope. HE faces the death penalty, y'know.
>
>In peacetime?

Yes, in peacetime. See Phil Kane's excellent post on this very subject. Does Phil know whereof he writes or not?

> See another treasonous son of a bitch still
>alive in a federal prison who, unfortunately, was a USN
>warrant officer when he committed treason.

You mean Walker, who sold sub secrets to the Russkies?
>
>>But on a serious note, consider this: A while back the guy in Massachusetts
>>who
>>shot up his workplace and killed seven innocent people was mistakenly
>>identified as a ham. Turned out there were two people with exactly the same
>>name and similar descriptions living in the same town.
>
>...Living at the exact same address?!?

Not the Massachusetts guy. But it could be a mistake, or a relative, or a coincidence. Nobody thought there were two people with exactly the same name, approximate age and general description in a small burg in Massachusetts, but there were.

>Try reading the Affidavit
>and the FCC database for addresses.

Does the affidavit say the alleged spy and the ham in the database are one and the same person?
>
>Denial is a strong emotion that defies logic and rational
>thought.

Then why do you do it so much, Len.

>Try not to practice it.
>
I don't. I was simply advising caution before jumping to conclusions.

N2EY

4023. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-28 05:34:25 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010228003425.01469.00000292@nso-fk.aol.com>
Source record: 4223

In article <3A9C1FC9.ED1DD4FC@uci.edu>, Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu> writes:

>Did anyone else notice that I agreed with Len, and then he came back
>contradicted himself in order to disagree with me?

Of course. SOP. Or should I say, sophistry.

See Python, Monty: "Argument Clinic"

To quote K0HB: "On the internet, nobody knows you're a chihuahua".

73 de Jim, N2EY

4024. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-28 05:34:26 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010228003426.01469.00000294@nso-fk.aol.com>
Source record: 4224

In article <3A9C2DA9.65349F27@IEEE.org>, W6RCecilA <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
writes:

>Jim Kelley wrote:
>> Back 3 years ago, you sure made it sound like it was a bad thing.
>
>3 years ago, we didn't have a 5wpm only Morse code exam.

But we did have medical waivers for those who had trouble with speeds higher
than 5 wpm.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4025. Re: First official RRAP CW net on 7038.7 kHz

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-28 05:38:17 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <8o3p9tcittv47tt442cisvh2cmpbeoj4fn@4ax.com>
Source record: 4225

Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
> Hey Jones, why didn't you check in??? <g>

I forgot. Maybe next week... :-)

4026. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-28 05:42:57 UTC
From: W6RCecilA <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A9C8FE1.15450A91@IEEE.org>
Source record: 4226

N2EY wrote:
>
> In article <3A9C2DA9.65349F27@IEEE.org>, W6RCecilA <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
> writes:
>
> >Jim Kelley wrote:
> >> Back 3 years ago, you sure made it sound like it was a bad thing.
> > >
> > >3 years ago, we didn't have a 5wpm only Morse code exam.
>
> But we did have medical waivers for those who had trouble with speeds higher
> than 5 wpm.

We didn't have them soon enough.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

4027. Re: Thanks and Good Bye re. 11m, Tech Ticket, & The ARRL.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-28 06:01:33 UTC
From: "Leland C. Scott" <no-spam@junk-mail.net>
Message-ID: <1v0n6.26132$t26.848634@typhoon.mw.mediaone.net>
Source record: 4227

"SSB411D" <ssb411d@cs.com> wrote in message
news:20010226223501.23759.00000151@ng-mg1.news.cs.com...
> I do NOT, however, agree with trying to get the ARRL to lobby the FCC on behalf
> of 11 meter interests, merely NOT to involve themselves in 11 meter rule making
> proposals by and of legal 11 meter interest groups/individuals.

It should be pointed out that groups other than the ARRL, or Ham Radio related organizations, often get involved with Ham Radio issues. It happens all the time. Whether it has to do with the desire to get more spectrum for a commercial application, or public agencies like the LA police looking for spectrum for aerial TV surveillance, and so on. Likewise the ARRL gets involved with issues such as Part 15 and Part 95 devices, whose operation, or future potential operation, poses an interference issue for Hams, and protecting our spectrum from intruders.

As far as the ARRL getting involved in the 11m band issues, it is nothing more than business as usual to watch out for the interest of Ham Radio. Let me refresh your memory a little bit, it was due to the use of linear amplifiers, illegally on the 11m band, that prompted the FCC to enact the rules which crippled or eliminated the commercial sale of any amplifier that will function over the range of 12m to 10m. Granted that most of those amplifiers never operated on the Ham bands by a CBer bootlegging, it never the less impacted the Ham Radio community. And this is an activity that occurs on the 11m band, almost exclusively for all practical purposes. The argument is valid because it DID affect the Ham Radio community, while to what degree is not really the point. Nor is it the point about how easy, or difficult, it is to modify the amplifier to restore the ability to function on those bands either.

That in a nut shell is why I think the ARRL has a legitimate interest in what goes on in the 11m band, even if the immediate view appears not to affect Ham Radio. It's like the nose of the camel in the tent. If you don't watch out, and act quick, you end up with the rest of the camel inside. Then it's too late.

--
73's,

Leland C. Scott
KC8LDO

ARRL member
NCI member

"You ask what Morse Code is good for? I'll tell you. Morse Code is used exclusively by Electronics Based life forms to communicate amongst themselves using advanced Organic Digital Signal Processors, running state of the art Artificial Intelligence Software, to perform the highly complex transmit encryption, receive decryption and error correction functions."

4028. Re: First official RRAP CW net on 7038.7 kHz

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-28 06:34:18 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <97i61p$k1i$1@news.service.uci.edu>
Source record: 4228

W6RCecilA <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> wrote in message
news:3A9C89C9.714D3D18@IEEE.org...
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > Cecil W6RCA reported
> > thunderstorms in his area (southeast Texas), with sparks in the
> > hamshack! That had to be noisy, and risky too.

> And I don't understand what the sparks are all about. I have a
> set of knife switches mounted on a piece of plexiglas in my
> hamshack window. Those switches arc like crazy during a
> thunderstorm. During the roundtable, I could hear a flock
> of Canadian Geese flying around in the storm in the dark.
> The actual thunder was so loud it drowned out some of the
> signals.

I switched in my amp so Cecil could hear me. I heard everybody Q5. Had some QSB on the East coast stations. Hans was loudest. Lots of signals on the band. Somebody at 20 over came up a few hundred Hz above us and I've just got the stock filter in there right now. I ran the PBT all the way to the peg and got rid of him. I think I need Pa. so I'll QSL. I enjoyed hearing all the familiar calls checking in. Pretty neat. I'm the least experienced op in the group - and it probably showed a bit. Sorry if I was too long winded, guys. Anybody hear any gravel on my CW note?

> That was my first CW net. I use a brickwall filter and everyone
> wasn't on the same frequency. I had to keep tuning everyone in
> which changed my TX frequency. How is that problem handled on
> real life nets?

RIT? ;-) I turned off my DSP so I wouldn't miss anybody, but I think we were probably all within 150-200 Hz or so of each other. The difference in offset from one rig to another can run that much.

Great job running the net, Brian. Thanks very much. I hope we give it another shot in the future. Forty worked great for us.

73 to all

AC6XG

4029. Re: FBI spy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-28 06:55:43 UTC
From: Jim Kelley <jwkelley@uci.edu>
Message-ID: <97i79u$kv5$1@news.service.uci.edu>
Source record: 4229

Hans K0HB <k0hb@arrl.org> wrote in message
news:3A9C884A.B8E842EA@arrl.org...
> Cecil wrote:
> >
> > "Brian Kelly, w3rv" wrote:
> > > Addendum to previous post: I'll start beeping "cq rrapnet" around
> > > 03:10Z somewhere between 7035 and 7040 and listen for check-ins.
> >
> > That'll be my first CW net.

> Nice to put a "fist" to all the calls/names here on rrap. We ought to
make
> it a regular thing. K0CKB tried to check in at end, but Brian had to go
> get a drink. She thinks he's stuck up.

Was that you tuning up on top of us at the beginning of the net, Hans? ;-)
I could hardly hear Brian with all that racket. I could tell Jim had his
bug set for about 30 WPM at first. Thanks for not using any of that swing
we talked about, Hans. Cecil's got a pretty steady fist with that straight
key, don't you think? I appreciate being invited to be a part of the
notorious group. Haven't been on CW much since Field Day. Thanks for the
excuse to get on the air again.

73, Jim AC6XG

4030. Re: FBI spy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-28 07:13:07 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <na9p9tgo2krr6dr9565jtski64l2rtovs3@4ax.com>
Source record: 4230

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:

>Aaron Jones nomail@nomail.com> writes:
>>That would be no problem for our spy if he had been able to defect. He
>>could have just traded a few more double agents for a ham license. I'm
>>sure the KGB would have issued him one... :-)
>>
>One thing about double agents - they are never really trusted by the "other
>side". If he had managed to escape to Russia, they would watch him very
>carefully.

Well they wouldn't have to worry about trusting him with a ham
license. He certainly wouldn't use outdated CW to send secrets. He was
much more sophisticated than that... :-)

From Tucows PDA News:
Quoted: Hanssen allegedly tried to sell the Russians on using handheld
Palm VII organizers. According to the FBI affidavit, Hanssen wrote his
handlers, "we do need a better form of secure communication --
faster." "The VII version comes with wireless internet capability
built in," Hanssen allegedly wrote. "It can allow the rapid
transmission of encrypted messages, which if used on an infrequent
basis, could be quite effective in preventing confusions if the
existence [sic] of the accounts could be appropriately hidden as well
as the existance [sic] of the devices themselves. Such a device might
even serve for rapid transmittal of substantial material in digital
form."

4031. Re: CDL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-28 11:03:49 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010228060349.18626.00001144@nso-md.aol.com>
Source record: 4231

In article <B6C13EAA.3B35%stewartx@sccoast.net>, Dwight Stewart <stewartx@sccoast.net> writes:

(The grim tale of Dwight's trip in his mom's motorhome clipped)

> By the way, since her last trip, she now has a cellular phone. My mother, >a motorhome, and a cellular phone, is not a pretty picture. God help the >people who try to pass her during the next trip.

Dwight:

I would not have endured that kind of dangerous driving for one mile longer than was absolutely necessary. I would have insisted that she let me do the driving -- or I would have removed myself from that motorhome at the nearest safe place. The fact that you obviously did not shows callous disregard for the safety of your fellow human beings. Your mother's feelings be damned -- she's going to feel a lot worse if she ever injures or kills someone with her horrific driving.

73 de Larry, K3LT

4032. Re: Forced code exams? was Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-28 11:03:50 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010228060350.18626.00001145@nso-md.aol.com>
Source record: 4233

In article <3A9BAF66.8F65B4DF@IEEE.org>, Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>Larry, you have previously admitted that you were forced by
>circumstances to pass a Morse code exam. You have previously
>admitted that if it were not for those required circumstances
>that you would not have learned Morse code. That was the reason
>you gave for wanting to continue with the Morse code requirement.
>If you had not been required by circumstances to learn Morse code,
>you would not have learned it. My argument was (is) that hams
>will learn Morse code without it being required by the FCC.
>Remember?

Cecil:

The term "forced" implies an external influence. How can one be
"forced" to do something which he MUST volunteer to do of his own
accord? Nobody gives a rats ass whether or not I obtain or upgrade
a ham ticket. Therefore, nobody is "forcing" me to meet the
requirements. I do that strictly on my own volition, free of external
influence. That the requirement exists and must be achieved in order
to obtain the goal is a mere fact; it is not "force."

73 de Larry, K3LT

4033. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-28 11:03:50 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010228060350.18626.00001146@nso-md.aol.com>
Source record: 4234

In article <3A9BAC08.51724D1C@IEEE.org>, Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>You have admitted that you were "required by circumstances" to pass
>a Morse code exam. "Required by circumstances" is the dictionary
>definition of "forced". You have admitted that your Morse code skill
>was "produced with effort" which is another definition of "forced".
>You have admitted that you didn't like Morse code until you had
>forced yourself to learn it. It doesn't matter if you did that
>voluntarily or involuntarily. The result is the same either way.

Cecil:

If any force was applied to me to learn the Morse code, I applied
it to myself. I did, admittedly, disagree with the requirement at one
time. However, at that time I was looking at the situation through
the eyes of a selfish and immature individual. Once I grew out of
that particular mental state, and began to accept responsibility for
my own personal growth, I realized that the Morse learning/testing
requirement was valid, essential, and eminently practical. Not
surprisingly, it was at that time that I realized that nobody was
"forcing" me to take the Morse code tests. They became a rite of
passage which granted me entree into a worthwhile activity, and
as such, I was more than eager not only to meet these requirements,
but to excel at them. Go figure.

73 de Larry, K3LT

4034. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-28 11:03:51 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010228060351.18626.00001147@nso-md.aol.com>
Source record: 4232

In article <97gb8b$66t$1@nnrp2.phx.gblx.net>, "Jim Bromley, K7JEB"
<w5gyj@primenet.com> writes:

>
>The fact that the US government is involved at all means that every aspect
>of the process is 'forced'. That's what governments do - force everyone
>and everything into prescribed behaviors. It's political science 001, folks.
>
>Get real.
>
>
>Jim Bromley, K7JEB k7jeb@arrl.net
>Glendale, Arizona

Damnit, Jim -- I'm an amateur, not a professional! This is a voluntary
hobby, and just because there are government regulations that must
be obeyed in order to practice this hobby, doesn't mean I'm being
forced to obey them. I do so voluntarily, gladly, willingly. I totally
agree with what little regulation still exists over this hobby -- I wish
there were more. Government does have a legitimate role, particularly
when managing finite, shared resources such as the radio spectrum.
For the government to de-regulate this hobby and give away full
privileges to as many people as want them with dumbed-down
licensing requirements doesn't make a bit of sense to me! So, with
all due respect, Jim -- "get real" yourself!

73 de Larry, K3LT

4035. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-28 12:04:13 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010228070413.18626.00001152@nso-md.aol.com>
Source record: 4237

In article <3A9A651B.35867119@IEEE.org>, Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>Dave Heil wrote:
>> There are enough holes in it to fly a 747 through.
>
>Let's reduce the scope to keep it simple. Exactly where are the holes
>in the following?
>----------------
>Premise:
>All HF hams are required by circumstances to pass a Morse code exam.
>
>From Webster's: "forced - required by circumstances".
>
>Conclusion:
>All HF hams are forced to pass a Morse code exam.
>----------------
>Please show me the holes in the above (and only the above) without muddying
>the waters by resorting to diversionary tactics. I'm not going to respond
>to any of your diversions. I will respond to any holes you find in the
>above premise/conclusion.

Cecil:

Tell you what -- if you want to call it "force," then knock yourself right
flat out. You're just not going to convince any of the rest of us that we
were "forced" to take Morse code tests.

>> I gave you a fairly lengthy list of items, all of which you described as
>> "required by circumstance". These were the kinds of things which a
>> normal person would never say are forced on him like picking up a
>> newspaper. But to you they all were. It is apparent that you do not
>> believe in free will or choices open to man.
>
>The reason you are unable to change your mind in the face of overwhelming
>evidence is that you are predestined to have a closed mind that believes in
>free will.

"A closed mind that believes in free will?" If it takes a "closed mind"
to believe in free will, than I hope my mind is permanently welded
shut!

73 de Larry, K3LT

4036. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-28 12:04:14 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010228070414.18626.00001153@nso-md.aol.com>
Source record: 4235

In article <3A9BB428.E960F7D6@IEEE.org>, Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>
>Earth to Dick: Forcing their citizens to obey regulations is one
>of the things that governments do for a living.

Earth to Cecil:

I am "forced" (required be the presence of negative consequences) by
the government to pay my taxes. If I don't pay them, I can receive
stiff fines and even a jail sentence. That's quite a gun to my head -- and
to keep it from firing, I keep sending a totally unfair portion of my
income to the government every April 15th.

I am not "forced" (required by any damn thing whatsoever) to take a
Morse code test for an amateur radio license. If I choose not to do so,
there is no negative consequence, apart from simply not being granted
permission to do something that I could already live without doing.
Trust me, if I "choose" not to pay my taxes, the consequences are not
nearly as benign. I can't live very well without my freedom, or if I lose
my financial independance due to being "required by circumstances"
to pay heavy fines to the IRS.

For there to be "force," there has to be some sort of gun to your head.
Not being granted a ham radio license isn't even a straw with a spit-ball
in it.

73 de Larry, K3LT

4037. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-28 12:04:14 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20010228070414.18626.00001154@nso-md.aol.com>
Source record: 4236

In article <3A9C7D93.CA4DF553@IEEE.org>, W6RCecilA <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
writes:

>
>N2EY wrote:
>> Ah - so you think requiring code tests for an amateur licenses is not a bad
>> thing.
>
>I'm satisfied with the present requirements.

Jim:

Whining no-coders won't be satisfied until the code testing
requirements are eliminated.

The present code testing requirements are dumbed-down to
insignificance, and now, Cecil is satisfied with them. I'm sure
that when they are totally eliminated, he will be even more
satisified with the "code requirements."

Cecil is just another whining no-coder.

Cecil: Type your way out of that one, logic boy!

73 de Larry, K3LT

4038. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-28 13:34:22 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010228083422.01707.00000288@nso-fp.aol.com>
Source record: 4238

In article <3A9C8FE1.15450A91@IEEE.org>, W6RCecilA <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>>
>> In article <3A9C2DA9.65349F27@IEEE.org>, W6RCecilA <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
>> writes:
>>
>> >Jim Kelley wrote:
>> >> Back 3 years ago, you sure made it sound like it was a bad thing.
>> >
>> >3 years ago, we didn't have a 5wpm only Morse code exam.
>>
>> But we did have medical waivers for those who had trouble with speeds
>higher
>> than 5 wpm.
>
>We didn't have them soon enough.

1990 wasn't soon enough? Why not?

Besides, in 3 years or so we probably won't have ANY Morse code exams.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4039. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-28 13:34:22 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010228083422.01707.00000287@nso-fp.aol.com>
Source record: 4240

In article <3A9C7D93.CA4DF553@IEEE.org>, W6RCecilA <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>> Ah - so you think requiring code tests for an amateur licenses is not a bad
>> thing.
>
>I'm satisfied with the present requirements.

What will you say when they are reduced still further?

73 de Jim, N2EY

4040. Re: 28.085 New channel 19 ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-28 13:34:23 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20010228083423.01707.00000289@nso-fp.aol.com>
Source record: 4239

In article <3A972794.D4D87C1A@IEEE.org>, Cecil <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:

>> Do you have a problem with geography? Texas is east of California, unless
>> you're looking for a "long path" route.
>
>Nope, just have a problem being associated with Eastern liberals.

What about Texas liberals? They're the worst, by far. Remember that it was a Texas liberal (LBJ) who got us mired in Vietnam, started the whole US welfare state setup with his "Great Society" programs, and funded the whole mess with deficits. And all the while the real problems of society (like overdependence on foreign energy, and an aging industrial infrastructure) were ignored, setting the stage for the staglfation of the 1970s and the huge national debt that we are only now beginning to pay off.

LBJ was so awful he makes Richard Nixon look good.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4041. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-28 14:30:56 UTC
From: W6RCecilA <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A9D0BA0.104FC476@IEEE.org>
Source record: 4241

N2EY wrote:
> >We didn't have them (waivers) soon enough.
>
> 1990 wasn't soon enough? Why not?

Because a competent ham who got his technician license in the 50s,
who has an engineering degree, who had a commercial radio license,
who for years was chief engineer at an AM broadcast station, and
who tried for hundreds of hours to get his code speed up to 13wpm,
was not allowed reasonable privileges on HF ham bands until the 90s.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

4042. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-28 14:37:50 UTC
From: W6RCecilA <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A9D0D3E.CF97C29@IEEE.org>
Source record: 4242

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> >I'm satisfied with the present requirements.
>
> Whining no-coders won't be satisfied until the code testing
> requirements are eliminated.
>
> Cecil is just another whining no-coder.

Here's Larry logic in action:
Cecil is satisfied with the present requirements.
Whining no-coders are not satisfied with the present requirements.
Therefore: Cecil is a whining no coder.

Why am I not surprised at your continued use of invalid logic?

> Cecil: Type your way out of that one, logic boy!

I just did, Larry, where were you when we had the r.r.a.p
CW net last night? Does joining a CW net in the middle of
a severe lightning storm sound like a no-coder to you?
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

4043. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-28 14:49:21 UTC
From: W6RCecilA <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A9D0FF1.86E95D2B@IEEE.org>
Source record: 4243

N2EY wrote:
>
> <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org> writes:
> >I'm satisfied with the present requirements.
>
> What will you say when they are reduced still further?

Depends on how and how much they are reduced. For instance,
I don't see much utility in requiring the examinee to know,
off the top of his head, the answer to the following:

"What should be the approximate capacitance of the resonating
capacitor in a gamma matching circuit on a 1/2WL dipole antenna
for the 20-meter wavelength band?"
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

4044. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-28 15:06:43 UTC
From: W6RCecilA <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A9D1403.F0F91828@IEEE.org>
Source record: 4244

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> If any force was applied to me to learn the Morse code, I applied
> it to myself. I did, admittedly, disagree with the requirement at one
> time.

Then you are admitting, as you have previously admitted, that you
were required by circumstances (at the FCC), to learn Morse code.
"Required by circumstances" is the dictionary definition of forced.

> ... it was at that time that I realized that nobody was
> "forcing" me to take the Morse code tests.

It was at that time that you figured out how to rationalize the
requirements. Governments create and enforce requirements.
That's what governments do.

Here's a little logic exercise for you. Take a piece of paper and
draw a circle. Label that circle, "the set of all US HF hams".
Now how many individuals in that set were not required by
circumstances to pass a Morse code exam? "Required by circumstances"
is the dictionary definition of "forced". Larry, ALL US HF hams,
including you, were required by circumstances to pass a Morse code
exam. Only people outside the circle are not required by circumstances
to pass a Morse code exam.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

4045. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-28 15:37:50 UTC
From: W6RCecilA <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A9D1B4E.981DE67D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 4245

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> This is a voluntary
> hobby, and just because there are government regulations that must
> be obeyed in order to practice this hobby, doesn't mean I'm being
> forced to obey them.

It is irrelevant how you feel about the regulations. The truth is
that you, as a licensed amateur radio operator are forced to
obey the regulations. If you don't believe that, please try
contacting the foreign hams in the US CW/digital portion of
40m. See how long it is until you are forced to obey the
regulations.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

4046. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-28 15:45:26 UTC
From: W6RCecilA <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A9D1D16.B06040FB@IEEE.org>
Source record: 4246

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> I am not "forced" (required by any damn thing whatsoever) to take a
> Morse code test for an amateur radio license.

Taxes are what you pay for the privilege of living in this country.
Morse code tests are the "taxes" you pay for the privilege of being
a US HF amateur radio operator. All US HF amateur radio operators have
been required by circumstances to pass a Morse code exam. You are
a US HF amateur radio operator. Therefore, you were required by
circumstances to pass a Morse code exam. How you feel about being
forced is irrelevant. Is this a case of relax and enjoy it and
then it's not rape?

> If I choose not to do so,
> there is no negative consequence, apart from simply not being granted
> permission to do something that I could already live without doing.

There is no way a US HF amateur radio operator can choose not to take
a Morse code exam. Obviously, there is no way you can change your
mind and not have taken a Morse code exam.

> For there to be "force," there has to be some sort of gun to your head.

That's a false statement according to Webster's dictionary. Even your
cheap dictionary says: "forced - produced with effort". You have already
admitted that your Morse code skill was "produced with effort". Therefore,
your Morse code skill was "forced".
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

4047. Re: Pride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-28 15:50:30 UTC
From: W6RCecilA <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A9D1E46.37164C98@IEEE.org>
Source record: 4247

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> Tell you what -- if you want to call it "force," then knock yourself right
> flat out. You're just not going to convince any of the rest of us that we
> were "forced" to take Morse code tests.

So you seem to be admitting that you cannot refute my logical argument.
It doesn't matter what you feel, Larry. Your feelings are irrelevant.
What is relevant is the dictionary definition of "forced". You met that
definition of "forced" when you took your Morse code exam. I'm sorry
that facts upset you, Larry, but you getting upset and denying reality
is irrelevant.

> "A closed mind that believes in free will?"

A closed mind that believes in free will is predestined to believe
in free will and has no choice in the matter. Only an open mind that
questions the existence of predestination VS free will is actually
open.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

4048. Re: FBI spy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-28 16:00:22 UTC
From: W6RCecilA <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A9D2096.AC3DE33D@IEEE.org>
Source record: 4249

Jim Kelley wrote:
> Cecil's got a pretty steady fist with that straight key, don't you think?

Actually, last night I was wondering if it's time to give up on
physically being able to send CW without a keyboard. My familial
tremors are getting worse. Sometimes I press down and nothing
happens and sometimes I press down and two things happen.

Strangely enough, last night I realized that I had not paid enough
attention to call signs on this newsgroup to recognize them on the
air. When Brian said to give AC6XG a call, I thought, "Who's that?" :-)
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

4049. Re: 28.085 New channel 19 ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-28 16:04:54 UTC
From: W6RCecilA <Cecil.A.Moore@IEEE.org>
Message-ID: <3A9D21A6.F8888DFB@IEEE.org>
Source record: 4250

N2EY wrote:
> LBJ was so awful he makes Richard Nixon look good.

I agree, Jim. I wish LBJ had not been a Texan. There's
a historical pocket of corruption down around Duval and
Jim Wells Counties. When LBJ went to Congress, dead
people had voted for him and lots votes were cast for
him in alphabetical order. LBJ and Clinton were out of
somewhat the same mold. Anything goes as long as they
don't get caught.
--
http://www.mindspring.com/~w6rca

4050. Re: First official RRAP CW net on 7038.7 kHz

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2001-02-28 16:08:39 UTC
From: Aaron Jones <nomail@nomail.com>
Message-ID: <vl8q9t0aq63h2ge9gf3s7ddh2ccrn0pmmp@4ax.com>
Source record: 4248

Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
> At 1010PM EST Feb 27 W3RV called the first session of the RRAP CW Net.
>Checking in were;
>W3RV Brian- NCS
>W0EX Dick
>AC6XG Jim
>K0HB Hans
>N2EY Jim
>W6RCA Cecil

Although I didn't listen to the net, I'll wager that none of you folks called each other a name, said a cross word, or ran each other down during this QSO/Net. Why was that? You folks often do one or more of those things to each other here on rrap. Is this the gentleman's effect of the CW mode at work??

> Hey, that was fun! Been a long time since I've participated in a CW
>"roundtable". We gotta do that again some time.

Yep. Hams were actually treating each other like hams...